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The purpose was to investigate the relationship between the self-concept of teachers and their perceptions of others. William Fitts' Tennessee Self Concept Scale and L. S. Wrightsman's Philosophy of Human Nature Scale were administered to 84 classroom teachers employed by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System. Correlation analysis, using the Pearson-Product Moment formula, was obtained between the scores of the two scales. t tests were employed to obtain differences between the sex and teaching level variables. The .05 and .01 levels were selected for determining significance. Significant correlations were found between the scores of the two scales. An analysis of the data indicated that the more positively a person perceived himself the more positively he perceived others. The relationship between the self-definition of the subjects and their perceptions of others was more pronounced than the relationship between the way the subjects proceeded to define themselves and their perceptions of others. The t tests reported some significant differences in self-concept between males and females, but no significant differences in perceptions of others. There were no significant differences between elementary and secondary level teachers in self-concept or perceptions of others. Implications offered are for incorporating the knowledge of the relationship between self-others perceptions into teacher training programs and inservice training workshops.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Literature exists to suggest that philosophers and teachers in Ancient Greece and Rome were dealing with the question of personal identity, or in modern terms one's self-concept (Gergen, 1971). The recognition of Freud's formulation of the psychoanalytic system of psychology was followed by increased awareness of the dynamics of an individual's psychological process.

In 1943 Rainy defined self-concept: "The self-concept is the more or less organized perceptual object resulting from the present and past self observation . . . (it is) what a person believes about himself" (cited in Combs and Snygg, 1959, p. 127). Since then other psychologists and theorists, such as Combs and Snygg (1959), Carl Rogers (1961), and William Fitts (1971) have made contributions to the understanding of the construct "self-concept".

Just as the evolution of man's thinking about his psychological process and his understanding of himself has been slow, so has the evolution of man's understanding of his perceptions of others. L. S. Wrightsman (1964) states:

For most of us, "human nature" is a pervasive and useful concept. We rely on it frequently to justify our own behavior and the behavior of others. Our beliefs about it influence everything from the way we bargain with a used-car dealer to our expectations...
about a nuclear war. Yet research psychologists and sociologists have almost completely ignored the scientific study of people's attitudes toward their fellow man. We seem so intent on making it explicit that there is no such thing as "The human nature" that we appear unaware that the average man believes that there is and that he employs his philosophy of human nature in his dealings with others. (p. 743)

These two concepts, i.e., self-concept and philosophy of human nature, are recognized, but the relationship between them could bear further investigation. Given that each individual has specific views of himself as a person and specific views of others as persons, this author has raised the question: Is there some similarity in the viewpoints, or are they entirely different?

**Statement of Problem**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the self-concept of teachers and their perceptions of others and the degree to which this relationship exists. More specifically, the study is an investigation of whether teachers with positive self-concepts also hold positive concepts of others and whether teachers with negative self-concepts hold negative concepts of others.

**Significance of Study**

Many people (May, 1953; James & Jongeward, 1976; Rogers, 1961; and Kluckhohn, Murray, & Schneider, 1969) have become interested in how an individual feels about himself and how he relates to others. It is not clear what the relationship is between one's feelings for himself and how he feels about others. There are psychological theories which suggest that a person who feels positively about himself will also view others positively, and that those who view themselves negatively will have negative perceptions of others. Sullivan (1953) states in his discussion of modern psychiatry:

> As I have said, the peculiarity exists that one can find in others only that which is in the self. And so the unhappy child who grows up without love will have a self dynamism which shows great capacity for finding fault with others and, by the same token, with himself. (p. 22)

He further asserts:

> This selective exclusion of experience which leads to one's being occupied with or noticing only the hostile unfriendly aspect of living not only is manifested in one's attitudes toward self, but also is represented in the attitude toward the self. (Sullivan, 1953, p. 24)

Self-theorists (Rogers, 1961; Combs and Snygg, 1959) have maintained that behavior is influenced by one's self-concept and also that attitudes and beliefs about other people are directly related to self-perception.

There are other theories which suggest that a person may view himself positively and others negatively, or vice
versa. James and Jongeward (1971) state:
Before children are eight years old they develop a concept about their own worth. They also formulate ideas about the worth of others. They crystallize their experiences and decide what it all means to them, what parts they are going to play, and how they are going to play them. (p. 34)

Transactional Analysis Theory (Harris, 1967) hypothesizes that these decisions lead a person to take psychological positions which fit into four basic patterns: I'm OK, You're OK; I'm OK, You're not-OK; I'm not-OK, You're OK; and I'm not-OK, You're not-OK.

Having a knowledge of the relationship between self-concept and philosophy of human nature can be significant when one begins to deal in areas of human interaction. Teachers, by the nature of their profession, are placed in positions where there is teacher/student interaction every day. The teacher directly relates to thousands of students in the course of a career. This relationship between the teacher and student is known to be significant in terms of the student's performance and the student's feelings of adequacy and self-worth (Aspy, 1975; Mitchell, 1976; and Salvia, Clark, and Ysseldyke, 1973).

Fitts (1972) states: "Whether learning is exciting and rewarding, or boring and irrelevant is largely dependent upon the teacher. Teachers can make students feel valuable, trustworthy, confident, and 'turned on,' or they can cause students to lose all sense of dignity and self-respect" (p. 44).

Hypotheses
To deal with this subject the hypotheses are stated in the null form:

Major Null Hypothesis
There is no significant relationship between an individual's self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and his perceptions of others as measured by the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale with respect to the variables of total group, sex, and teaching level.

Null Subhypotheses
1. There is no significant relationship between the definition of self as measured by the Positive Scores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the perceptions of others as measured by the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale (PHN) for the total group.
2. There is no significant relationship between the definition of self as measured by the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS and the perceptions of others as measured by the PHN for the total group.
3. There is no significant relationship between the definition of self as measured by the Clinical Scores of the TSCS and the perceptions of others as measured by the PHN for the total group.
4. There is no significant t ratio between males and
females on the Positive Scores of the TSCS.
5. There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS.
6. There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the Clinical Scores of the TSCS.
7. There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the scores of the PHN.
8. There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Positive Scores of the TSCS.
9. There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS.
10. There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Clinical Scores of the TSCS.
11. There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the scores of the PHN.

Definitions
For the purpose of this study the following terms are defined: (a) self-concept, (b) philosophy of human nature.

Self-Concept
Rogers' (1951) use of the term "self-concept" is descriptive of the meaning employed in this study:
The self concept of self-structure may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive and negative valence.

(p. 136)

Philosophy of Human Nature
Wrightsman (1964) uses several independent dimensions in defining philosophy of human nature, or the concept used to explain personal actions and the actions of others. These dimensions are:

Trustworthiness. The extent to which people are seen as moral, honest, and reliable.

Altruism. The extent of unselfishness, sincere sympathy, and concern for others.

Independence. The extent to which a person can maintain his convictions in the face of society's pressures toward conformity.

Strength of will and rationality. The extent to which people understand the motives behind their behavior and the extent to which they have control over their own outcomes.

Favorability. A dimension which is a total overall view of human nature, encompassing trustworthiness, altruism, independence, and strength of will and rationality.
The complexity of human nature. A dimension which cuts across the other dimensions and deals with the extent to which people are complex and hard to understand or simple and easy to understand.

Variability in human nature. This dimension relates to the extent of individual differences in basic nature and the basic changeability in human nature.

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

Assumptions of the Study

For the purpose of the study the following assumptions are made:

1. The subjects of this study are a representative sample of teachers employed by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System.

2. The responses on the test questions are considered to be frank and honest.

3. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale is a valid and reliable measure of self-concept.

4. The Philosophy of Human Nature Scale is a valid and reliable scale for measuring philosophies of human nature.

5. The person administering the inventories is competent and will not in any significant way bias the responses.

6. The statistical techniques and analyses are adequate to treat and explore the data.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations are recognized and reported for this study:

1. The results are limited to the subjects in the study and to similar populations.

2. The subjects in this study are volunteers and thereby an internal bias may exist.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

Combs (1965) in discussing the effective teacher says the good teacher must share his "self" and the self must have a satisfactory degree of adequacy, which he describes as follows:

1. This person tends to see himself in essentially positive ways, i.e., he sees himself as generally liked, wanted, successful and as an able person with dignity, worth, and integrity.

2. He perceives himself and the world accurately and realistically. He is able to confront the world with openness and acceptance, seeing both himself and external events with a minimum of distortion or defensiveness.

3. He has deep feelings of identification with other people. He feels "at one with" large numbers of persons of widely differing backgrounds. Identification is not a matter of polished social graces, but is a feeling of oneness in the human condition.

4. He is well informed. An adequate person is not uninformed, but has a perceptual field which is rich, varied, and available for use when needed.

The effective teacher is the teacher who respects himself and others. He allows the student to learn in an atmosphere of democracy and mutual concern.

In keeping with this view of interpersonal relationships, the review of literature will be centered around the following topics: (1) attitudes of teachers; (2) self-concept of teachers; (3) perceptions of others; (4) relationships between self-concept and perception of others.

Attitudes of Teachers

There are numerous studies related to the attitudes of teachers. This review is a selection of significant studies appropriate to this investigation.

Cook and Leeds (1947) devised a scale for measuring the attitudes of teachers. In assessing their efforts they state:

we assumed that a teacher who is well liked by his pupils, and who establishes intimate and harmonious working relationships with them has a high level of the personality traits we sought to measure. We believed that the emotionalized attitudes of pupils toward their teachers could be measured. We furthermore assumed that the attitudes of pupils toward teachers were the result of the teachers' attitudes toward pupils. (p. 399)

Cook and Leeds (1947) found in constructing the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) that the attitude of individual teachers toward students was significantly related to the pupil's attitudes toward the teachers. Both sets of attitudes were measured and were found to be reliable at .90 and the relationship between the attitudes of teachers and students was correlated at .46

Piana and Gage (1955) reported in the summary of their
was a significant positive relationship between teachers' scores on the MTAI and the ratings of the teachers by their pupils. Kingston and Newsome (1960) investigated the degree of relationship between teachers' attitudes as measured by the MTAI and opinions and attitudes which reflect authoritarian opinions and attitudes. In their study they found the teachers to be somewhat conservative and domineering.

Wakefield and Cunningham (1975) found teachers' attitudes to correspond to teachers' personality needs, as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Vocational Preference Inventory. Mitchell (1976) states: "For teachers, judgments whether correct or incorrect are based on their own background and biases . . ." (p. 303). He further implies that the group climate in a classroom is essentially determined by the teacher. He indicates that some classes exhibit friendliness and cooperation while others are noted for jealousy, and that when these situations occur, the teacher is typically the direct model through which behaviors foster the climate for the students. He implies that teachers who respond favorably to differences among students in personality, independence, capability, or motivation are good models for other teachers and for students.

Mitchell (1976) supports the belief that the teacher who perceives correctly a student's potential or capability will probably have realistic attitudes and expectations. Attitudes become crucial if they become self-fulfilling prophesies. According to Mitchell, not all expectations do become self-fulfilling prophesies but certain circumstances enable a teacher to significantly affect or alter a student's academic or social behavior.

In 1959 La Bue investigated the relationship between the amount of professional information a teacher had and his classroom attitudes. He found that a knowledge of the principles of educational psychology, child development, and child behavior were significantly related to teacher attitudes as measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Scates (1956) found that the type of teacher education institution attended and the amount of education a teacher had were influencing factors on teacher attitudes. Ryan (1960) states that elementary teachers generally show more favorable attitudes than secondary teachers. The number of years of teaching experience and age factors did not appear to be associated with the attitudes of teachers in his study.

Silberman (1969) found that elementary school teachers were not found to be highly accepting or rejecting of disabled persons. Teachers' attitudes were not significantly influenced by their race, age, religion, education, experience, specialized area, or contact with a disabled person. Females were found to be less rejecting of disabled persons
than males. Shotel, Iano and McGlynn (1972) found that teachers were more positive toward learning disabled children than toward educable mentally retarded children or emotionally disturbed children. Salvia, Clark and Ysseldyke (1973) in studying the effect of labeling children learned that children who were labeled gifted were seen more positively than children who were labeled normal. The children labeled retarded were rated less favorably than the "normal" or "gifted" children.

Brophy and Good (1970, cited in Mitchell, 1976) found that teachers do respond differently to identical behaviors exhibited by students of different racial groups, socioeconomic status or achievement level. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) found that when elementary school teachers were falsely told certain children in their classes were late bloomers and could be expected to make substantial gains in their academic achievement, that there was a marked improvement in academic performance of the experimental group. Differences in performance were attributed to teacher expectation. Other studies (Clairom, 1969; Snow, 1969; and Taylor, 1970) have found little or no change in student behavior after teachers were given false information regarding educational predictions. Haskett (1969) found a significant positive correlation between teacher expectation and student social development and a significant relationship between teacher expectancy and student achievement.

Self-Concept of Teachers

In 1971 J. M. Beniskos described a teacher's self-concept as it might be. He implies:

1. He should be aware of his greatness. This means that he will then also be aware that greatness applies to everyone and he will be respectful of the greatness of others.

2. He should be aware of his uniqueness. The most precious thing a teacher brings to his pupils when he walks into the classroom is himself. He adds that if teachers accept themselves and their own uniqueness then they can allow the students to be individuals even though they may make them "toe the line" when necessary.

3. He should be aware of his need to love and of his need to be loved. Teachers must realize that a love relationship is what the child needs not only in the home but in the school. Pupils invariably describe the good teacher as someone who is humane, who is friendly, humorous, and interested in them. Research also indicates that a good teacher is flexible, that he personalizes his teaching, and that he relates to his pupils. The good teacher feels adequate, wanted, worthy; he identifies with people and has positive feelings for others.

4. He should be aware that he is limited. Beniskos believes that good educators are always striving for self-improvement and for personal development of individual students.
Beniskos (1971) presented characteristics which he felt described the self-concept of a good teacher. Other researchers have found teachers do not always possess these characteristics.

Smith (1965) studied the image of high-school teachers and found that there are differences in the image of the "ideal" high school teacher as viewed by teachers and non-teachers. The non-teachers wished the teachers would be more aggressive, active, and socially forceful, while the teachers saw their roles as more passive and conforming. Older, more experienced teachers viewed their roles as being passive and conforming, while the younger teachers were not satisfied with the passive, conforming role.

Dieken and Fox (1973) investigated the relationship between the perceptions teachers have of themselves as teachers and their pattern of verbal interaction in the classroom. They report:

1. There were statistically significant differences between teachers who were classified as interactionists and leaders. The interactionists praised the students more, lectured less, used less criticism and teacher authority, elicited more student-initiated talk, devoted less time to content, and utilized more indirect teacher influence.

2. There were differences between teachers classified as managers and innovators. Managers used more criticism; lectured more; had less student-initiated talk; and spent more time on content than did innovators.

3. There were differences between teachers classified as interactionists and innovators. Interactionists gave fewer specific directions; spent less time talking; used less criticism and teacher authority; had more student-initiated talk; and utilized greater indirect influence than the innovators.

4. There were differences between teachers classified as managers and as leaders. Managers used more criticism than leaders.

5. There were differences between teachers classified as interactionists and any of the other groups. Interactionists placed a higher degree of emphasis upon stimulating independent thought than any of the other groups.

Rowson (1970) and Trowbridge (1969) found that teachers with more positive self-concepts generate different kinds of classroom activity than those with less positive self-concepts. The students of teachers with more positive self-concepts were more likely to engage in divergent and evaluative thinking and less likely to spend time in routine, memory, or convergent thinking activities.

Hounshell and Dieter (1975) investigated the self-image of outstanding biology teachers and found that outstanding biology teachers scored high on achievement, endurance, order, intraception, dominance, nurturance, defensiveness, personal adjustment, favorableness, self-
confidence, self-control, and scored low in succorance (instrument was the Gough Adjective Checklist).

Studies conducted by Pitts (1972) indicate that teachers scored slightly different than the general population on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. He reports that the Total Positive Score is slightly above the average score, indicating that the teachers included in his study had a slightly more positive self-image than the norm group.

Garvey (1970) studied the relationship between self-concept and student teaching. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was used as the measure for self-concept and was compared to the rating of the students’ teaching offered by the instructor. The successful student teachers scored higher on Identity, Total Positive, Family Self, and Social Self than the less successful students. The successful student teachers scored lower on conflict and higher on certainty and consistency than the less successful student teachers. The highly rated student teachers demonstrated less similarity to mental patient groups and closer similarity to the well integrated group. Garvey states:

These findings confirm . . . that success in student teaching is affected, but not necessarily determined, by a positive view of oneself, lack of confusion in self-perception, and good adjustment. (p. 360)

Passmore’s (1970) findings support the study conducted by Garvey. The results of Passmore’s study demonstrate that there are differences in the performance of teachers which are related to their self-concepts.

Aspy (1975) investigated the relationship between the teacher’s self-concept and the student’s academic achievement. Six third-grade teachers were selected for the study and twenty students from their classes were chosen for the study. A positive relationship, significant at the .05 level, was found for four subtests on the Stanford Achievement Test. The levels of self-concept of the teachers related positively to the cognitive growth of the students. Aspy comments:

This study supports the general hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the levels of teacher self-concept and cognitive growth of the students. In particular, it points up the need for assessing teachers on other than intellective indices. (p. 389)

Lafferty (1961) investigated the improvement of a teacher’s mental health after participating in a consulting program. The results indicate positive changes in eight of the sixteen scales (Masochistic, Self-Effacing, Managerial/Autocratic, Competitive/Narcissistic, Rebellious/Distrustful). The experimental group became less distrustful; made advances in leadership; and were more self-sufficient. The control group became less willing to give to others and to themselves. Lafferty says:

Through consultation, there was an increase in the real-
ization of actual and ideal self-concepts held by instructors. In the experimental group the instructor who had set an unobtainable goal for himself felt less guilty about not achieving it while the control group instructor still felt strong anxiety. (p. 24)

Lafferty (1961) further says that members of the experimental group described themselves as more assertive, confident, and self-respecting while the control group members were more dependent, submissive, and timid. The study seemed to reveal that successful changes in self-perception in instructors can occur under a consultation program.

Mixer and Milson (1973) state that before the teacher can become aware of the student's needs he must:
be possessed of a quiet sense of self-respect and self-worth. A teacher nourishes from overflow, not from emptiness. The amount and degree of available overflow depends strongly on the self-image. Every human being must make sense to himself. You do unto others what you do unto yourself. (p. 348)

Perceptions of Others
There is no consensus of opinion as to the nature of man, but authorities from all areas of study do indicate that some image of man or doctrine of man is essential wherever men interact with other men. Wrightsman (1964) says: "It is assumed that everyone possesses at least some fragments of a philosophy of human nature, or some expectancy that people will behave in certain ways" (p. 743).

The following review will deal specifically with studies conducted around perceptions of others as measured by the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale (PHN) for the general population. Studies on this subject with teachers are limited.

Tompkins (1965) found that eighty per cent of the people who say they believe that man is basically good also believe in left wing ideologies which he labels as "humanistic" while eighty per cent of the people who believe that people are basically evil are committed to the right wing belief that men should conform to external standards.

Carlson (1966) found that people with high faith in human nature generally have liberal social attitudes, while belief in people's successes as determined by their own efforts is related to conservative attitudes.

Lignon (1963, cited in Mason, 1966) reported a favorable view of human nature correlated with a religious attitude which stressed humanitarianism. Mason (1966) found no significant differences between perceptions of human nature held by seminary students and counselor trainees. He also reported that a negative view of human nature was statistically related to the tendency to be authoritarian.

Dole, Nottingham and Wrightsman (1969) studied the views of human nature held by counseling, clinical, and rehabilitation students. They found the students in these
three fields of study held neutral, although slightly favorable, attitudes toward others and view others as complex and variable.

Miller (1968) found statistical differences between social work students and professional social workers on four variables of the PHN Scale (Trustworthiness, Altruism, Independence, and Total Positive). Professional social workers viewed human nature as being more positive than the students.

Koepper (1966) found a significant positive correlation between a teacher's General Favorability Score on the PHN Scale and the extent to which he would agree to teach in a desegregated school.

Duke and Wrightsman (1968) investigated the relation of a personality dimension of defensive expression, i.e., repression-sensitization, to the dimension of the philosophy of human nature as measured by the PHN Scale. He found that sensitizers (those who intellectualize and who are obsessive) have a more negative view of human nature than repressers (those who avoid using the defense mechanisms of denial and repression). Sensitizers focus on negative experiences while repressers focus on positive experiences. Males and females scored about the same on their conceptions of complexity and variability of human nature and both groups believe that human nature is complex and hard to understand and that each person differs in his psychological makeup.

Cox (1972) investigated the relationship between behavioral expectations regarding other people and the policies, programs, practices, and interpersonal behavior styles on a college campus. The PHN Scale was administered to counselors, administrators, faculty, and full-time students. Cox offered the following relevant findings:

1. The educators tended to hold more favorable philosophies of human nature than the students. Counselors generally held the most favorable beliefs about human nature.
2. All subjects reported that people are complex and variable.
3. Female students scored higher on the Trustworthy, Altruism, Independence, and Variability Scores than did the male students. Female students also viewed man as generally more positive and multiplex overall than did the male students. Female faculty reported man as more trustworthy than did the male faculty.

Hamrick's (1970) study reports similar findings to those of Cox (1972). The study conducted by Hamrick investigated the differences between university trustees, administrators, faculty, and students on the philosophies of human nature. She found that all groups believed that people are different and complex, that the trustees reported the most favorable perceptions of others and the students reported the least favorable perceptions of others, and that the faculty subjects perceived others as being more trustworthy than the student subjects.
Wolf (1971, cited in Wrightsman, 1971) investigated the relationships among faculty morale, philosophies of human nature of high school principals, and teachers' perceived participation in educational decision-making. He reports:

There is no significant relationship between the principals' beliefs about human nature and the teaching staffs' morale but the relationship is pronounced. Of the 11 principals with high PEN scores, eight had teachers with above-average morale. Of the 11 low PHN principals, eight had teachers with below-average morale. (p. 36)

Wrightsman's (1964) studies indicate that college students see human nature as neither particularly good nor particularly bad. He reports that females possess a more positive view of human nature than do males. Dissatisfaction with one's self-concept was related to a negative view of human nature. Students who held positive views of human nature tended to evaluate their instructors favorably.

Relationship Between Self-Concept and Perceptions of Others

The review of studies on the relationship between self-concept and perceptions of others will be for the general population.

Elizabeth Sheerer (1949) investigated the tone of a client's self-reference and the changing content of his self-concept. Emphasis was placed on the client's statements which contributed to an analysis of his personality. The statements which provided the clearest answers to the analysis fell into five headings: (1) statements relating to the problem of choice of standards for behavior; (2) statements showing whether the client sees himself or others as responsible for his behavior, for the origin and solution of his problems; (3) statements relating to the philosophy of life; (4) statements relating to self-evaluative comments; (5) statements of evaluative comments about other persons. These statements described the degree to which the client accepted and respected himself and others. From this conclusion, Sheerer stated the hypothesis for her study: "There is a positive correlation between the extent to which an individual expresses acceptance of and respect for self and the extent to which he expresses acceptance of and respect for others" (p. 170).

After defining self-acceptance and respect for self and acceptance of and respect for others, Sheerer developed a scale comprised of 50 statements for self-evaluation and 50 statements covering evaluation of others. Raskin, Sheerer, and Pearse (1949) rated the acceptance of and respect for self and others of ten counseling clients in a total of 59 interviews. The product-moment correlation coefficient was found to be .51, which was significant at the .01 level. Sheerer found a marked increase in self-acceptance and respect for self throughout eight of the ten cases and an increase in acceptance of and respect for others in six of the
cases.

While Sheerer was conducting her research, Stock (1949) was studying much the same problem using a different methodology. Stock investigated the feelings about self and others, the relationship between the two sets of feelings, and the differentiation of feelings about others. Ten categories about feelings toward self and others were selected for organizing the data and making the analysis systematic. The statements were judged according to reference to self and others and also for intensity and direction of feeling. The study is a report of applying this design in ten counseling cases which were conducted according to the principles of non-directive therapy. Using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient Stock found the relationship to be .38 for the total group of interviews and .66 for those interviews which reported more than ten statements of feeling about others. Stock implies:

The total results of this study indicate that a definite relationship exists between the way an individual feels about himself and the way he feels about other persons. As his feelings about himself change to objective or positive, feelings about others change in a similar direction. (p. 180)

Stock found in her study that attitudes toward individuals in a social relationship correlated more highly with self-attitudes than did feelings in the area of family relationships or more impersonal relationships. It was also indicated that there is a close correspondence between self-attitudes and the emotions directed toward others and the feelings about the relationship with others.

Berger (1952) studied the positive relationship between acceptance of self and acceptance of others and whether this relationship would be strengthened by an approach using larger groups and more varied samples than Sheerer and Stock. The scales were administered to a variety of groups and correlations between acceptance of self and acceptance of others were significantly positive. McIntyre (1952) endeavored to support the work of Sheerer and Stock and found positive correlations between attitudes toward self and others.

Phillips (1951) used the scales devised by Sheerer to rate college students at George Washington University. In Sheerer's study the "inferred self" was rated by observers, but in Phillips' study 48 students rated themselves. The correlation between attitudes toward self and others was .74, a correlation above those reported by Sheerer (1949) and Stock (1949), but in line with the reports of Rogers and his students (1949). Phillips expanded his research and considered the age variable. He gathered data for 77 additional college students, obtaining correlations of .54. He then gathered data for 45 sophomore high school students (correlation .67) and 41 senior high school students (correlation .51). The correlation in all cases was positive and significant. Phillips reported: "It is apparent from
these results that the self-others attitudes as measured in terms of an objective, multiple-choice questionnaire show substantial relationships far above that expected by chance" (p. 80). The results also show that the observations of clinicians in regard to self-others attitudes hold for normal persons as well as for patients.

In the study done by Fry (1954) the expressed attitudes of self-acceptance were found to be firmly and positively related to expressed attitudes of acceptance of others. The correlation was .40 which is significant at the .01 level.

Davidson and Lang (1960) approached the study of self-others attitudes from a different direction. They studied children's perceptions of their teacher's feelings toward them and the children's perceptions of themselves. Instruments were developed to measure self-perception and perception of the feelings of others. The instruments were administered to 89 boys and 114 girls in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades of a New York City public school. The self-perception and the perception of others correlation was .82. Girls perceived their teacher's feelings toward them more favorably than did the boys and the child with the more favorable self-image was the child who was more likely to perceive his teacher's feelings about him more favorably. Davidson and Lang comment: "It was also found that the more positive the children's perceptions of their teachers' feelings, the better was their academic achievement and the more desirable their classroom behavior as rated by the teachers" (1960, p. 116).

Kipnis (1961) investigated the relationship between interpersonal perceptions and the process of changing self-concepts. A relationship was found between the subjects' perceptions of their friends and changes in self-concept and indicates a strong relationship between interpersonal perceptions and self-perception. The changes in self-concept were related to choice of friends who held positive personality characteristics. The subjects then attributed to themselves more positive personality traits than before.

A study done by Winkler, Munger, Gust, and Teigland (1963) was designed to measure the degree to which an individual perceives himself as being similar to others with whom he is associated. It was found that the subjects of two groups gained in acceptance of others and perceptions of themselves as similar to others in the group. Providing a therapeutic atmosphere in one group precipitated changes in self or "ideal self", but there is no significant differences between the therapeutic group and the non-therapeutic group on measures of perception of self and others.

Mueller (1963) studied the self-others perceptions by approaching the study with three purposes:

1. To investigate the relationship between two kinds of accuracy scores in social perception.
2. To investigate the influence of self-insight on these accuracy scores.
3. To investigate the relationship between self-in-
sight into himself. The results of the study support the contention that an individual's sensitivity to others is a function of his insight into himself.

Richmond, Mason and Padgett (1972) state:
It is becoming increasingly urgent that man learn to live with others in a more effective manner in order to combat problems of social, racial, and environmental proportions. There is much speculation but little research to support the notion that one's view of oneself is inextricably interwoven with one's perceptions of others. (p. 103)

In studying the relationship between self-others perceptions these authors administered the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale to 150 undergraduate students. Results indicate small, but significant, relationships between self-concept scores and scores for perception of others. Results also show that females scored higher in altruism and in Family Self and lower in Total Variability than did males. Females reported higher concepts of themselves as integrated, worthwhile members of the family. Males exhibited more variability and uncertainty in viewing themselves. Men were less integrated in their self-concepts than women. The conclusions reached by Richmond, Mason, and Padgett are that males and females differ in their perceptions of themselves and others and that there are significant relationships between the subjects' perceptions of themselves and their views of others.

Crane (1973) investigated the relationship between attitudes towards acceptance of self and others and adjustment to teaching. He found a significant relationship between self-other perceptions and adjustment to teaching. The relationship correlated with four different estimates of expected job satisfaction for three different population samples.

The studies reported above seem to indicate the accuracy of conclusions drawn by Sheerer (1949):
The central conclusion is that one's attitudes toward others are related, to a decidedly significant degree, to the attitudes one holds towards one's self. In one sense, this is common knowledge. If we are to take it seriously however, it might mean that change in attitudes of acceptance toward others can come about basically only through change in attitudes toward self. If we apply this to some of the problems of social psychology, it might mean the increased acceptance of minority groups, foreigners, and the like, could best be achieved by some type of group therapy which would tend to alter the individual's acceptance of and respect for himself. It might mean that in situations of industrial tension, or professional friction, the most effective means of approach would be through dealing with the
attitudes of the person toward himself, rather than devoting our energies to the expression of, and description of, the external "causes of the tension." (p. 174)

Summary
The review of related literature as presented in this chapter may be summarized as follows:

1. Attitudes of teachers toward students are related to the student's attitudes toward the teachers. Teacher attitudes are related to their personality needs and to the amount of professional information and training.

2. Teachers differ in their self-perceptions, and these differences account for some differences in patterns of classroom interaction. The teachers with higher self-concepts may be more successful teachers. A positive relationship between a teacher's self-concept and the student's achievement exists.

3. People who score high on positive perceptions of others generally have liberal social attitudes. People who score negatively on perceptions of others generally believe that man must conform to external standards and generally have conservative, authoritarian attitudes.

4. For patient and non-patient groups there is a positive correlation between the relationship between self-other perceptions. The more positive the perceptions of teacher's feelings about a student, the better the academic achievement of that student.

CHAPTER 3
Procedures
In chapter three the subjects of the study are identified; the procedures are discussed; the instruments used in the study are described; and the statistical techniques employed to treat the data are explained.

Subjects of the Study
The subjects for this study are classroom teachers, who are presently employed by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System, North Carolina.

Selection, Treatment, and Evaluation Procedures
During the Spring Semester, 1977, five hundred letters (Cf. Appendix A) were sent to classroom teachers in fifteen schools throughout Forsyth County. In these letters there was an explanation of the study and a request for volunteer participants. Ninety-three teachers responded affirmatively to the request and were given individual packets containing an information sheet (Cf. Appendix B), the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and answer sheet, and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale and answer sheet. Eighty-four teachers completed the tests and returned them to this investigator.

Instruments
The instruments in this study are the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Clinical & Research Form) and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (1965)
The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) contains 100 self-descriptive statements which portray the individual's self-perception. It is based on research that a person's concept of himself influences his behavior and his realistic or unrealistic approach to life. For each of the 100 items, the subject is asked to choose one of the following five responses:

1. Completely False
2. Mostly False
3. Partly True and Partly False
4. Mostly True
5. Completely True

The Scale has two forms, the Counseling Form and the Clinical and Research Form. The Clinical and Research Form, which was used for this study, yields four types of scores: the Positive Scores, the Task Approach Scores, the Clinical Scores, and the Time Score. These scores are described as follows:

**Task Approach Scores.** There are nine scores which are considered task approach scores and measure the way an individual proceeds in defining himself. They are:

1. Self Criticism - This score contains ten mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them. (Defensive people deny most of these statements)
2. Variability - The degree of consistency or inconsistency.
3. Distribution - A summary of the distribution of scores across five choices which provides another measure of self-perception; whether the person is certain about the way he sees himself.
4. True/False Ratio (T/F) - This score is a measure of response set or response bias, an indication of whether the subjects approach to the task involves any strong tendency to agree or disagree regardless of item content.
5. Net Conflict Scores - These scores are highly correlated with the T/F Score. More directly, however, they measure the extent to which an individual's responses to positive items differ from, or conflict, with his responses to negative items in the same area of self-perception.
6. Total Conflict Scores - High scores indicate confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self-perceptions. Low scores have the opposite interpretation, but extremely low scores have a different meaning. The person with such low scores is presenting such an extremely tight and rigid self-description that it becomes suspect as an artificial defensive stereotype rather than his true self-image. The Conflict Scores are reflections of conflicting responses to positive and negative items within the same area of self-perception.
7. Row Variability - This score is the sum of the variations across the rows and was not used in this study.
8. Column Variability - This score measures and summarizes the variations within the columns and was not used in this study.
9. The Distribution Scores (5,4,3,2,1) - These scores
should not be confused with the previous Distribution Score. These scores represent the five choices used to answer the questions. Each number is listed separately. These scores were not used in this study.

**Positive Scores.** There are nine positive scores, which identify positively or negatively an individual's views of himself in eight specific areas. The Positive Scores are:

1. **Identity** - This score is a description of basic identity; how a person identifies himself, i.e., Who I Am.
2. **Self Satisfaction** - Self Satisfaction is a description of the feelings about self which the person sees; his self-acceptance.
3. **Behavior** - This score represents perceptions of own behavior on the way an individual functions.
4. **Physical Self** - This score reports the individual's view of his body, health, physical appearance, skills and sexuality.
5. **Moral-Ethical Self** - A score which describes the self from the moral-ethical frame of reference; moral worth, relationship to God, feelings of being good or bad, and satisfaction with one's religion or lack of religion.
6. **Personal Self** - Personal Self Score is a reflection of an individual's sense of personal worth, his feelings of adequacy, and evaluation of his personality apart from his body or in relationship to others.
7. **Family Self** - A measure of the reflections of one's sense of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member.
8. **Social Self** - A reflection of one's sense of adequacy, his worth in his social interaction with other people in general.
9. **Self Esteem or Total Positive (Total P)** - This score is a measure of the overall level of self-esteem. High scores reflect a tendency to like oneself, to feel the self as valuable and worthwhile, to have confidence, and to act accordingly. Persons with low scores are doubtful about their worth, see themselves as undesirable, and are characterized by feeling of anxiety, depression, and lack of confidence.

**Clinical Scores.** There are seven scales which represent clinical groups as differentiated from normal groups. The scores are empirical and represent the following groups:

1. **Defensive Positive (DP)** - This score is a measure of defensiveness and is more subtle in nature than the Self Criticism Score. The DP Score stems from the basic hypothesis of self-theory; that individuals with established psychiatric difficulties do have negative self-concepts at some level of awareness, regardless of how positively they describe themselves on an instrument of this type. A high DP Score indicates a positive self-description stemming from defensive distortion. A significantly low DP means that the person is lacking in the usual defenses for maintaining even minimal
self-esteem.

2. General Maladjustment (GM) - This scale is composed of twenty-four items which differentiate psychiatric patients from non-patients but does not differentiate one patient group from another. It serves as a general index of adjustment-maladjustment but provides no clues to the nature of the pathology.

3. Psychosis Scale (Psy) - The Psy Scale is based on twenty-three items which best differentiate psychotic patients from other groups.

4. Personality Disorder Scale (PD) - The twenty-seven items of this scale are those that differentiate this broad diagnostic category from the other groups. This category pertains to people with basic personality defects and weaknesses in contrast to psychotic states or the various neurotic reactions.

5. Neurosis Scale (N) - This scale is inverse and is composed of twenty-seven items. As with other inverse scales, high scores on the Profile Sheet mean high similarity to the group from which the scale was derived; in this case neurotic patients.

6. Personality Integration Scale (PI) - This scale contains twenty-five items that differentiate the personality integration group from other groups.

7. Number of Deviant Signs Score - This score is based upon the theoretical position of Berg (1957, cited in Pitts, 1965) that individuals who deviate sharply from the norm in minor behaviors are likely to be deviant in more major aspects of behavior. The findings with the Number of Deviant Signs Score substantiate this hypothesis since disturbed persons often obtain extreme scores on either end of the continuum (Pitts, 1965). This score was not used in this study.

Time Score - The Time Score is a measure of the time, to the nearest minute, that the subject required to complete the Scale. The majority of subjects complete the Scale in less than 20 minutes. It has been found that psychiatric patients in general take longer than non-patients. The Time Score was not used in this study.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability

The reliability estimate is based on test-retest with 60 college students over a two-week period. These reliability estimates range from .60 (Row Total Variability) to .92 (Total Positive, General Maladjustment). This is remarkably similar to profile patterns found through repeated measures of the same individuals over long periods of time. Through various types of profile analyses Pitts (1965) has demonstrated that the distinctive features of individual profiles are still present for most persons a year or more later.

Other evidence of reliability of the scores was found when Congden (1968, cited in Pitts, 1965) obtained a reliability coefficient of .88 for the Total Positive Score.
when using a shortened version of the Scale.

Validity

Fitts (1965) employed four kinds of validity procedures: (a) content validity, (b) discrimination between groups, (c) correlation with other personality measures, and (d) personality changes under particular conditions.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was standardized on a broad sample of 626 people from various parts of the country with age ranges from 12 to 68 years. Representatives of all social, economic, and intellectual levels were included. The variables of sex and race were also considered. There are no separate norms by age, sex, race, or other variables established because the variance is quite negligible, usually in the .20's. Fitts indicated that norms are overrepresented in the number of college students, white subjects, and persons in the 12 to 30 age range.

The TSCS was correlated with the following instruments: (a) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (McGee, 1960 cited in Fitts, 1965); (b) the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Sundby, 1963 cited in Fitts, 1965); (c) the Inventory of Feeling (Hall, 1964 cited in Fitts, 1965); (d) the Taylor Anxiety Scale (Taylor, 1953 cited in Fitts, 1965); and (e) the California F-Scale (Lefeber, 1964 cited in Fitts, 1965).

Philosophy of Human Nature Scale (1964)

The Philosophy of Human Nature Scale (PHN) is a measure of a person's beliefs about human nature. Emphasis is placed upon the interpersonal aspects of human nature. Six dimensions are conceptualized as aspects of human nature:

1. Trustworthiness-vs-Untrustworthiness
2. Altruism-vs-Selfishness
3. Strength of Will and Rationality-vs-Lack of Will
4. Independence-vs-Conformity
5. Simplicity-vs-Complexity

A seventh dimension, the Favorableness-Unfavorableness Score, ranges from +168 and -168 (SD = 37.16) and measures the collective positiveness and negativeness attributed to human nature. An eighth dimension, Individual Differences in Human Nature was not used in this study.

The Scale is a series of attitude statements, each representing a commonly held opinion with no right or wrong responses. There are 84 statements to which the respondents are asked to choose the extent to which they agree or disagree by circling a number for each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

If you agree strongly circle +3
If you agree somewhat circle +2
If you agree slightly circle +1
If you disagree slightly circle -1
If you disagree somewhat circle -2
If you disagree strongly circle -3
Reliability and Validity

Reliability
The reliability estimate is based on 100 undergraduate (50 males and 50 females) and 100 graduate students (50 males and 50 females) using the split-half reliability of each subscale and correlating the half-scores by applying the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula. The split-half reliability coefficients range from .60 to .92 for the undergraduates and .40 to .78 for the graduate students (Wrightsman, 1964).

Test-retest reliability of the subscales was assessed by testing a group of 30 freshman girls and retesting them three months later. The coefficients are: Trustworthiness .74, Altruism .83, Independence .75, Strength of Will and Rationality .75, Complexity .52, Variability .84, and Total Favorability (Total PHN) .90 (Wrightsman, 1964).

Validity
The Philosophy of Human Nature Scale was standardized on data from 333 students from four colleges. Validity was determined by construct validity, predictions relating the scale to sex differences, differences in religious backgrounds, evaluations of one's instructor, and groups at different colleges and universities. The intercorrelations are moderate in nature, -.04 to +.69, indicating the possibility of wide divergencies in a person's view of the different aspects of human nature. The scores indicate that females possess a more positive view of human nature than do males and that students from a fundamentalist religious atmosphere have a general negative view of human nature which reveals itself to an extreme degree. Dissatisfaction with one's self-concept in relation to a negative view of human nature was confirmed at .65 and positive views of human nature correlated to favorable evaluations of instructors are significant at the .05 level.

The PHN Scale was correlated with the Faith-in-People Scale (Rosenberg, 1956 cited in Wrightsman, 1964); the Political Cynicism Scale (Agger and Goldstein, 1961 cited in Wrightsman, 1964); and the Machiavellian Scale (Christie and Merton, 1958 cited in Wrightsman, 1964). The correlations are negative, ranging from -.42 to -.55 between the PHN and the Political Cynicism Scale. Negative correlations were found between the Machiavellian Scale and the PHN, -.38 to -.67. Correlations between the Faith-in-People Scale and the PHN are positive, .39 to .75 (Wrightsman, 1964).

Statistical Procedure
For the purpose of treating and summarizing the data of this study, the relationship between the variables was computed using the Pearson-Product Moment formula. Each of the seven subscores of the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale was correlated with the scores of the twenty-one scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, for total group, male teachers, female teachers, elementary teachers, and secondary teachers. t tests were computed between sub-
groups with respect to sex and teaching level. The .05 and .01 levels are selected for determining significance.

Summary

Eighty-four teachers employed by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System received and completed the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale. Correlation analysis, using the Pearson-Product Moment formula, was obtained between the scores of the two scales. t tests were employed to obtain differences between the sex and teaching level variables. The levels of significance are .05 and .01.

CHAPTER 4
Analysis of Data

The present chapter presents an analysis, description, and report of the results of the statistical data, i.e., correlations and t tests according to the variables of total group, sex, and teaching level.

Major Null Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between an individual's self-concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and his perceptions of others as measured by the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale (PHN) with respect to the variables of total group, sex, and teaching level.

Tables 1 and 2 present the means and standard deviations for the TSCS Scores and the PHN Scores for the total group. The means and standard deviations for the variable of sex are presented in Tables 3 and 4. The data for the variable of teaching level are contained in Tables 5 and 6.

Null Subhypotheses

Eleven null Subhypotheses are made in this study:

Null Subhypothesis I

There is no significant relationship between the definition of self as measured by the Positive Scores of the TSCS and the perceptions of others as measured by the PHN Scale for the total group.

Table 7 shows the correlations between all Positive Scores, i.e., Total Positive (Total P), Identity, Self Sat-
Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale Scores for the Total Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True/False</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict</td>
<td>-4.88</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>364.55</td>
<td>29.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>130.42</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>119.13</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Self</td>
<td>70.99</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>75.57</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>70.07</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>75.94</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>71.95</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>39.36</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>125.20</td>
<td>23.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Positive</td>
<td>57.11</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Maladjustment</td>
<td>100.73</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Disorder</td>
<td>80.66</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosis</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosis</td>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Integration</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale Scores for the Total Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Will</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>12.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PHN</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>40.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale Scores for Male and Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Male SD</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
<th>Female SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>39.42</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True/False</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict</td>
<td>-5.80</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>-4.36</td>
<td>9.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>370.27</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>361.32</td>
<td>31.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>132.13</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>129.45</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>116.97</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>113.96</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>121.43</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>117.83</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Self</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>69.38</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>75.13</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>72.17</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>68.89</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>75.43</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>76.23</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>71.64</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>38.77</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>125.67</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>124.94</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Positive</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>55.64</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Maladjustment</td>
<td>102.53</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>99.72</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Disorder</td>
<td>80.93</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>80.74</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosis</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosis</td>
<td>89.97</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>84.32</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Integration</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations for the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale Scores for Male and Female Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Male SD</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
<th>Female SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Will</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PHN</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>45.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale Scores for Elementary and Secondary Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Elementary Mean</th>
<th>Elementary SD</th>
<th>Secondary Mean</th>
<th>Secondary SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True/False</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>-5.58</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>376.92</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>367.25</td>
<td>28.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>129.58</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>130.76</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>110.75</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>116.80</td>
<td>12.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>117.63</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>119.75</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Self</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>71.98</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>74.50</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>70.71</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>74.88</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>76.37</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>71.46</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>72.15</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>42.17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>120.46</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>127.14</td>
<td>24.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Positive</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>56.95</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Maladjustment</td>
<td>99.33</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>101.31</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Disorder</td>
<td>79.71</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>81.05</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosis</td>
<td>44.92</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosis</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>87.24</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Integration</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations for the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale Scores for Elementary and Secondary Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Elementary Mean</th>
<th>Elementary SD</th>
<th>Secondary Mean</th>
<th>Secondary SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PHN</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>38.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Correlation Matrix for the Positive Variables of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale Scores for the Total Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Positive</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Self Satisfaction</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Physical Self</th>
<th>Moral-Ethical Self</th>
<th>Personal Self</th>
<th>Family Self</th>
<th>Social Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant at .05 level
**Statistically significant at .01 level

Degrees of Freedom = 83
indication that to the extent that teachers see themselves as adequate generally and specifically in the areas of identity, self-acceptance, behavior, and the physical, personal, and social aspects of the self-concept they see others as being altruistic, unselfish, sincere, and concerned about others.

Total P, Self Satisfaction, Physical Self and Social Self Scores correlated at the .01 level with the Independence Score of the PHN. Identity, Behavior, and Personal Self Scores correlated at the .05 level. These significant correlations point out that teachers who feel that others can maintain their own convictions in the face of pressure from society to conform perceive themselves as being positive, satisfied with themselves, and feel positive about their physical, personal, and social selves.

All Positive Scores with the exception of the Family Self Score correlate at the .01 level with the Total PHN Score of the PHN. The Family Self Score correlates at the .05 level with the Total PHN Score. Correlations signify that teachers who perceive themselves positively in all areas of self concept as measured by the TSCS also perceive others positively as measured by the PHN, more particularly on the PHN Scores of Trustworthiness, Strength of Will, Altruism, and Independence.

The Behavior Score of the TSCS was correlated at the .05 level with the Variability Score of the PHN. The correlation indicates that teachers who are satisfied with their behavior do not believe that other individuals are different in basic human nature and that they can change.

The correlations between the Total P and the Behavior Scores with the Complexity Score of the PHN were significant at the .05 level. Correlations between Personal Self and Social Self with the Complexity Score were significant at the .01 level. The results indicate that teachers who feel positive about their behavior, their personal worth, and their social interactions do not feel that others are complex and hard to understand but are simple and easy to understand.

The null hypothesis was rejected for all relationships except for the following:

2. Total Positive with Variability.
3. Identity with Variability and Complexity.
5. Physical Self with Variability and Complexity.
7. Personal Self to Variability.
8. Social Self with Variability.

Null Hypothesis II.

There is no significant relationship between the definition of self as measured by the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS and the perceptions of others as measured by
Table 8 contains the data reporting the correlations between the Task Approach Scores, i.e., Self Criticism (SC), True/False (T/F), Net Conflict, Total Conflict, Variability, and Distribution, of the TSCS and the scores of the PHN (Trustworthiness, Strength of Will, Altruism, Independence, Total PHI, Variability, and Complexity). These correlations indicate that teachers who are open and capable of accepting some criticism see other people as being complex and hard to understand and different in their basic nature.

The Self Criticism Score correlates at the .01 level with Variability and Complexity. These correlations indicate that teachers who are open and capable of accepting some criticism see other people as being complex and hard to understand and different in their basic nature.

Total Conflict Score correlates at the .01 level with all the PHI Scores. The results indicate that teachers who show little confusion, contradiction, and conflict perceive others as being trustworthy and having control over their own lives. Teachers who show conflict, contradiction, and conflict perceive others as being hard to understand and different in their basic nature.

The Distribution Scores correlate at the .05 level with Trustworthiness and Strength of Will. High scores on Distribution indicate that the subject is certain about the way he sees himself. The teachers in this sample had, as a group, the PHN for the Total Group.
high scores, indicating from the correlations with the Trustworthiness and Strength of Will Scores that teachers who are definite and certain in what they say about themselves tend to trust others and feel that others can take care of themselves.

The Variability Score correlates at the .01 level with Trustworthiness, Strength of Will, Altruism, Independence, and Total PHN. Teachers who are consistent in defining themselves trust others, feel others can reject conformity, are concerned about others, and have control over the outcomes of their lives. The teachers who are consistent in their self-report have an overall favorable view of others.

The null subhypothesis was rejected for all relationships except the following:
1. Self Criticism with Variability and Complexity.
2. True/False with all scores of the PHN.
3. Net Conflict with all scores of the PHN.
4. Variability (TSCS) with Variability and Complexity of the PHN.
5. Distribution with Altruism, Independence, and Total PHN Variability, and Complexity of the PHN.

Null Subhypothesis III
There is no significant relationship between the definition of self as measured by the Clinical Scores of the TSCS and the perceptions of others as measured by the PHN for the total group.

Table 9 contains the report of the data for the correlations between the Clinical Scores, i.e., Defensive Positive (DP), General Maladjustment (GM), Psychosis (Psy), Personality Disorder (PD), Neurosis (N), and Personality Integration (PI) of the TSCS and the Scores of the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale.

The DP Score correlates with the Independence Score at the .05 level and at the .01 level with the other PHN Scores. The teachers as a group scored 57.11 on the DP, a score suggesting a healthy level of unconscious defensiveness. The correlations indicate that teachers who exhibit healthy defenses trust others, believe that others control their own lives, have concern for and feel that others are unselfish, feel that others are capable of rejecting conformity, and feel that others are similar and easy to understand.

General Maladjustment correlates at the .05 level with Strength of Will and Complexity and at the .01 level with Trustworthiness, Altruism, and Total PHN. The results show that teachers who are well adjusted (the mean score for this group of teachers was 100.73, a score indicating good adjustment) will trust others, will feel that others are concerned for people, will feel that others are capable of controlling their own lives, and feel that others are simple and easy to understand. The teachers who are well adjusted will have overall favorable perceptions of others.

The Psychosis Score correlates negatively at the .05
The mean Psy score for this group was 44.95, a score slightly below the mean for the standard population and indicating limited resemblance to the psychotic patient group. The correlations indicate that to the degree teachers were dissimilar to the psychotic norm group they tended to trust others; they felt others were unselfish; and had overall favorable perceptions of others.

The Personality Disorder Score correlated with the Strength of Will, Altruism, and Total PHN scores at the .05 level and with the Trustworthiness and Complexity scores at the .01 level. The mean score for PD was 80.66, a score indicating that the subjects exhibited very little resemblance to the norm group with personality disorders. Teachers who showed limited signs of personality disorders tend to trust others; they felt others were unselfish; and had overall favorable perceptions of others.

The Neurosis Score correlates at the .05 level with Independence, Variability, and Complexity and at the .01 level with Trustworthiness, Strength of Will, Altruism, and Total PHN. The mean N was 86.36, a score which shows average similarity to the score of the neurotic norm group. The correlation indicates that teachers who tend to have few characteristics of neurotics tend to report favorable perceptions of others; feel others can handle their own lives; have favorable views of others; and feel that others are simple and easy to understand.
of others in all areas as measured by the PHN.

The null hypothesis was rejected for all relationships except the following:

1. GM with Independence and Variability.
2. PD with Independence and Variability.
4. PI with all scores of the PHN.

Null Subhypothesis IV

There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the Positive Scores of the TSCS.

Table 10 reports the t ratios for males and females for the Positive Scores. The null subhypothesis was not rejected for Total P, Identity, Self Satisfaction, Behavior, Moral-Ethical Self, Family Self, and Social Self Scores.

A significant ratio was found between males and females on the Physical Self Score and the Personal Self Score. Male teachers feel more positively about their bodies, their state of health, their physical appearance, skills, and their sexuality than do the female teachers in this study. Male teachers perceived themselves more positively in terms of personal worth, feelings of adequacy, and evaluations of personality in non-physical aspects than did the female teachers.

The null subhypothesis is rejected for the Physical Self and the Personal Self Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Self</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Subhypothesis V.

There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS.

Table 11 represents the t ratios for male teachers and female teachers on the Task Approach Scores. The null subhypothesis is not rejected for the T/F, Net Conflict, Total Conflict, Variability, and Distribution Scores.

The Self Criticism Score was significant at the .01 level. The females scored higher on the SC Score, indicating that they were significantly more open and accepting of criticism than the males. The null subhypothesis is rejected for the Self Criticism Score.

Null Subhypothesis VI.

There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the Clinical Scores of the TSCS.

Table 12 reports the data for the t ratios between the male and female teachers on the Clinical Scores. The null subhypothesis is not rejected for the Defensive Positive, General Maladjustment, Psychosis, Personality Disorder, and Personality Integration Scores. The null subhypothesis is rejected for the Neurosis Score, which was significant at the .01 level. Males scored higher on this scale than did the females. The score for this scale is inverse, consequently a higher score represents less similarity to the Neurotic Group than a lower score. The results indicate that the male subjects perceived themselves to be less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True/False</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Positive</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Maladjustment</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Disorder</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosis</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosis</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Integration</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

null hypothesis VII.

There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the scores of the PHN.

Table 13 presents the data for the t ratios of the PHN Scores for the sex variable. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

null hypothesis VIII.

There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Positive Scores of the TSCS.

Table 14 reports the data for the Positive Scores of the TSCS on the variable of Teaching Level. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

null hypothesis IX.

There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS.

Table 15 contains the t ratios for elementary and secondary subgroups on the Task Approach Scores. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

null hypothesis X.

There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Clinical Scores of the TSCS.

Table 16 represents the data on the t ratios for teaching level for the Clinical Scores. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

similar to neurotic patients than did the female subjects.

null hypothesis VII.

There is no significant t ratio between males and females on the scores of the PHN.

Table 13 presents the data for the t ratios of the PHN Scores for the sex variable. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

null hypothesis VIII.

There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Positive Scores of the TSCS.

Table 14 reports the data for the Positive Scores of the TSCS on the variable of Teaching Level. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

null hypothesis IX.

There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS.

Table 15 contains the t ratios for elementary and secondary subgroups on the Task Approach Scores. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

null hypothesis X.

There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the Clinical Scores of the TSCS.

Table 16 represents the data on the t ratios for teaching level for the Clinical Scores. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.
### Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Will</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PHN</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Self</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

*t* Ratios for the Task Approach Scores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale for the Total Group on the Variable of Teaching Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th><em>t</em> ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True/False</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Conflict</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conflict</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

*t* Ratios for the Clinical Scores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale for the Total Group on the Variable of Teaching Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th><em>t</em> ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Positive</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Maladjustment</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Disorder</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosis</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosis</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Integration</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Subhypothesis XI.

There is no significant t ratio between elementary and secondary level teachers on the scores of the PHN.

Table 17 represents the ratios of teaching level for the PHN Scores. The null subhypothesis is not rejected.

Summary

The summary of the analysis and description of the data is as follows:

1. Many of the correlations between perceptions of self and perceptions of others were significant at the .05 level and the .01 level. The correlations between the Positive Scores and the Clinical Scores with the scores of the PHN were predominately significant. The self-concept as reported in the areas of overall self-esteem, behavior, identity, self-satisfaction, physical, personal, and social selves was significantly correlated to favorable perceptions of others. The absence of characteristics which are associated with defensiveness, personality disorders, psychoses, neuroses, and general maladjustment is related to favorable perceptions of others.

The correlations between the Task Approach Scores and the scores of the PHN were less significant. The subjects who showed little confusion and conflict and were certain in their self-reports had positive perceptions of others.

2. Some significant differences were noted between the male and female subjects of this study. Male teachers per-
ceived themselves more positively on Physical Self and Personal Self Scores than did the female teachers. Female teachers were more open and accepting of criticism than the male teachers. Female teachers reported more characteristics which are associated with neurosis than the male teachers. There were no significant differences in perceptions of others between male and female teachers of this study.

3. The variable of teaching level was not significant on any scores of the TSCS and the PHN for the subjects of this study.

CHAPTER 5
Summary, Conclusions, and Implications of the Study
Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the data, and implications of the study based on the results of the statistical analysis of the data and overall findings of the study.

Summary
The purposes of this study were to determine the relationship between perceptions of self and perceptions of others and to determine the differences between male and female and secondary and elementary level teachers on these perceptions.

Literature related to the study was reviewed and reported under four headings:

1. Literature related to the attitudes of teachers.
2. Literature related to the self-concepts of teachers.
3. Literature related to perceptions of others as measured by the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale.
4. Literature related to the relationship between self-concept and perceptions of others.

The subjects of this study were eighty-four classroom teachers employed by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System. The subjects were given the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale and the data collected was subjected to correlation analysis and t-test analysis. There were eleven null subhypotheses.
This study revealed significant correlations between many of the self-concept subscores and the subscores of the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale (PHN). The correlations between the Positive Scores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the scores of the PHN were generally significant. The Total Positive Score of the TSCS (representing the overall level of self-esteem) was correlated at the .01 level with six of the seven scores of the PHN; thus it appears evident from examining the data that the more positively a person feels about himself the more positively he will perceive others as being trustworthy; as having charge of their own lives; as having concern for others; as being independent; as having overall favorable perceptions of others; and as viewing others as being simple and easy to understand.

There were 63 correlations obtained from the nine Positive Scores of the TSCS and the seven scores of the PHN. Thirty-six of these correlations were significant at the .01 level and seven were significant at the .05 level. The non-significant correlations were predominately between the Variability and Complexity Scores of the PHN and the scores of the TSCS. The Family Self and the Moral-Ethical Self Scores of the TSCS were not significant with the Altruism and Independence Scores of the PHN. These four subscores account for the 18 correlations which were not significant.

The correlations between the Task Approach Scores of the TSCS and the scores of the PHN were not as significant as the correlations between the Positive Scores and the PHN Scores. The lack of significant correlations between the Task Approach Scores and the PHN Scores points out that the relationship between the way an individual proceeds to define himself and his perceptions of others is less significant than the relationship between his self-definition and his perceptions of others. The Total Conflict Scores and the Variability Scores were significant in relation to the PHN Scores. The subjects who reported little confusion and conflict and who were consistent and certain in their self-perceptions perceived others as being positive.

The correlations between the Clinical Scores of the TSCS and the PHN Scores were significant for the Defensive Positive, the General Maladjustment, the Personality Disorder, and the Neurosis Scores. The results indicate the subjects who tended to be defensive on a healthy level, who tended to exhibit greater levels of adjustment, who exhibited less similarity to patients with personality disorders and neuroses tended to perceive others as being favorable.

The t tests revealed some significant differences between the perceptions of the male subjects and the female subjects. Males perceived themselves more positively in the areas of physical and personal aspects of the self-image. Females reported perceptions of themselves as being more open and accepting of criticism than the males. Males exhibited less similarity to neurotic patients than the fe-
males. There were no significant differences between males and females on perceptions of others.

The t tests indicate no significant differences between the scores of the TSCS and the PHN for the elementary and secondary level teachers.

Conclusions

The present study supports the existing literature concerning the relationship between self/other perceptions. In every case the data report significant correlations between the perceptions of self and the perceptions of others. This study indicated that the more positively one viewed himself the more positively he would view others, or the more negatively one viewed himself the more negatively he would view others.

There are differences in the self-report of males and females. Richmond, Mason, and Padgett (1972) report that males and females of their study were different in their self-reports, i.e., males were less integrated in their self-concepts, males were more variable and uncertain in their self-concepts, and females were more positive in their self-concepts as worthwhile family members.

This study indicates that males and females perceive themselves differently in terms of physical self, personal worth, levels of openness, and tendency to exhibit neurotic characteristics. The males of this study reported higher levels of personal worth and feelings of adequacy in areas of physical attractiveness. The males perceived themselves as having fewer neurotic characteristics than the females. The females were more open and willing to accept criticism than the males.

Even though Hounshell and Dieter (1975) report no significant differences between the self-image of males and females, it would seem logical to conclude that there are differences in the self-concepts of males and females. The culture in which we live has different expectations for males and females, and there certainly have been different roles which were expected of men and women. It seems that the expected roles of men and women are in the process of changing, but these differences do exist, probably precipitating some differences in self-concepts between males and females.

There were no significant differences between males and females in the perceptions of others. There is existing literature to support the hypothesis that there are differences between males and females on perceptions of others. Wrightsman (1964) and Cox (1972) report that females possess more positive perceptions of others than males and Richmond, Mason, and Padgett (1972) report that females scored significantly higher on altruism than did males. The present study reports no significant differences. This study does indicate that the subjects do contradict the existing literature in that the males scored higher on four of the seven subscales of the PHN than did the females. Male
subjects scored higher on the Trustworthiness, the Strength of Will, the Altruism, and the Total PHN Scores of the PHN; however, these scores were not significant. The conclusion, which may be drawn for this study, for sex differences of perceptions of others is that there are no significant differences and that at some level the male subjects do perceive others more positively than females.

There were no significant differences between the elementary level teachers and the secondary level teachers on perceptions of self and perceptions of others. There was no literature to suggest that there would be any significant differences.

Implications

There is a convincing body of literature to support the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the way an individual perceives himself and the way he perceives others. For both clinical patients and non-patients this positive relationship has been reported to be the case.

What does this knowledge mean? The implications drawn by Sheerer (1949) would certainly seem to be appropriate. She states that the realization of the relationship between self-other perceptions might be used to increase acceptance of minority groups and foreigners; that situations involving high levels of industrial tension or professional friction might be approached through efforts dealing with attitudes and feelings about self, rather than through descriptions of the causes of the tension.

It has been reported that changes in a person's self-concept do occur through individual and group efforts (Sheerer, 1949; Stock, 1949; Lafferty, 1961). Studies also indicate that with these changes in self-perception, changes in the perceptions of others occur in the same direction (Sheerer, 1949; Stock, 1949).

What does this evidence mean for teachers and educators? There is evidence that the teachers' perception of themselves influences the type of relationships they have with their students, the academic achievement of their students, and the general success of the teachers. Evidence exists that attitudes of teachers influence the student's attitudes, influence the interactions the teachers have with their students, and influence the levels of achievement of the students. The very nature of the relationship between the teacher and student is important and significant in terms of the teacher's and the student's performance, their feelings about each other, and their feelings of adequacy and self-worth and their levels of achievement.

The evidence indicates that the possible solution to problems of discipline, learning difficulties, drop-out rates, racial tension, and professional differences might be approached through changes in self-perception which lead to changes in perceptions of others. Much controversy has developed around solutions in solving the school-related
problems which are previously mentioned. Some solutions may be effective while others may not be. Conclusions drawn from this study indicate that there would be positive solutions to classroom problems if the solutions incorporated the knowledge of the positive relationship between self-others perceptions and used this knowledge to provide experiences for developing more positive self-concepts and, thus more positive perceptions of others.

A further implication which might be drawn from the conclusions of this study is that teacher's levels of self-concept as related to successful teaching might be investigated with the idea of using self-concept measures in evaluating and employing teachers. Aspy (1975) implies that teachers might be assessed in areas other than intellectual. The nature of a teacher's self-concept may be as significant in determining his success as a teacher as is the level of intelligence and knowledge of teaching techniques and specific area of information.

Another implication is that teacher training institutes may find it appropriate to include in their curriculum opportunities for growth in achieving more positive self-concepts of their students. Curricular traditionally provide courses relating to methods of teaching, knowledge of subject area, and some courses in child and adolescent psychology. There is more often than not limited opportunity for assessing the student's self-concept and providing experiences for enhancing the self-concept.
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Teachers,

I am a graduate student in Counselor Education and Research at Appalachian State University. In fulfilling part of my requirements for graduation I am writing a thesis entitled A Comparative Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concept and Perceptions of Others of Teachers. The subjects for this study are teachers employed by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System.

I would appreciate any support from you/teachers who feel free to give it. To be a participant in the study one must take two tests, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale by William Fitts and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale by L. S. Wrightsman. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale is a measure of one's perceptions of himself while the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale is a measure of how one perceives others. To complete both tests would take approximately 35 to 40 minutes of your time.

I would like to assure you that I respect your privacy and that the individual test scores will be held in strict confidence. You may take the two tests anonymously and no one of your colleagues or administrators will have access to this information. For those of you who would like interpretation of your own tests Dr. Harry Padgett, my thesis advisor and a professor at Appalachian State University, along with myself and other graduate students are willing to inter-
pret these test results for any teacher who participates in 
the study and would like this information. I would like to 
stress again, your participation would be strictly volun-
tary.

If you would be willing to be a participant please 
sign your name in the space provided below and return this 
letter to your school office within two (2) days. I will 
be in contact with those of you who respond.

Thank you.

Pamela S. Marshburn

I am willing to be a participant in this study. School

APPENDIX B
INFORMATION SHEET

Number_________________ School_________________

Sex_________________ Race_________________

Date of Birth_________________

Please do not put your name on either of the answer sheets; they have a number and that number should be the same as the number on this information sheet.

Instructions for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale:
Read each statement and choose the response which describes you as you are, not as you would like to be. Be sure to respond to each statement.

The answer sheet may be confusing so please examine it carefully. The test was designed so that the numbers on each page do not run consecutively. In answering you will move down the column rather than across.

Instructions for the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale are on the first page of the test.

Please complete both tests and then place the tests, the answer sheets, and the information sheet back in your folder. Return your folders to the Guidance Office in your school.

If you wish to learn the results of your own test place your name in the space provided below and I will contact you after the scoring is completed.

Thank you. Pamela S. Marshburn

Name_________________