Self-concepts of Career Level II and III Teachers and Career Ladder Eligible Teachers in the Public Schools of Tennessee

Lois C. Myers
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://dc.etsu.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons, Other Psychology Commons, Special Education and Teaching Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact dcadmin@etsu.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.
Self-concepts of Career Level II and III teachers and career ladder eligible teachers in the public schools of Tennessee

Myers, Lois Carol, Ed.D.
East Tennessee State University, 1992
SELF CONCEPTS OF CAREER LEVEL II AND III TEACHERS
AND CAREER LADDER ELIGIBLE TEACHERS IN
THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF TENNESSEE

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Supervision and Administration
East Tennessee State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Carol Myers
December 1992
APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Graduate Committee of

CAROL MYERS

met on the

27th day of October, 1922.

The committee read and examined her dissertation, supervised her defense of it in an oral examination, and decided to recommend that her study be submitted to the Graduate Council and the Associate Vice-President for Research and Dean, School of Graduate Studies, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Administration.

Chairman, Advanced Graduate Committee

Signed on behalf of
the Graduate Council

Associate Vice-President for Research and Dean, School of Graduate Studies
ABSTRACT

SELF CONCEPTS OF CAREER LEVEL II AND III TEACHERS

AND CAREER LADDER ELIGIBLE TEACHERS IN

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF TENNESSEE

by

Carol Myers

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a significant difference in the self concept of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply but have not elected to participate in the Career Ladder Program in the public schools of Tennessee.

The technique of causal-comparative research was used in this study. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), developed by William Fitts, was selected as the appropriate instrument for use in this study. The TSCS is a versatile instrument that measures ten dimensions related to self concept: total level of self esteem, self criticism, identity, self satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self. Demographic data were also collected to obtain information concerning the personal characteristics of the teachers.

A total of 1,115 surveys were sent to teachers in the public schools of the seven districts of Tennessee, stratified by whether they were Career Level II and III or eligible. A total of 808 useable responses were returned. This sample represented 408 Career Level II and III teachers and 400 eligible teachers.

Data analyses and interpretation indicated that statistically significant differences existed between Career Level II and III teachers and eligible teachers on all ten measures of self concept. All the null hypotheses were rejected. Eligible teachers were determined to have a significantly lower total self esteem score when compared to Career Level II and III teachers. Career Level II and III teachers indicated a higher score on all nine subscales, as well as the total self esteem score. However, the self concept scores of eligible teachers were still above the norm group mean.

Inspection of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results revealed that no significant differences in mean total self esteem by educational level were found. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for mean total self esteem by age, followed by a Scheffe's post hoc multiple comparison test, indicated individuals aged 25-44 and aged 45-54 were significantly different on total self esteem as were individuals aged 25-44 and aged
55 and older. No significant difference was found between age 45-54 and age 55 and older.

A t-test for independent sample for mean total self esteem indicted there was a significant difference in the total self esteem of males and females with females having a higher self esteem.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) report was considered by many observers to have given the impetus to what is considered the first wave of school reform of the 1980s. It has had a Sputnik-like impact on American education. The theme of the first wave centered on higher expectations and standards for schools. The reform movement, led by governors, state legislators, and state boards of education, dealt mostly with improved graduation requirements, and it raised questions about the qualifications of teachers and the quality of teacher preparation programs (Pulliam, 1987).

A variety of education reforms have been enacted. Proponents of these reform efforts reason that current ways of organizing schools are not necessarily best suited to the demands placed on modern society and that teaching in the current situation lacks appeal for a sufficient number of talented and motivated people. Increasing this appeal and exploring new designs of work could create a better work force and improve schooling (Holmes Group, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1987). Salary and compensations are inescapable measures of job desirability in American society (Johns, 1988). In addition, financial rewards and expanded career options can provide incentives for teachers to become proficient in their profession by seeking more advanced training (Furtwengler, 1987a).
Ernest Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for Advanced Educational Studies, in his address to a leadership colloquium at Memphis State University, cited "... lack of regard for teachers ... and ... too little recognition and rewards ... as conditions that exist nationwide in education today" (Boyar, 1986).

In order to address this situation, on March 6, 1984, Lamar Alexander, Governor of Tennessee, signed Senate Bill No. 1 of the First Extraordinary Session of the Tennessee General Assembly, thereby enacting the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 (CERA) (Tennessee Code Annotated, 1990) (T.C.A.).

Lamar Alexander (1983), U.S. Secretary of Education, made the first in the nation statewide Career Ladder Program in the nation for educators a major focal point of the Tennessee educational reform package. Governor Alexander (1986) stated:

There is a blunt reason why the legislature and I have made such a huge investment of our time and the taxpayers' money in the Career Ladder. Tennesseans need to catch up. Paying teachers more for teaching well will do that better than anything else. To have the best schools, we must keep and attract the best teachers. (p. 4)

The career ladder was implemented under the Commissioner of Education, Robert McElrath. Commissioner McElrath stated that "this is a program filled with opportunity, prestige, and high pay for teachers; it is not a penalty" (McElrath, 1986).

The Career Ladder Program was established as an integral part of CERA and was designed to promote professional development, improve instruction, recognize and reward teachers, provide opportunity for

Since career ladder programs are vehicles for upward mobility in the field of education and since the efforts of such programs have been documented for teachers, the career ladder may be one of the major ways of providing outlets for teachers with positive self concept. Are teachers who have a positive self concept more willing to engage in activities which offer higher psychological and financial rewards?

This study examined the self concepts of the Career Level II and III teachers and the self concept of teachers who are eligible to apply.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

Much emphasis and time has been given to Tennessee's Career Ladder Program during the last nine years and to this date it has attracted 95% of those eligible. However, only 20% of educators who are eligible for upper-level status have applied. Does this lack of participation in the upper levels of the program suggest a lack of positive self concept?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a significant difference in the self concept of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply but have not elected to participate in the Career Ladder in the public schools of Tennessee. The study provided an opportunity to examine self concept.
Significance of the Study

School reformers call for improvements in the quality of the teacher work force through a combination of expanded work responsibilities, incentive pay schemes, and career ladders. There is a need for leaders in education to be more aware of the variables that affect the success of the Career Ladder Programs. This study has the potential to show a relationship between the factors of self-esteem and positive attitude for teachers who are successful participants in the Tennessee Career Ladder Program. An investigation of the self concept of teachers is important so that educators may fully understand the influence and the role that positive attitude and self-esteem play in teaching and student learning. Therefore, school reform could enact more meaningful change.

More specifically, information gathered from this study should aid educational institutions at all levels in developing programs to foster high self-esteem in teachers or in modifying current programs.

Information obtained from this study will enhance the base for research.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were relevant to this study:

1. The study was limited to a group of 8,072 Career Level II and III teachers and 27,620 teachers who are eligible to apply across the State of Tennessee in the public schools.

2. The study was limited to the 1991-92 roster provided by the Tennessee State Department of Education.
3. The measurement of teacher's self concept was limited to those measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS). (See Appendix B.)

4. The study was limited to an analysis of self concept.

Research Assumptions
The following assumptions were considered relevant to this study:

1. Comparisons and contrasts can be examined between the self concept of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

2. A need existed to study the self concept of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

3. The sample of teachers from whom data were collected was representative of teachers in the target population.

4. The participants of the study were representative of the total population of public school educators in the State of Tennessee.

5. The measurement device (TSCS) was a valid instrument for measuring the self concepts identified for this study.

6. Demographic variables such as age, sex, and level of education influenced decisions about Career II and III application.

7. The teachers responding to the TSCS were professional, serious, and honest in their responses.

Definitions of Terms
Career Ladder Program--consists of Probationary Teacher, Apprentice Teacher, Career Level I Teacher, Career Level II Teacher, and Career Level III Teacher positions. The Career Ladder Program shall be designed to promote staff development among teachers, and to reward with
substantial pay supplements those teachers evaluated as outstanding and who may accept additional responsibilities as applicable (T.C.A., 1990).

Career Level I Teacher--refers to a person who holds a Career Level I License issued by the State Board of Education and has been employed for at least four years as a teacher. This person receives a state salary supplement of $1,000 for a ten-month contract. The license is valid for ten years and requires that two local evaluations, an interim and a recertification evaluation, be done for renewal of Career Level I License. Also, if the candidate holds below a master's degree, a three-hour semester course in their field of assignment must be completed for renewal (T.C.A., 1990).

Career Level II Teacher--refers to a person who holds a Career Level II License issued by the State Board of Education and has been employed for at least eight years as a teacher. A teacher receives a state salary supplement of $2,000 on a ten-month contract. An eleven-month contract can be opted for through an extended contract agreement determined by an annual needs assessment done by each local school district. The state salary supplement is $2,000 or $4,000, respectively. Career Level II License is issued to teachers who went through complete state evaluation procedures and met the minimum qualifying scores for this level (T.C.A., 1990).

Career Level III Teacher--refers to a person who holds a Career Level III teacher license issued by the State Board of Education and has been employed for twelve years as a teacher. Career Ladder III license is issued to teachers who went through complete Tennessee state evaluation procedures and met the minimum qualifying scores for this level. One
receives a state salary supplement of $3,000 on a ten-month contract. An eleven- and twelve-month contract can be opted for through an extended contract agreement determined by an annual needs assessment done by each local school district. The state salary supplement is $2,000 for eleven-month contract; $2,000 for twelve-month contract; or $4,000 for both eleven- and twelve-month contract; or $7,000, respectively (T.C.A., 1990).

CERA (Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 in Tennessee)--This act is Section 1 of Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49. Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 49, was amended by adding Section 3-78 as a new chapter. The act became law on July 1, 1984 (T.C.A., 1990).

Extended Contract--the additional time or months of service that a local education agency provides to teachers based upon an annual needs assessment that has been done to focus the activities to be offered. Licensed educators with Career Level II and Career Level III status shall be given priority to participate (T.C.A., 1990).

Non Career Level II and III Teachers--a classroom teacher who teaches in the Tennessee Public Schools and has not received Career Level II and III status but is eligible to apply (T.C.A., 1990).

Self Concept--all aspects of the perceptual field to which we refer when we say "I" or "me." It is that organization of perceptions of self which seems to the individual to be who one is. It is composed of thousands of perceptions varying in clarity, precision, and importance in the person's particular economy. Taken together, these are described by the perceptual psychologist as the self concept (Combs, Avila, Purkey, 1971).
by the perceptual psychologist as the self concept (Combs, Avila, Purkey, 1971).

**Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS)**--consists of 100 self-descriptive items by which an individual portrays what one does, likes, and feels. The TSCS is a versatile instrument, widely used in education, counseling, and clinical, medical, and research settings. The scale is intended to summarize an individual's feeling of self worth, the degree that the self-image is a deviant one. The scale can be used with virtually anyone from individuals 12 years or older and gives a multidimensional description of self concept. It is supported by an impressive body of research and extensive evidence of validity (Fitts, 1991).

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses considered to be relevant to this study were:

**H1** There will be no significant difference in total Self Esteem scores between teachers of different ages.

**H2** There will be no significant difference in total Self Esteem scores between teachers who have attained different levels of education.

**H3** There will be no significant difference in total Self Esteem scores between males and females.

**H4** There will be a significant difference in the total Self Esteem score of Career Level II and III teachers when compared to the total Self Esteem scores of teachers who are eligible to apply.
$H_5$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Self Criticism of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

$H_6$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Identity of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

$H_7$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Self Satisfaction of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

$H_8$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Behavior of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

$H_9$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Physical Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

$H_{10}$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Moral-Ethical Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

$H_{11}$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Personal Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.
$H_{12}$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Family Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

$H_{13}$ There will be a significant difference in the level of Social Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

**Procedures**

The following procedures were followed in conducting the study:

1. A detailed review of related literature was conducted.

2. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), a validated instrument was selected.

3. A letter requesting permission to use and reprint the TSCS questionnaire was submitted to Western Psychological Services, 12031 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90025 (Appendix A).

4. The TSCS machine scoreable answer sheet was used to gather the demographic data.

5. One thousand one hundred fifteen (1,115) copies of the TSCS (Appendix B) were sent to respondents so that approximately 780 would be received back, given that 70% response rate is acceptable in mail-out surveys.

6. The sample for this study was derived from the Tennessee State Department of Education, Department of Data Management and the Division of Career Ladder Certification by obtaining a list of Career Ladder II and III teachers and a list of teachers eligible to apply.
7. A copy of the TSCS (Appendix B) was sent to each teacher involved in this study. The subjects were asked to read a statement and then indicate the degree the statement accurately describes themselves as they perceive themselves. The TSCS was described to the subjects as a "questionnaire designed to gather data about how teachers feel about themselves."

8. A letter explaining the study (Appendix C) and directions for completion of questionnaire and answer sheet (Appendix D) were mailed to each teacher in the study.

9. Two weeks later a follow-up letter was mailed to the teachers who had not responded (Appendix E). Follow-up calls and visits were made to non-respondents.

10. The data were collected for scoring and analysis.

11. The findings were summarized, recorded, and analyzed to test the hypotheses.

12. Demographic data were analyzed for relevancy to the study.

13. Summary, conclusions, and recommendations were made.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized and presented in five chapters.

Chapter 1 contains the introduction of the study and the statement of the problem, including its purpose, significance, limitations, and assumptions. A list of hypotheses and definitions of terms are provided. Also included are descriptions of the procedures and an organization of the study.
Chapter 2 provides a review of literature related to the study.

Chapter 3 contains the procedures and research methodology of the study.

Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the data and treatment of the results.

Chapter 5 includes the summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Relevant Literature

Introduction

A review of the literature was conducted to identify relevant research essential to an investigation of the self concept of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. There are five sections to the literature review.

Section one deals with national reform, and an attempt is made to present a general picture of the great American educational reform movement. This will include a review of its philosophical foundation and the many major practical innovations and reforms currently going on in the public schools around the nation.

Section two will be the section on state reforms and incentive programs. An outline of which states are in the discussion stage, which are pilot testing programs or are developing programs, which have only local initiatives, and which have fully implemented programs will be reviewed.

Section three of the literature review outlines the Career Ladder Program phenomenon by exploring the historical antecedents of career ladders with a detailed description of the Career Ladder Program, including studies, research, theories, and changes.

The fourth section of the chapter provides a detailed description of the Tennessee Career Ladder Program as it was formed and is being implemented during the 1992 school year.
The final section of the literature review—dealing with self concepts—will focus on self concept development, self concept change theories, and the influence of self concept on teacher behaviors and effectiveness with students.

**National Education Reform**

Since the first school was established in America, public faith in the quality of schools and their influence in the development of our youth has been unwavering.

Reform in the nation’s public education has a long history. It began with the Old Deluder Satan Act of 1647. With the enactment of the Northwest Ordinance in 1787, the federal government established a national interest in nourishing education. The ordinance allowed federal land to be sold and the monies acquired to be used by the states for education. American faith in schooling has been pronounced, persistent, and historic. Horace Mann, a mid-19th century reformer, stated, "A human being is not, in any proper sense, a human being until he is educated" (Seldes, 1967, p. 84). Horace Mann and other mid-19th century reformers viewed the spread of common schools in cities and rural areas as a way of binding the nation together to eliminate growing distinctions between social classes and to counter the emergence of urban crime and poverty (Cuban, 1990).

The federal government became alarmed about the educational system when Russia launched the Sputnik in 1957. The launch of Sputnik stirred a national concern for the state of the national preparedness, and the focus concentrated on our school system. The government’s interest in educational reform became intense and continues to be so at the present.
The National Defense Education Act of 1958, passed under President Dwight Eisenhower, helped to raise academic standards. Federal funds flowed through an enlarged U.S. Office of Education directly to states and districts in a massive effort to expand the number of graduates in math and science (Ravitch, 1983).

Increased federal involvement in education also marked the 1960s, although the focus shifted from national defense to desegregation as the civil rights movement mobilized the public and the federal government. As the spreading social movement fought for full black participation in American life, its agenda broadened to include the elimination of poverty. In 1965 that link was further strengthened in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which became a primary weapon in President Lyndon Johnson's war on poverty (Jung & Kirst, 1986). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 focused our nation's attention on its schools and brought with it the feelings of dissatisfaction that have characterized national politics since that time.

The effective reform movement was given impetus by the 1966 publication of the Coleman Report that suggested characteristics in the home environment, such as income, exposure to books, and social class were more important to the education of the student than items such as curriculum, facilities, and teacher salaries. The Coleman Report suggested that social inequality was a significant factor in poor learning for many students (Coleman, et al., 1966). This report had effective research that supported the belief that schools make a difference, and some schools make more of a difference than others.
The report, *A Nation at Risk*, issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983 was said to have had an impact similar to that of Sputnik in 1957 (Pulliam, 1987). The report depicted a system that was floundering while systems in other advancing nations were graduating bright and highly capable workers. It also exposed the illiteracy among the nation's young and criticized the decline in teaching competence. What made the report, *A Nation at Risk*, so disturbing was not that it pointed out how the educational system was failing, but that the system had lost its vision of success and what achieving it would require in the future.

Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, and of the high expectations and disciplined efforts needed to attain them.

(National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5)

*A Nation at Risk* caught the attention of the public and educators alike and made a strong case for the urgency of educational reform if America was to retain its place in the modern world.

William Bennett, U.S. Secretary of Education, was trying to restore vision through his "What Works" series and his James Madison Curricula. His vision was to reestablish a vision in the educational system. A great number of other reports and studies were done immediately following *A Nation at Risk*, all pointing to the failure, but *A Nation at Risk* was credited with creating the move for the American educational reform movement. This was President Reagan's pet report and was backed by highly regarded associations, such as Phi Delta Kappa, the American
A number of studies and reports have been done in regard to educational reform. In *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*, Adler (1982) criticized the present educational system and advocated giving the same quality of schooling to all students by enabling them to follow one track so that the general education with high quality could be strengthened.

Boyer (1986) contributed significantly to the educational reform by his report for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Boyer saw the teaching profession in America as being in a situation of deep crisis in that teachers were very troubled about poor public image, low salaries, loss of status, bureaucratic, and lack of recognition. The author argued that the push for excellence in public education must begin by improving the undesirable conditions of the teaching profession. Boyer believed that reform would fail unless teachers were given real professional status comparable to other professions.

Goodlad (1984) called the attention of the American public to the teaching profession and the crisis of schooling in America. The author talked about teacher morale, lack of productivity, low student achievement, high dropout rate, and the loss of public confidence in American schools. He suggested that drastic actions must be taken in community involvement for the support of public education.

Sizer (1984) criticized the high degree of standardization that was common to the schools. He advocated decentralization with school-based management and delegation of authority to district or school building
level. More authority should be given to individual teachers for experimental options in the instructional improvement process, and the involvement of teachers, parents, students, community leaders, and representatives of business and industry in public education should be encouraged.

The report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986), was prepared by the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. The report cites the need for fundamental change in the structure and working conditions within schools in response to trends in the national economy. Rapid changes in technology and methods of production dictate that future workers will require dramatically different skills.

The report of the Holmes Group, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), offer recommendations regarding the restructuring of schools and the teaching profession. The Holmes Group recommend a differentiated structure for professional opportunity. Three levels are proposed:

1. The Career Professional Teacher, capable of assuming responsibility not only within the classroom but also at the school level.

2. The Professional Teacher, prepared as a fully autonomous professional in the classroom.

3. The Instructor, novices who would practice only under the supervision of a Career Professional.

President Bush (U.S. Department of Education, 1991) released *America 2000: An Education Strategy* in which he makes the following remarks:
"The 21st century has always been a kind of shorthand for the distant future--the places we put our most far off hopes and dreams. And, today, that 21st century is racing toward us--and anyone who wonders what the century will look like can find the answer in America's classrooms. Nothing better defines what we are, what we will become than the education of our children. To quote the landmark case, Brown vs. Board of Education, 'It is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education.' Down through history, we've defined resources as soil and stones, land and the riches buried beneath. No more. Our greatest national resource lies within ourselves. The quality of teachers and teaching is essential to meeting our goals. We must have well prepared teachers, and we must increase the number of qualified teachers in critical shortage areas. Policies must attract and keep able teachers who are prepared, certified, rewarded, developed, and supported on the job and capable of teaching all of our children to think and reason" (p. 5). America 2000 is a long-term strategy to move us toward the national educational goals that the President and governors adopted in 1990. (U.S. Department of Education, 1991)

Lamar Alexander, U.S. Secretary of Education, said that President Bush offered a striking vision for our schools. He challenged us to join him in a populist crusade to make America--community by community, school by school--all that it should be (U.S. Department of Education, 1991).
Alexander stepped forward to prepare both a clear-cut strategy and a timetable for achieving what many people think may be the impossible. As a two-term governor of Tennessee, former Chairman of the National Governors Association and President of The University of Tennessee, he earned a national reputation as a pioneer in education reform. So, in many ways, the new Education Secretary could be one of the most important members of the cabinet, because no other issue will have greater impact on the future of America than education (Klein, 1991).

Summary

Changing times and peoples' changing needs have brought about the need for educational reform. The long history of educational reform in America ranges from the Old Deluder Satan Act of 1647 to President George Bush's America 2000 suggestions for educational strategy.

The enactment of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 revealed the federal government had an interest in the nourishment of education: "Religious morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government, and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" (Seldes, 1967, p. 84).

The Coleman Report of 1966 suggested that environment, income, lack of exposure to books, and social inequality were factors in poor learning for many students.

A Nation At Risk was said to have quite an impact on the nation. It showed that our system was on the decline and had lost its vision, while other systems were flourishing. A Nation At Risk was credited for creating the move for the American reform system (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).
Boyer (1986) pointed out that educational reform would fail unless teachers were given professional status equal to that of other professions. Goodlad (1984) pointed out that more community involvement was needed for the support of public education.

President Bush insisted that we must improve the quality of teachers and teaching if we are to meet our educational goals of the twenty-first century (U.S. Department of Education, 1991).

So, from the Old Deluder Satan Act of 1647 to Mr. Bush's America 2000 strategy of 1992, there has been an awareness of the need for change and improvement.

These national education reform studies have led to reform activities in both state and local school districts.

State Education Reform

The failure of the states to adequately meet their responsibility in operating their schools has given the federal government a chance to put its foot in the schoolhouse door.

The state and local school district variations have taken shape in quite different manners. Although, many states have collaboratively developed and implemented comprehensive educational reform plans by governors, legislatures, and state departments of education. All these plans dealt mostly with such areas as high school graduation requirements, school community relations, and particularly the improvement of the teaching profession through certain incentive programs which aimed at recruiting, retaining, and rewarding the most capable teacher. (Frase, 1992, p. 8)
Forty-one states had developed and initiated specific state-level education reform plans. Some states called their plans the career ladder, and others named theirs the master teacher plans. Rewards were made available to those teachers who were evaluated as outstanding, and who accepted extra duties and signed extended contracts. The rewards involve a movement up a career ladder with differentiated pay and status. The states of Utah, Texas, California, Florida, Arizona, North Carolina, and Tennessee were considered to be the most progressive in the reform movement.

In 1986, six states--Arizona, Missouri, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah--were funding statewide or pilot career ladder projects. By 1992, the same six states and Ohio funded career ladder programs. Funding has increased in all of these states except Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky (Cornett, 1992a).

The evidence is clear that reward and incentive programs are still viable options for states that seek to improve student outcomes. Thousands of teachers and hundreds of schools across about 25 states are receiving awards from career ladder and incentive programs. Some programs have fallen to continued challenges and the budget axe. But, in career ladder programs alone, more than $500 million will be paid to thousands of teachers this year. Since 1983, one state--Tennessee--has put that amount of money in a single state program (Cornett, 1992b).

School incentive programs that emphasize results for students are becoming more popular. States are increasingly linking both rewards and sanctions for schools or school districts to student achievement. Many states are giving districts relief from traditional state regulations.
In the past year, states such as Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia have mandated that steps be taken to define what students need to know. These states are developing new assessments and reporting results through state report cards. Other states, including Alaska, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky, have similar reporting efforts underway (Cornett, 1992a).

Some career ladder and mentor teacher programs are helping teachers move into new roles and paying them for extra work. However, the notion of tying rewards for individual teachers to results of students is an area where few states have dared to tread. Arizona's plan has been the most direct in developing ways to link individual teacher performance and student achievement (Cornett, 1992b).

Lawmakers initially supported career ladders as a way to reward teachers who do the best teaching, but few programs have been developed to achieve that end. These programs may be worthwhile and important—but, are they what state policymakers envisioned or hoped for in the mid-1980s? On the positive side, there is evidence that career ladders have improved teaching in some settings, provided resources and encouragement for teachers to take on new roles, and helped teachers think about teaching in new ways. But, have these programs served as "incentives" to attract and retain the best teachers (a stated goal of most programs)? And, are they playing an integral role in achieving goals set by the nation, states, and districts?

The state role in making incentive programs work is critical. A recognized expert on school change, Michael Fullan, writes, "Schools cannot redesign themselves . . . (the) role of the district is crucial."
Teachers need motivation throughout their careers, Fullan says. He also
speaks to the importance of states providing guidelines and support for
programs to be developed (National Staff Development Council, December
1991/92). It is interesting to note that states which began with
district-designed programs now often have a more centralized program
with state guidelines. On the other hand, programs that were highly
centralized or state-focused have become more flexible and involve
teachers and principals more in changes (Cornett, 1992a).

Summary

Since the constitution of the United States does not give
jurisdiction over education to the federal government, it becomes the
responsibility of the states to operate their educational systems.
In recent times the states have dragged their feet in their
responsibilities concerning education. The federal government in some
instances has stepped in to give financial aid to the states.

It seems that our educational system is not keeping up with the
demands of our changing society. The "authorities" on change in
education seem to have reached consensus that radical reform of our
educational system will have to be brought about by external pressures.
In fact, these pressures are the leverage for the current reform
movement in education.

The reform movement seems to be focused on teacher improvement and
greater rewards for the improved teachers. Of course the ultimate goal
is to be able to see improved student achievement due to the
implementing of the state programs.
The programs of reform advocated by the states seem to be similar in nature. Some states refer to their vehicle of reform as the "Career Ladder," while others call their program the "Master Teacher Plan." Whatever the name, the states' reform programs have basically the same ingredients.

"More than eight of ten Americans favor increased pay for teachers who prove themselves particularly capable." According to the Gallup Poll, this is a higher percentage than seven years ago, when the nation's first incentive plans for teachers were being debated and established. Career Ladder and other incentive pay programs are the largest educational experiment in the United States today" (Cornett, 1992a). If this experiment is successful in showing a significant increase in student achievement, perhaps the Career Ladder will be the core of future state educational reform programs.

**Career Ladder Programs**

From merit pay to differentiated staffing patterns, career ladders mean different things to different people (Pipho, 1988). Differentiated staffing provides extra pay for additional duties or responsibilities and frequently involves an increase in the hours of employment (Kohut & Wright, 1984). According to Miller and Young (1982), the purpose of merit pay is to provide a motivating force, an incentive, which results in greater productivity of the worker. Career ladder programs may involve one or both of these concepts.

The first record of merit pay plan dates back to 1908 in Newton, Massachusetts. Similar plans peaked in the 1920s, then declined in the 1930s and 1940s (Kohut & Wright, 1984). Interest revived in the mid
1950s, with several states adopting or considering merit pay legislation. During the 1960s, the idea stabilized but declined again in the early 1970s (Coffman & Mariano-Leggett, 1984). The concept gained momentum again during the 1980s and 1990s.

"Over the years the term merit pay has been used loosely. In theory, merit pay for teachers is an award for superior performance" (National Education Association, 1984, p. 4). Merit Pay has been used to refer to differentiated pay, incentive pay, and performance pay (National Education Association, 1984). True merit pay can be described as differing wages, based on a bonus structure, paid for the same job classifications and work obligations. Merit bonuses may be annual stipends or may be added to base salaries and accumulate over the years. Career ladders differ in that higher pay is linked to additional duties and/or longer contracts (Johnson, 1984).

The idea of differentiated staffing was developed in Temple City, California, and became a central issue in the national debate on the structure of the teaching profession during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Defining differentiated staffing is a complex task. Allen and Klein (1972) declare that there is no single definition applicable to all the possible permutations of differentiated staffing. Closest to a functional definition of differentiated staffing is Florino's (1972) identification of characteristics common to the varying models of this type of program:

"Differentiated staffing is a concept which proposes to improve the effectiveness of the instructional staff by capitalizing on their strengths. Its four characteristics
include: (1) differentiation by function and responsibilities; (2) a hierarchy of several salary levels; (3) type and/or degree of responsibility determining placement in the hierarchy; (4) involvement of all positions in the instructional process." (p. 13)

Staff differentiation can be accomplished by redefining teacher roles in one of two ways. Vertical differentiation can be accomplished by delineating teacher assignments by difficulty and arranging them hierarchically. Horizontal differentiation is accomplished by defining teacher roles based on the nature of the tasks to be performed, not on the difficulty of the tasks themselves (Weissman, 1969).

Other incentive systems include the use of salary tracks, salary ladders, permanent bonuses added to the salary schedule, two-year bonus plans, three-year bonus plans, extended contracts, and a combination of annual bonuses plus permanent salary increases (Andrews, 1987).

According to Alexander (1986a), more pay for outstanding teachers is an incentive. Coffman and Manarino-Leggett (1984) identified accountability and inflation as two important reasons for schools to provide an incentive program and increasing salaries for teachers and administrators. They cited these reasons for following merit pay: "incentive for improvement, reward for excellence, and reward for those who make extra efforts" (p. 57).

Randall (1986) maintained that the rank and file teachers and most of the American public favored merit pay for teachers. Eighty percent of the public in a Newsweek poll favored the teacher merit pay plan. In a 1983 survey conducted by the American School Board Journal, 63% of the
teachers responding endorsed the teacher merit pay concept, and only 18% favored the traditional teacher union stance of salary determined by seniority/credits alone (Rist, 1983).

Rosenholtz and Smylie (1984) reported that various studies have concluded that intrinsic satisfaction derived from contributions made to student achievement is the most important thing teachers want from their work. Furthermore, teachers also want to have their needs gratified for self-esteem and peers' recognition through their expertise and professional competence. They also desire to have gratified their needs for job security and job advancement through economic benefits and professional opportunities.

Experts in the area of human needs and motivation consistently hold that what really motivates people to do the things that they desire to do is not the extrinsic rewards but rather the intrinsic values. Maslow (1943) established a hierarchy of human needs. Maslow held that once an individual's need at a particular level is gratified, it will no longer motivate him. Instead, what becomes a motivator for him is the higher level of needs which superseded the already met need. Therefore, once money is obtained by the teacher and his financial security need is satisfied, money as an incentive in the merit pay system will no longer be the important motivator for him.

According to Herzberg, Mauser, and Snyder (1959), two distinctly different sets of factors lead to either motivation or dissatisfaction. The first set which are job-motivating and job-satisfying factors is related to such intrinsic work content as achievement, recognition, interest in work itself, growth, responsibility, and achievement. The
other set which accounts for job dissatisfaction (hygiene factors) are factors which are extrinsic to work content and closely related to the work context such as company policy, relationships with administrators, supervisors, and coworkers, work conditions, security, and salary. These hygiene factors, if gratified, can lessen or even avoid the workers' dissatisfaction. However, providing more of these hygiene factors will not motivate the workers or bring them satisfaction. Therefore, salary supplements as a hygiene factor in the merit pay plans do not bring happiness, intrinsic motivation, nor satisfaction to the teachers. Instead, money could only lessen the teachers' dissatisfaction and unhappiness.

Kaiser (1981) did significant research in the area of teacher motivation and job satisfaction based on the theories of both Maslow and Herzberg. Kaiser argued that the theories of Maslow and Herzberg are very much similar in that Maslow's higher levels of needs correspond exactly to Herzberg's motivation factors related to the intrinsic work content (self-actualization for responsibility and advancement, esteem for achievement and recognition) while Maslow's lower order needs fit well with Herzberg's hygiene factors related to work context (belongingness and love for work conditions and human relationships, safety and security for retirement and medical fringes, and physiological needs for salary). Kaiser argued that while boards of education must attend to salary and fringe benefits to prevent dissatisfaction from resulting in teachers, they must not attend to these factors to the detriment of the motivation factors. Instead, administrators must work hard with teachers' organizations "to increase
motivation factors of enriched job responsibility, a chance for advancement, recognition for excellence in performance, and an increased sense of achievement" (p. 66).

According to Lawler (1973), the valuation of rewards is greatly influenced by one's performance. That is, high performers can be expected to believe that they should receive greater rewards than low performers. High performers feel that performance-based rewards, e.g., merit pay plans, are fair and equitable because their job contributions are higher than those of low performers. Job attractiveness is related to this valuation of performance-based rewards. According to Lawler's formulation, high performers are more attracted to, and satisfied with, merit pay jobs. Job turnover, in turn, is related to job attractiveness. The more attractive and satisfying one finds a job, according to Lawler, the less likely she will be to leave her job.

The former governor of Tennessee Lamar Alexander maintained that his incentive pay system was able to draw and keep the best young people in the teaching profession and would inspire excellence in the classrooms by rewarding (monetarily) excellence in teachers (Furtwengler, McLarty, & Malo, 1985).

McElrath (1986) strongly maintained that the state salary supplements ranging from $1,000 for Career Level I teachers and $7,000 for Career Level III teachers in the Tennessee Career Ladder Program are definitely one of the motivating forces for teacher participation in the program and for teacher instructional improvement.

In 1986, Range reported that successful candidates in the merit pay system had a renewed pride in themselves and their teaching profession,
and that their renewed self-esteem and professional pride were reinforced by the monetary bonuses. Indeed, in the eyes of the merit pay supporters, money is a motivating factor for the teacher's improvement of instruction, and higher salary supplements for motivating and rewarding outstanding teaching performance is not only sound and logical, but also working and working well.

Tutor (1986) studied the relationship between the perceived need deficiencies and the factors influencing teacher participation in the Tennessee Career Ladder Program. Major findings indicated that a high esteem need deficiency existed among all teachers. Level I teachers had the highest security need deficiency. Older teachers had lower need deficiencies than younger teachers. Dissatisfaction with esteem was the greatest need deficiency among all teachers on all levels. Salary was the most influential factor affecting participation in the Tennessee Career Ladder Program. Therefore, it was suggested that salary should not be considered as a hygiene factor, mutually exclusive with motivation factors. Instead, salary must be considered as an integral part of all factors involving teaching participation in incentive programs. The results also revealed that the majority of teachers involved in the Tennessee Career Ladder Program perceived the program as a viable avenue of addressing their needs.

Career ladder programs and merit pay plans are viewed as a way to motivate teachers and improve instruction (Alexander, 1986b; Rist, 1983). Polls have shown that the public favors paying good teachers more than average or poor teachers (Sharpes, 1987; Ligeon & Sailor, 1984; U.S. House of Representatives, 1984). Johnson (1984) states that
taxpayers would be more willing to support public education if teachers were paid according to their performance. Since advancement on career ladders and merit pay is granted or withheld due to a teacher's performance, it is assumed that teachers will improve their teaching, thus increasing the potential for student learning (Furtwengler, 1987b; Sharpes, 1987; Alexander, 1986b; Schneider, 1984).

When individuals are rewarded financially for doing an outstanding job, they may be encouraged to enter and then remain in a profession. Some researchers (e.g., Rosenholtz, 1986; Johnson, 1984) state that career ladders and merit pay plans will retain good teachers in the classroom. Career ladders and merit pay plans are also seen as a way to attract better candidates into teaching (Furtwengler, 1987b; Rosenholtz, 1986; Miller, 1985). Tennessee's former governor Lamar Alexander (1983) states that "merit pay would make teaching a full professional career, draw our best young people into education, and keep our best teachers in it" (cited in Heathington, Alexander, & Barker, 1984, p. 30).

Attracting and retaining highly qualified and competent teachers is one aim of many educational reformers (Hart & Murphy, 1986). According to Hart and Murphy (cited in Roseholtz, Smylie, 1984, p. 150), teaching is highly complex work and it should be recognized as such by performance-appraisal systems. "The ability of schools to attract and retain good teachers depends on the incentives and opportunities that the profession of teaching offers and on the organizational conditions under which teachers work."

Researchers (e.g., Monk & Jacobson, 1985; Darling-Hammond, 1986; Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984) found the capacity of the education
profession to attract and retain highly competent teachers is diminishing. Low starting salaries, low status, and poor working conditions affect teacher retention, and they appear to be major impediments to attracting people into the profession (Masters & Watts, 1985; Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984).

To attract and retain talented individuals, teaching must pay salaries comparable with other professions that require a college degree (Cameron, 1985; Edelfelt, 1985). According to Masters and Watts (1985), when monetary rewards are considered, only entry salaries and lifetime career earnings make a difference in attracting teachers to the profession. Intrinsic rewards, such as working with students, seeing students learn and succeed, believing one's job is valuable to others, and being able to grow personally and professionally, are powerful motivational forces that attract and retain teachers in the classroom (Masters & Watts, 1985; Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984; Bredeson, Fruth, & Kasten, 1983). Even though most people pursue a teaching career for its intrinsic value, they still have reasonable expectations about starting pay and potential career earnings (Masters & Watts, 1985).

In order for teachers to remain in the profession, the rewards must outweigh the frustrations (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984). Career ladder programs and merit pay plans are systems that reward teachers and encourage them to enter and then remain in the teaching profession.

Most teachers report that teaching is an intrinsically rich and satisfying form of work (Koch, 1982) motivated by intrinsic rewards. Teachers gain satisfaction from watching students learn and achieve (Johnson & Riches, 1987; Darling-Hammond, 1986; Bredeson, Fruth, &
Hasten, 1983; Hawkes & Dedrick, 1983; Lortie, 1975). Lawler (1970) discovered that intrinsic rewards can satisfy higher order needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization, because they involve such outcomes as feelings of accomplishment and achievement. According to Hawley (1985), "Almost every study on teacher motivation, job satisfaction, or attrition concludes that the most important thing teachers want from their work is intrinsic satisfaction derived from contributions made to student achievement" (p. 57). Masters and Watts (1985) conclude that the intrinsic rewards of helping students is a powerful factor in attracting teachers in the profession.

Teacher satisfaction with their jobs can be influenced by the quality of the workplace. The quality of the workplace can have an impact on teachers' decisions to remain in the profession as well as affect their classroom performance. According to Guest (1979), quality of worklife is a process by which an organization attempts to bring out the creative potential of its people by involving them in decisions affecting their worklives. According to Richardson (1973), the school as a workplace should be satisfying; therefore, changes must be made that will increase the satisfaction of the workers, students, and teachers. The people who feel challenged by their work, who have autonomy in carrying out their work, and who are rewarded are more likely to remain in and be satisfied with their profession. Job satisfaction is an important indicator for the quality of work the teacher will actually do.

A key to better education is the teacher. Teachers must be a part of all efforts to achieve a higher level of educational excellence.
Teachers are at the center of educational experiences and if they are dissatisfied with the profession they may not be performing at the best of their ability. Teachers want to be recognized for their excellence in teaching (Hawkes & Dedrick, 1983), and career ladders and merit pay plans are ways to recognize and reward teachers for their excellence. According to Dunwell (1986), "Only through a total commitment to a human resource development system can we engage the fundamental motivation of the individual teacher to increase productivity and excellence in schools" (p. 11).

According to Goodlad (1983), "Teaching must be taken out of its cloak of privacy and autonomy to become the business of the entire school and its staff" (p. 557). Effective schools have participants who share purposes, values, and the determination to succeed together (Johnson, 1984).

"Career ladders can be appropriate and powerful stimuli for the improvement of the overall quality of the teaching force and the improvement of schools" (Hart & Murphy, 1986, p. 26). Career ladders may help recruit and retain teachers with high academic ability because they attempt to meet teachers' needs for growth, recognition, and advancement (Hart & Murphy, 1986; Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984). Career ladders redefine teaching by providing a system for promotional positions (Hart, 1986; Hart & Murphy, 1986; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1984).

The basic purposes of career ladders are to counteract stagnation by varying teachers' responsibilities and to reward and motivate superior teachers through enhanced prestige, responsibility, and more
pay (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1984). Career ladders encourage the effective teachers to advise, assist, evaluate, and model good teaching for others in the school (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984). Currently, opportunities do not exist for teachers to receive higher salaries unless they enter administration (Goodlad, 1983). Implementing career ladders is an attempt to enhance the attractiveness of the teaching job by providing more money for doing a good job rather than providing other job options in education (Hart, 1986).

Taxpayers have become more demanding of public service performance and management in recent years. As public services become predominant in our economy, with business and agriculture shrinking to small proportions due to their own efficiency, public demands for better service, performance and management will become even more intense in the future.

The rationale for taxpayers to spend money without evidence of performance simply cannot be sold anymore. And it isn't right, either as a basis for public expenditures or for teacher satisfaction. Boards who approve expenditures without evidence of good performance are driving down performance. (Genck, 1985)

Interest in both incentive packages and school effectiveness has promoted career ladder programs across the country. Several states examined incentives to attract, retain, and motivate teachers and administrators (Hart, 1987).

Career ladder programs point to the following changes (Cornett, 1992a).
* There appears to be a shifting emphasis from rewarding teachers for what they do to granting rewards for improving student outcomes.

* Career ladder programs have improved teacher evaluation, and peer teachers are more involved in the evaluation of colleagues.

* Principals have become more involved in instructional issues.

* Research shows that before Arizona's career ladder had an effect on teacher and student performance, districts had to "be ready." They needed school board support, funding, communication, well-aligned curriculum and assessment, and adequate teacher in-service. Outside evaluations of school districts in Utah showed similar patterns.

Public and governmental leaders continue to emphasize the importance of incentives to improve teaching (Cornett, 1992a).

* The 1991 Gallup Poll reports that 69 percent of the public favor merit pay for teachers who teach effectively; 63 percent favor more money for teaching in dangerous new environments; and 49 percent support the concept of teachers serving as mentors for other teachers. (p. 6)

Can career ladder and incentive programs serve to promote the newest thinking about professionalizing teaching, rewarding outcomes, and emphasizing results? Will they continue to be seen as "add on" programs, or will they become more a part of the fabric—a catalyst for changes in the schools (Cornett, 1992b)?
The evidence is clear that reward and incentive programs are still viable options for states that seek to improve student outcomes. Thousands of teachers and hundreds of schools across about twenty-five states are receiving awards from career ladder and incentive programs. But, in career ladder programs alone, more than five hundred million dollars will be paid to thousands of teachers this year. Since 1983, one state—Tennessee—has put that amount of money in a single state program (Cornett, 1992a). One of the most highly publicized career ladders, Tennessee’s performance-based, state-developed program is presently in its eighth year.

Summary

Merit pay is nothing new to the American educational system. The first record of a merit pay plan dates back to 1908 in Newton, Massachusetts. Similar plans peaked in the 1920s, declined in the 30s and 40s, and revived once again in the 1950s. During the 1960s, the idea of merit pay stabilized but declined again in the early 1970s. The concept gained momentum again during the 1980s and 90s.

Merit pay means different things to different people. It is used to refer to differentiated pay, incentive pay, and performance pay. Career ladders differ in that higher pay is linked to additional duties and/or longer contracts.

It seems the principal objectives of merit pay are to retain the better teachers and to attract some of the better young minds to the teaching profession. This appears to be the case whether merit pay is referred to as an incentive plan, master teacher plan, or the career ladder program.
There are theories that maintain after a teacher's extrinsic, monetary rewards have been satisfied, he seeks intrinsic rewards such as achievement, recognition, and growth.

Polls have shown that the public favors paying good teachers more than average or poor teachers. Johnson states that taxpayers would be more willing to support public education if teachers were paid according to their performance.

Much has been said about teachers' intrinsic rewards from teaching. No doubt one finds great satisfaction in being an instrument that brings about favorable behavior change in boys and girls. However, one must keep in mind that teachers must live also; extrinsic rewards are very important too.

This section has dealt with career ladders in general. In the next section we shall look specifically at the Tennessee Career Ladder, initiated by Governor Lamar Alexander and the Tennessee State Legislature.

Tennessee Career Ladder Program

The Tennessee legislature was very concerned about the progress of public education in the state. They realized that the need for improvement was indeed very urgent. In 1981, the legislature began an eighteen-month statewide study of public education which was undertaken by a 27-member task force (Furtwengler, McLarty, & Malo, 1985). This resulted in the Tennessee Comprehensive Education Study. The study recommended, among other things, that the State Board of Education and local educational agencies should investigate fair and impartial ways of rewarding outstanding teachers and consider some apprentice and master
teacher programs. It was further suggested that the State Department of Education utilize current research to develop and provide an evaluation instrument for statewide teacher evaluation (State of Tennessee, 1982).

Lamar Alexander, the Governor of Tennessee, proposed a master teacher system to Tennessee's legislature as a means of addressing this study and other problems (Rabin, 1983). One of the Governor's objectives was to attract and retain better quality teachers. The master teacher plan, which was designed to reward superior teaching, was a centerpiece of the Governor's educational reform proposals. This merit pay plan was modified during the political process, and in 1984 the Tennessee Career Ladder Program was adopted by Tennessee's General Assembly as part of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA) of 1984 (Cromer and O'Hara, 1984).

The Tennessee Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA) of 1984 was a very important piece of legislation. The act includes four essential sections: (1) certification; (2) teacher training; (3) a principal administrator academy; and (4) a career ladder program for teachers, principals, and supervisors (T.C.A., 1990).

While CERA provided for the establishment of "a new professional career ladder program for full-time teachers, principals, and supervisors," this review includes only those aspects of CERA relative to classroom teachers. CERA defined the terms used within the program, the various teacher levels, the pay supplements to be available at each level, and the guidelines and minimum standards to be used for evaluation procedures (T.C.A., 1990).
In the fall of 1984, the State Board of Education, in conjunction with the Interim Certification Commission which had been created in 1983 to develop a teacher evaluation system, granted approval for implementation of the career ladder program. To facilitate this implementation the Tennessee Department of Education published the Teacher Orientation Manual 1984-85 (State of Tennessee, 1985a). Its main purpose was to explain the program, which had been defined by state law, in terms easily understood by those involved as participants in the program. It included the assumptions and principles upon which the program would be implemented, a full delineation of the various levels within the program, and the requirements which had to be met to obtain certification at each level.

According to the Tennessee Career Ladder Teacher Orientation Manual, some of the fundamental principles and beliefs concerning the evaluation program, the teacher, the evaluator, the evaluation process, and the evaluation instruments have been established by the Tennessee Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, while others are based on educational research and the experience of those instrumental in developing the evaluation system. The fundamental principles and beliefs are stated in the following five areas:

The Program

* The primary goal of the evaluation program is to identify and reward outstanding teaching performance.

* A second important goal of the evaluation program is instructional improvement.
* A sound evaluation program focuses on performance rather than credentials.

* To be most useful, the evaluation program must be coupled with a strong professional development program.

* It is possible to assess differences in teacher performance.

The Teacher

* The teacher wants to be a competent professional.

* Instruction is the primary element in the overall role of the teacher.

* Skills needed and used by outstanding teachers do not differ from skills needed by less able teachers.

* All teachers can improve performance.

The Evaluator

* Teachers are able to evaluate the performance of their peers.

* Rigorous and comprehensive training is essential for an evaluator.

* Evaluation is best conducted by a team of evaluators rather than by a single individual.

* The evaluator must have a commitment to instructional improvement.

The Evaluation Process

* The evaluation process should not discourage diversity in teaching behavior.
* Multiple observations of teaching are necessary to obtain a reliable picture of teaching behavior.

* Effectiveness of teaching behavior must be assessed in light of the learner, school, and/or school system characteristics, needs and organizational structure.

* The evaluation process should focus on the identification of patterns of teaching behavior.

* Multiple sources of data are essential to the development of a complete picture of teaching performance.

The Evaluation Instruments

* The evaluation instruments must be developed from the evaluation process.

* The instrument(s) must be understood by all teachers and administrators.

* The instrument(s) must assess the performance of competencies/skills considered important to effective teaching. (pp. 1-2)

* Checklists and rating scales are useful only as reflections of summarized information. (State of Tennessee, 1990, pp. 1-2)

The main body of CERA defined a program to be implemented over time. Therefore, requirements for new teachers hired after July 1, 1984, were those orderly progressive steps outlined by law. Table 1 is taken from the orientation manual and shows the requirements originally prescribed by CERA. However, another system was devised to deal with teachers employed and certificated as of July 1, 1984 (State of Tennessee, 1985a). The Tennessee Legislature provided an avenue to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Level</th>
<th>Years of Experience to Qualify</th>
<th>Certificate Length and Duration</th>
<th>Who Evaluates?</th>
<th>Contract Duration</th>
<th>State Salary Supplement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>One-Year Nonrenewable</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Three-Years Nonrenewable</td>
<td>Local - 3rd Year Review</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>To be Determined by State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Level I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Five-Years Renewable</td>
<td>Local - 2 times in five years</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State - 5th Year Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Level II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Five-Years Renewable</td>
<td>Local - Once in 3 Years</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State - two times during five-year period</td>
<td>11 Month</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Level III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Five Years Renewable</td>
<td>Local - Once in 3 Years</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State - two times during five-year period</td>
<td>11 Month</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Month</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
encourage participation for these teachers which was the inclusion of a "Fast Track" program in CERA to provide five ways to enter the career ladder program in 1984-85. For those teachers who had three or more years as a certified teacher, certification could be obtained by making a sufficient score on the Core Battery of the National Teachers' Examination (NTE); making a sufficient score on the Tennessee Career Ladder Test; participating in a sufficient number of hours of staff development; or by requesting full evaluation by either an approved local evaluation method or the State Model of evaluation (State of Tennessee, 1984).

Table 2, also taken from the orientation manual, reflects the requirements for those teachers who utilized the Fast Track method to obtain certification.

CERA created two career ladders, one for teachers and the other for administrators. Two teacher evaluation plans were put in place covering five levels, or "rungs," of the career ladder. A lower system provided for evaluation, at the local level, of probationary teachers (with no teaching experience), apprentice teachers (with one year of experience), and Level I teachers (with at least three years of experience). An upper evaluation system provided for state and regional evaluation of teachers applying for Levels II and III. Eligibility for Levels II and III were based on Level I status and eight or twelve years of experience, respectively. Rewards for attaining Level III ranged from $5,000 to $7,000 additional pay per year, and for Level II from $3,000 to $5,000, depending on whether the teacher chose to work extra months in the summer. Rewards for achieving Level I were $1,000 per
Table 2

Teachers Employed and Certificated as of July 1, 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Level</th>
<th>Years of Experience To Qualify</th>
<th>Certificate Length and Duration</th>
<th>Who Evaluates?</th>
<th>Contract Duration</th>
<th>State Salary Supplement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Level I</td>
<td>3* Years Renewable</td>
<td>5-Year Local - Minimum of two times in 5 years State Review - 5th Year</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Level II</td>
<td>8** Years Renewable</td>
<td>5-Year Local - Once in 3 Years State - 2 times in 5 years</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Level III</td>
<td>12*** Years Renewable</td>
<td>5-Year Local - Once in 3 Years State - 2 times in 5 years</td>
<td>10 Month</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

★Teachers with less than three years of experience who were employed and certified on July 1, 1984, may apply for Career Level I Certification when they obtain the three-year experience and other applicable requirements.

★★Teachers with less than eight years of experience who were employed and certified on July 1, 1984, may apply for Career Level II certification when they obtain the eight-year experience and other applicable requirements.

★★★Teachers with less than twelve years of experience who were employed and certified on July 1, 1984, may apply for Career Level III certification when they obtain the twelve-year experience and other applicable requirements.
year. Reevaluation for maintaining Level I, II, or III was scheduled on a five-year cycle.

Evaluation for the upper levels was based on multiple data sources. These data sources included three classroom observations (one of which was unannounced), three questionnaires (peer, supervisor, and student), a professional skills test, assessment of a teacher-compiled portfolio (designed to document teaching competence), and a consensus decision of the three evaluators who performed the classroom observations. These evaluation inputs were developed to assess various components of six teaching competencies (State of Tennessee, 1985a).

In developing the evaluation system, both educational research and information from teachers across Tennessee were used to identify the skills and knowledge of effective teaching. The domains of competency that are evaluated are consistent with this research and also with what thousands of Tennessee teachers mentioned when asked what skills were important to good teaching (State of Tennessee, 1990, p. 13).

The domains of competence identified by the evaluation plan for the Career Ladder include: (1) planning for instruction, (2) teacher strategies, (3) evaluation of student progress, (4) classroom management, (5) professional development and leadership, and (6) basic communication skills. These domains appear consistent with the areas of teacher attributes identified by McGreal (1987).

"In measuring areas of competence, it is important to have as many sources of information as possible. Tennessee's Career Ladder Program uses the multiple data sources concept" (State of Tennessee, 1990, p. 25). The data sources utilized in the system include: the teacher,
the evaluator, the teacher's principal, and the teacher's students. Six instruments are used to collect the data in the evaluation process: classroom observation rating forms, dialogue session summary forms, two questionnaires (one student, one principal), a summary of professional development and leadership activities, and a written test of professional knowledge.

In addition, evaluators are instructed in the process of conducting dialogues and providing feedback at various intervals during the year (State of Tennessee, 1990).

Evaluators were chosen during the first year of implementation by Tennessee Career Ladder Program staff from among teachers they believed would meet Level III evaluation criteria. Evaluators were chosen in subsequent years from the ranks of Level III teachers. In its first year, roughly 90% of Tennessee's tenured teachers (about 37,000) enrolled in the Tennessee Career Ladder Program. During that initial year, 8,000 teachers applied for upper Level evaluation, but the number of trained evaluators only permitted evaluation of 3,100 teachers (Vaughn, 1985). Of those evaluated that first year, 1,090 teachers attained an upper Level (458 Level II and 632 Level III), or approximately 35%. By August of 1988 there were 6,178 upper Level teachers (2,410 Level II and 3,768 Level III) (State of Tennessee, 1988) out of 42,657 teachers in the state, or approximately 15%. The TCLP, by the end of the 1987-88 school year, had cost an estimated $282 million for four years of operation (State of Tennessee, 1986), or an average of $70.5 million per year.
By June, 1985, over 32,000 teachers had received certification in
the career ladder program (State of Tennessee, 1985b). To further
enhance participation, an accelerated career development program was
developed. This was specifically designed for candidates who missed the
requirements for either Level II or Level III by only a small amount in
one domain score. Some 400 teachers fell into these categories after
the evaluation process of the 1984-85 school year (State of Tennessee,
1985b).

In May, 1985, Robert L. McElrath, Commissioner of Education for the
State of Tennessee, sent a questionnaire to the career ladder
participants (State of Tennessee, 1985b). The questionnaire provided
six possible responses to a series of statements. These responses were:
strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly
agree, and don't know/no opinion. The respondents were asked to use the
above responses to statements which addressed classroom observation, the
portfolio, the peer, principal, and student questionnaires, the
professional skills test, and the A, B, and C evaluators. In addition
to these areas, the teachers were also given open-end response
statements which dealt with the evaluation process,
the evaluators, the orientation manuals, and a general information
statement.

The results of the questionnaire were released in summary form
(State of Tennessee, 1985b). A 62 percent response rate resulted from
the mailing of some 3,200 questionnaires. The most positive response
rates dealt with the observations, the evaluators, and the professional
interaction that these observations provided. As a result, the number
of observations was increased from three to six for the 1985-86 school year. In addition, dialogue sessions were added to provide greater opportunity for interaction and focus on areas of planning, evaluation, teaching strategies, and analysis of information formerly presented in the portfolio. While the portfolio is not specifically addressed in the summary, changes like that above and a reduction in portfolio areas from four to one indicate that the portfolio was not well-received by the participating teachers. Of interesting note was the negative response rates to the five statements relating to the professional skills test. Only two of the five statements on the questionnaire regarding the professional skills test received favorable responses, while the remaining three statements received negative responses. However, no change in the Career Ladder Test, of which the professional skills test is a part, has been made to this date (1991-92). The principal questionnaire had the most noticeable alteration, resulting in a reduction of items from forty-five to twenty and the inclusion of an explanation where none had existed before. Observation evaluations shifted from how frequently a teacher did something; i.e., usually, all of the time, half of the time, etc., to how well he/she did something; i.e., average, distinguished, etc. Regarding evaluation consensus, the number of domains was reduced from five to four with the exclusion of the leadership domain from consensus requirements. These changes were reflected in the Teacher Orientation Manual 1985-86 in addition to more specific information regarding the entire Tennessee career ladder program which had been requested by classroom teachers through the questionnaire process (State of Tennessee, 1985).
An interview with Robert McElrath (1992), the former Commissioner of Education in the State of Tennessee and a major designer and promoter of the influential Tennessee Career Ladder Teacher Evaluation System, revealed significant insights. According to McElrath, bright young students did not in the past choose education as their career and many capable teachers have left the teaching profession because of low salaries and the lack of professional prestige as educators. But the establishment of the Career Ladder Program has done much to reverse that trend. Students entering the College of Education at the University of Tennessee, for instance, formerly had the lowest scores compared with the students entering the other eleven colleges. Now, they have at least the average scores of the twelve colleges. These future educators of Tennessee report that they have become more confident with the teaching profession. In addition, 80% of the teachers who have successfully achieved Levels II and III on the career ladder have chosen the extended contract and are excited to be mentors for the younger and inexperienced teachers. Therefore, the Tennessee Career Ladder Program has attracted the best people to preparing for the teaching profession, inspired excellence in schools, and rewarded excellent instructional performance with both money and status.

Furthermore, the Tennessee Career Ladder Program has been an innovative means to bring accountability into the teaching profession. It has caused all the educators to review carefully the elements of effective and positive teaching. As a result of the four years of implementation, test scores in the Tennessee public schools have generally improved. The Career Ladder Program has not only prevented
good and qualified teachers from leaving the teaching profession but also made the empowerment of teachers a reality (McElrath, 1992).

According to the former Commissioner, one of the most successful aspects of the Career Ladder Program has been the emphasis on teachers' career development. The Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) provides many meaningful training modules to advance the career development of the Tennessee educators. With the help of the TIM, teachers have gotten a better inventory of effective teaching techniques. The Model also equipped many Levels II and III teachers to be instructional leaders in that they developed the proposed extended programs for their own schools and have served as mentors for new teachers and taught instaff training (McElrath, 1986).

More than 7,000 educators were involved in the development of the evaluation criteria for the Career Ladder Program. Among the many that were involved, there were leaders from the Tennessee Education Association (TEA), three Teachers of the Year of Tennessee, one principal, one supervisor, and three lay citizens. The Career Ladder Program was field tested and later revised for improvement before its implementation. In addition to drawing from the wealth of professional experience of the Tennessee educators, the Career Ladder Program was believed to be based upon sound research findings of effective school literature (McElrath, 1992).

Nothing is perfect, and this is true of the Tennessee Career Ladder Program. McElrath (1992) recommended that future administrative costs must be cut down, and that the amount of paperwork on the part of the teachers, although cut down tremendously already, must be further
reduced. Finally, there exists an urgent need for better and more effective communication between the State Department of Education and the local educational agencies.

According to Johns (1988), the career ladder program has given Tennessee educators the proper incentives to become better and more accountable at their jobs.

In 1992, more than 40,000 educators or ninety-seven per cent of educators have entered the career ladder program (State of Tennessee, 1992b). Governor Alexander's commitment to quality improvement and effort to gain political support were significant factors in the realization of the career ladder program in Tennessee (Stedman, 1983).

French, Halo, and Rakow (1988) conducted extensive analyses of evaluation results and procedures from the career ladder program. Their procedures included surveys and interviews with Tennessee educators and administrators who have experienced career ladder evaluation. They concluded that "no longer can arguments against performance-based merit pay or career ladder placements be based on the assumption that creation of an evaluation system appropriate to the task is technically impossible" (p. 72).

Key program developers and those supportive of the Career Ladder Program believe that the entire program is based on sound principles and beliefs, that the evaluation instruments which are used by the evaluators who are thoroughly and intensely trained by the state are valid and reliable, and the data generated from multiple sources provided unbiased information for fair evaluations of teacher instructional performance.
Tennessee's Career Ladder Evaluation Program and other similar programs should provide information for future endeavors. Much has been learned from the planning, development, and implementation of the first statewide career ladder program in the nation.

Summary

For many years Tennessee had the reputation of being on or near the bottom in the field of education. In 1985, Tennessee public education ranked forty-seventh in per pupil expenditure and forty-first in teachers' salaries. Student performance on standardized tests were down, and things in general seemed to be headed for ruin in Tennessee public education.

Lamar Alexander, Governor of Tennessee, proposed a Master Teacher Plan to the legislature for the purpose of retaining the better teachers of the state through merit pay. Consequently, the Tennessee Career Ladder Program was adopted by Tennessee's General Assembly as part of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA) of 1984.

In 1984, the State Board of Education granted approval for implementation of the Career Ladder Program. The Tennessee Department of Education published the Teacher Orientation Manual 1984-85 to explain the State Career Ladder Program. Some of the fundamental principles and beliefs concerning the evaluation program, the evaluator, the evaluation process, and the evaluation instruments were established by CERA.

Teachers with one year's experience (apprentices) and Level I teachers (with at least three years of experience) were evaluated at the local level.
Eligibility for Levels II and III were based on Level I status and 8 or 12 years of experience, respectively. Rewards for Level III teachers ranged from $5,000 to $7,000 additional pay, and for Level II from $3,000 to $5,000. Rewards for achieving Level I were $1,000 extra pay per year. By June, 1985, over 32,000 teachers had received certification in the Career Ladder Program.

According to McElrath, the Tennessee Career Ladder program has done much to attract bright young minds into teaching. Students entering the College of Education at the University of Tennessee now have average scores of the twelve colleges, while they previously had lower scores than the students in the other eleven colleges.

It is also claimed that the Tennessee Career Ladder program has been a means of bringing accountability into the teaching profession. It is also said that one of the most successful aspects of the program has been emphasis on teacher's career development.

Proponents of the Tennessee Career Ladder program sing its praises, claiming the entire program is based on sound principles and beliefs. However, critics of the program take a different stance, predicting its failure. Whatever the outcome of the Tennessee Career Ladder program, one cannot deny that much has been learned from the planning, development, and implementation of the first statewide career ladder program in the nation.

Has the Tennessee Career Ladder Program given more confidence to participating teachers and made them feel good about themselves as it was intended to do?
Self Concept

As one looks at differences in the self concept of teachers, it is important to touch upon various theories of the development of self concept. Self-concept theory has a lengthy history with important developmental stages. However, a detailed description of theory development will not be given for this study. A brief description of developmental theory will be given and a few theories will also be mentioned about the process of changing or altering the self concept. Another major idea that will be expressed is the influence of self concept on teacher behavior and effectiveness in working with students.

Self concept is the perception a person has of himself. Other terms used to mean generally the same as self concept include: self perception, self-image, self-worth, self-esteem, and others (Rogers, 1961). Coopersmith (1967) defined self-esteem as the reference to the evolution which the individual makes of himself: "... it is an expression of an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy" (pp. 4-5).

In short, self concept is a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself. Branden (1969) described self-esteem as having two interrelated aspects: a sense of personal efficacy and a sense of personal worth. He defines efficacy as self-confidence and personal worthiness as self-respect with the following rationale: "... every human being judges himself by one standard; and to the extent that he fails to satisfy that standard, his
sense of personal worth, his self-respect, suffers accordingly" (p. 104).

Symonds stressed the idea that self concept does not exist at birth when he stated:

The self as a percept is not present at birth but begins to develop gradually as perceptive powers develop... The self develops as we feel ourselves separate and distinct from others, but the differentiations are dim and hazy. It is probably true that one learns to recognize and distinguish others before one learns to recognize and distinguish the self... As the recognition of the familiar face takes shape, vague notions of the self simultaneously develop. As the mother begins to take place as a separate person, the baby forms vague notions of himself as a separate individual. (Symonds, 1951, p. 50)

Many psychologists conjectured about the nature of self-concept development in human individuals. One thing that most psychologists seemed to agree upon in the area of self theory was that the self concept begins to take form during the early months of life (Purkey, 1970). Purkey (1970) pointed out that a young child gradually recognizes the presence of significant family members, which sets the stage for the beginnings of awareness of self as an independent agent.

Burns (1979) characterized self concept as having three distinct components: how one views himself, how one feels he is viewed by others, and how one views his ideal self. This tripartite theory of self concept uses a global open system model of the self, which allows
for outside influences to affect an individual's self concept, such as work variables.

Schools should be concerned with self-concept development since Fitts includes school experiences as a part of lifetime experiences. Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1971) found evidence to suggest that the self concept may be a better predictor of a child's success in school than the I.Q. score (p. 45). To strengthen this position, Brookover, Shailor, and Paterson (1965) found a positive correlation between self concept and performance in academics. From the findings of these educators, there seems to be sufficient proof that schools do play an important role in an individual's self-concept development.

Each individual's self concept is a powerful determinant of his personal growth, behavior toward others and himself (Combs, 1965; Fitts, 1971). Although many psychologists are in agreement about the importance of self concept in determining behavior, few theories were found to exist on how to change or modify behavior through the process of changing or altering the self concept. Some have contended that self concepts must and do change in order for one to achieve a state of self-actualization. Maslow (1954) perceived self-actualization as the human desire to "become more and more what one is capable of becoming." In his later works, Maslow went into greater detail to describe the state of self-actualization. He stated:

Self-actualizing people are, without one single exception, involved in a cause outside their own skin, in something outside of themselves. They are devoted to working at something, something which is very precious to them. (Maslow, 1954)
At least three writers reported that self-actualization and positive acceptance of self is based on one’s perceptions of others’ responses to him, as well as his own perception of his characteristics and abilities. These researchers show that acceptance of self is positively associated with acceptance of others. Positive correlations ranging from .36 to .70 were found between scores of self-acceptance and acceptance of others and related to personality integration (Berger, 1952; Fey, 1957; Williams, 1962).

In perceptions of others, Hamachek (1971) found that good teachers viewed others with favorable opinions and positive attitudes toward students’ abilities, while poor teachers had negative opinions. Bernard (1970) suggests that fulfilling one’s potentials is largely dependent upon an acceptance of self and that the child who is warmly accepted, respected, and approved when he experiments and explores, is left free to develop his potentialities and can eagerly seek friends and show friendliness to others. He indicates that those interested in the development of the child’s potentialities (teachers, parents) must, therefore, approve, encourage, and support him. Attitudes and behavior showing acceptance and encouragement provide the sustenance for the healthy ego concept that will seek growth, expansion and socially-oriented self-actualization. Bernard points out that this is not an easy role for adults, because the way they look at others, children and pupils, is a reflection of their own self concepts.

Perkins (1965) advocated the idea of self concept change. He illustrated the motivation behind self concept change when he stated,
"not only does a person have a perception of himself, but he also has an image of the kind of person he would like to become" (Perkins, 1965). Perkins described this changing self-concept as the future ideal self. He stated:

. . . the extent of discrepancy between . . . self-concept and self-ideal is an indication of development and learning that has taken place . . . change in behavior cannot take place unless there is modification in his (the individual's) self-concept. (p. 450)

The question of whether a person can alter, change, or modify behavior through the process of changing or altering the self concept is important when considering teachers. Fitts stated:

If knowledge of the self-concept enables us to predict a wide variety of behaviors or characteristics relevant to an individual's successful functioning, it follows that modification of self-concept should result in predictable changes in behavior. (Fitts, 1972a)

According to Fitts, theories vary about self concept, but there is general agreement that the self concept does not exist at birth. Therefore, concepts are developed throughout the lifetime. The self concept is a very difficult and complex system to be measured or adequately described or labeled. Fitts, therefore, contended that the more optimal the self concept, the more optimal the behavior will be (p. 25). Fitts (1972b) claims the individual's concept of himself has been demonstrated to be highly influential in much of his behavior and also to be directly related to his general personality. "... people
who see themselves as undesirable, worthless, or 'bad' tend to act accordingly. Those who have a highly unrealistic concept of self tend to approach life and other people in unrealistic ways" (p. 1).

Theoretically, understanding the views each person holds of himself is essential in developing an understanding of that person.

An individual's self structure is an important determinant of his behavior, limiting his overt activities and his inner experiences (Fitts, 1972a). In general, he will endeavor to confine his thoughts, attitudes, feelings, and behavior in such manner as to maintain consistency with his perceptual self structure (Lecky, 1945). Lecky's theory of self-consistent behavior was instrumental in attracting the attention of contemporary psychologists to the need to maintain consistency in self regard as a fundamental force in human behavior.

In a review of the literature related to self, Wylie (1961) found overwhelming evidence which suggested that self-acceptance was related to adjustment and that a high regard for one's self is reflected in a high level of personal adjustment.

In a study of liked and effective teachers, Hamachek (1969) found that educational development and pupil response are functions of multiple forces that enhanced the pupil's self concept.

Among these forces the effective, personal and human factors revealed by teachers provide bases for differentiating the liked and effective teachers from those disliked and ineffective. The behavior characteristics must stem from teachers who are basically well adjusted, who enjoy children, who are pleasant, and who have a balanced outlook on life . . . key adults must look to their own
style of life if they are to be positive forces in the lives of children. (p. 343)

Hamachek (1971) brought similar findings more directly to bear upon the teaching profession. He observed that the ability to accept one's self is usually accompanied by the capacity to accept others. "Suffice it to say, interaction with others is an important social vitamin in one's daily nourishment of an expanding self-awareness" (p. 17). "The kind of teacher one is depends on the kind of person one is. . . . We have been notably remiss in our research efforts in linking a teacher's personality style to his overall teaching behavior" (p. 313). He found that good teachers see themselves as good people and have a positive and a healthy self-acceptance.

Ivan Quandt stated that there are two main aspects about which most psychologists agree:

1. The perceptions of self that an individual has include his view of himself as compared to others (self-perception), his view of how others see him (self-other perception), and his view of how he wishes he could be (self-ideal).

2. The perceptions of self that an individual has are largely based upon the experiences that he has had with those people who are important to him (significant others). Thus, such people can effect change in the individual's self-concept. (Quandt, 1971)
Buchanan (1971) felt that individuals electing to go into the teaching professions may or may not possess the necessary attitudes to make him or her successful in his dealings with students. She believes before one can deal effectively with students one must be able to deal effectively with one's self. This is the first step in effective expertise, which she defines as an individual's ability to be aware of another person's feelings and meanings. If individuals have undergone changes in effective expertise, then they in turn will change their classes, thus a secure and caring teacher modeling acceptance and appreciation of others will lead to students who will become secure and caring people modeling acceptance and appreciation as well.

Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1971) reported that the psychological literature was overflowing with articles and research studies dealing with the effects of the self-concept on a great variety of behaviors, including failure in school, levels of aspiration or goal setting, athletic prowess, mental health, intelligence, delinquency and criminality, ethnic groups, behavior of the socially disadvantaged, and industrial productivity. There is evidence to suggest that the self concept may be a better predictor of success in school than the time-honored I.Q. score.

The circular effect of the self concept purports that the person who thinks poorly of himself behaves poorly to support his belief; likewise, the person who thinks highly and positively of himself behaves or acts positively. Combs (1965) stated:

Persons with positive self-concepts are quite likely to behave in ways that cause others to react in similar fashion. People who
believe they can, are more likely to succeed. The very existence of such feelings about self creates conditions likely to make them so. (p. 46)

Rogers (1967) in a study of adequate and inadequate teachers rated by their principals and supervisors, who were also rated by their students as to the students' perception of the teachers' relationships to them. The adequately rated teachers were found to have high regard for their students and the less adequately rated teachers lower regard for their students. Hamachek (1971) agrees that teacher personality and behavior can influence the students for better or for worse.

Another study (Webb, 1971) purported to show that certain psychological behavior, how the teacher relates to the child, forms an important basis for the child's view of self and educational orientation.

The data obtained clearly indicate that teacher personality is a critical variable in the classroom. Lack of teacher sensitivity to students who are shy or insecure or to those who have poor opinions about school and themselves has a marked negative effect on their self-esteem and consequent learning attitudes. This is particularly true for pupils of average ability. (p. 458)

Woolner (1966) stated that a teacher's positive self concept facilitates a child's learning since teachers are important in a child's life and are copied. To help a child develop a positive self concept, the teacher should have a positive self concept, reported Woolner.

Discussing the teacher's "real-ness," Rogers (1961) said that learning
seems to be facilitated if the teacher's behavior is congruent with his self concept.

This involves the teacher's being the person that he is, and being openly aware of the attitudes he holds. It means that he feels acceptant toward his own real feelings. He can be enthusiastic about subjects he likes and bored by subjects he does not like. He can be angry, but he can also be sensitive or sympathetic. Because he accepts his feelings as his feelings, he has no need to impose them on his students, or to insist that they feel the same way. He is a person, not a faceless embodiment of a curricular requirement, or a sterile pipe through which knowledge is passed from one generation to the next. (p. 287)

For more than three decades researchers have been looking for the key to effective teacher personality that motivates the pupil to learn. It has been well documented that a high degree of self-esteem is a necessary characteristic of anyone in the helping professions (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971).

The helping professions demand the use of self as an instrument. Effective operation demands personal interaction. The helper must have the ability to share himself on the one hand, and, at the same time, possess the capacity for extraordinary self-discipline . . . the self must possess a satisfactory degree of adequacy before it can venture commitment and encounter. (p. 13)

Further, say these writers, "the self-concept and its functions lie at the very heart of the helping process" (p. 60).
William Purkey pointed out that in self-concept theory, people behaved according to their beliefs. This led Purkey to conclude that a teacher's belief about himself would strongly influence his effectiveness in working with students (p. 45).

Findings from numerous studies indicated that, in general, teachers, as groups, tended to have quite normal self concepts. Fitts concluded that teacher groups tended to score a little above the norm on self concept reports (Fitts, 1972).

Don Hamachek considered teacher self concepts as one of the most significant causes of differences between good and poor teachers. The more emotionally stable teachers were more apt to have positive kinds of self concepts (Hamachek, 1969).

Purkey (1970) found most research evidence showed a significant relationship between the self concept and achievement. In his research he found that Brookover (1967) did extensive research on self-image and achievement and concluded that the student's attitudes had much more impact on the level of his achievement in school than did human ability.

According to Purkey, for many years teachers have believed that the students who feel good about themselves and their abilities are the ones who are most likely to succeed. Conversely, it seems that those who look at themselves negatively tend to fail to achieve good grades.

If a teacher is to become instrumental in changing a student's self concept, he or she must first have positive and realistic concepts about himself before reaching out to help others. Berger (1953), Fey (1957), and Luft (1966) all correlate a relationship between the way an individual sees himself and the way he sees others. Those who accept
themselves tend to be more accepting of others. Omwake (1954) likewise concluded that those who reject themselves hold correspondingly low opinions of others. The most effective teachers have the most positive feeling about self.

According to Donald W. Felker, it has been shown that there is relationship between the self concept and academic achievements. He found that a positive self concept was related to good academic achievement, and a poor self concept was related to poor academic achievement. This relationship was shown from the early elementary school years through the high school years. The relationship was found in black and white groups which included both normal groups and groups with learning disabilities (Felkner, 1974).

Self concepts of teachers and students have been found to be indicative of certain specific teaching and learning behaviors. Most research about the self concept relating to teachers may be grouped into two main categories: one concerns the relationship of teachers' self concepts and generalized success in teaching. Pupils of high self-concept teachers demonstrate higher academic achievement than pupils whose teachers' self concepts are lower or less adequate (Sears, 1963; and Hamachek, 1972). Such findings firmly support the hypothesis that teachers' self concepts may be inextricably related to pupil learning (Freeman & Davis, 1974).

Summary

In the review of literature, one finds an explanation of what self concept is and a brief description of the development theory of self
concept. Another idea expressed was the influence of self concept on teacher behavior and his effectiveness in working with students.

Several lengthy definitions of self concept were given by different sources, but all of them had basically the same meaning--the perception one has of himself.

The findings of the literature all seemed to indicate that a positive self concept is closely related to excellence in academics. There also seemed to be a correlation of high self-esteem in teachers to success in working with students. If a teacher thinks well of himself, the students will think well of him also.

Summary of Review of Literature

The chapter on review of literature was divided into five major divisions: National Reform, State Reform, Career Ladder Programs, Tennessee Career Ladder Program, and Self Concept. All of these facets of the study seemed to be essential in the investigation of the self-concept behaviors of teachers of both Career Level II and III teachers and eligible.

The study of national reform revealed a long history of the desire for change in the American educational system, a history that dated from 1647 to President George Bush's America 2000 suggestions for educational strategy. So, from 1647 to 1992, there have been repeated attempts at national reform in education. At times these attempts have been spurred into action by the scientific success of rival nations.

The state reform movements seemed to be focused on teacher improvement and better rewards for improved teachers. Most states seemed to approach reform via the Career Ladder or the "Master Teacher
Plan." A review was given on how much the various states had funded for each one's plan and how the funding had increased or decreased since the initiation of the plan. Research indicated that the majority of both teachers and the general public were in favor of increased pay for teachers who proved themselves "particularly capable." The sources reviewed indicated the Career Ladder is still the popular vehicle for state reform.

Career Ladder programs, or incentive programs, are nothing new to the American educational system. These programs dated back as far as 1908. Since then, interest in them has ebbed and flowed from the 1920s to the 1990s when the concept again gained momentum.

One source offered the theory that, after a teacher's extrinsic rewards had been satisfied, he began to look inward for intrinsic satisfaction. It was suggested the teacher wanted recognition from his peers and desired to bask in the glow of his accomplishments.

Polls have shown according to Johnson that taxpayers would be more willing to support public education if teachers were paid according to their performance.

Governor Lamar Alexander proposed the Master Teacher Plan to the state legislature for the purpose of retaining the better teachers through merit pay in the state of Tennessee. The sources went on to tell about the differences in pay of Level I, II, and III teachers and how some parts of the plan had been changed. It was pointed out that the Tennessee Career Ladder program had brought more accountability into the teaching profession. It was also stated that one of the most
successful aspects of the program had been emphasis on the teacher's career development.

There are many proponents as well as many critics of the Tennessee Career Ladder program. It remains to be seen if this program develops a more positive self-esteem among teachers, resulting in a better learning environment for boys and girls.

Some studies revealed the idea that self concept was developed totally from within, while others claimed outside influences helped form one's self-image. The findings in the literature seemed to indicate that a positive self concept is closely related to excellence in academics. There also seemed to be a correlation of high self-esteem in teachers to successful teaching.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

Introduction

This chapter contains a description of the research design, population and selection of the sample, the research instrument, methodology, data analysis, and the summary.

Research Design

This study is causal-comparative in nature. A mailed questionnaire was used to collect data. Many important social, scientific, and educational research problems do not lend themselves to experimentation, although many of them do lend themselves to controlled inquiry of the causal-comparative kind (Kerlinger, 1973).

Causal-comparative research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulatable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables (Kerlinger, 1973).

According to Borg and Gall (1989), causal-comparative research is aimed at the discovery of possible causes and effects of a behavior pattern or personal characteristic by comparing subjects in whom this pattern or characteristic is present with similar subjects in which it is absent or present to a lesser degree.
Causal-comparative research is widely used in the behavioral sciences. This method will continue to be used in education since it is often impossible to manipulate such variables as aptitude, intelligence, personality traits, and some variables that might present unacceptable threat to human beings (Best, 1977). Before utilizing the causal-comparative design, it is vital that the limitations of this research be recognized:

1. The independent variable cannot be manipulated
2. Causes are often multiple rather than single
3. Subjects cannot be randomly assigned to treatment groups

(p. 152).

Despite these possible limitations in the use of causal-comparative research, this method is useful for identifying possible causes of observed variations in behavior. This, in turn, can be valuable in giving direction to later experimental studies, which are more likely to produce clear-cut results (Borg & Gall, 1989).

**Population**

The target population for this study comprised the Tennessee public school Career Ladder Level II and III teachers and those eligible to apply in the seven districts in Tennessee. The seven districts include the complete state of Tennessee and are listed as Northwest, Southwest, South Central, Upper Cumberland, Southeast, East, and First Tennessee and are depicted in Figure 1 (State of Tennessee, 1992a). This population is made up of 8,072 Career Ladder Level II and III and 27,620 teachers eligible to apply, or a total population of 35,692 educators.
Figure 1. State of Tennessee School Systems and Districts 1991-1992.
The population described is identified as: (1) eight plus years of experience, (2) proper professional licensure, and (3) career ladder eligible assignments (State of Tennessee, 1992b).

**Selection of the Sample**

Prior to selecting the sample for this study, the seven districts of Tennessee were identified as the population from which the selection was to be made. The geographical area encompasses the entire state of Tennessee. Figure 1 provides a description of each of the seven districts and the school systems included in each district.

For the purpose of drawing a sample of Career Level II and III teachers and those teachers eligible to apply, the target population (Borg & Gall, 1989) in the Tennessee public schools, the sampling procedure which was used is stratified random sampling, stratified by district with Career Level II and III versus those teachers who are eligible to apply.

The sample size for this study was determined by using the following formula (Ott, Mendenhall, & Scheaffer, 1986):

\[
N = \frac{Npq}{(N-1)(.05)^2 + pq}
\]

This formula provides for a 95% level of confidence and an error on the estimate of ±.5%. Using this formula it was determined that a sample of 380 would be adequate for Career Level II and III and a sample of 400 would be adequate for those teachers who are eligible to apply. Surveys were sent to 1,115 respondents so that approximately 780 would be received back, given that a 70% response rate is normal in mail-out
surveys. Fitz-Gibbon and Morris (1987) recommend making the sample as large as you can afford in terms of time and money. The larger the sample, the less likely for negative results and failure to reject the null hypothesis when it is actually false.

According to Borg and Gall (1989), the main purpose for using random sampling techniques is that random samples yield research data that can be generalized to a larger population within margins of error that can be determined statistically. Random sampling is also preferred because it permits the researcher to apply inferential statistics to the data. Inferential statistics enable the researcher to make certain inferences about population values, such as mean, standard deviation, and correlation coefficient on the basis of obtained sample values (p. 220).

According to Borg and Gall (1989), in the selection process, the sampling was stratified to assure that subgroups in the population will be represented in the sample in proportion to their numbers in the population itself. This is appropriate in studies where the research problem requires comparison between various subgroups and also assures adequate cases for subgroup analysis (p. 225).

The two lists were obtained from the Tennessee Department of Education, Division of Data Management (State of Tennessee, 1992b). One list contained all Career Level II and III teachers, broken down by district and system. The other list contained all teachers eligible to apply for upper level II and III of the Career Ladder, also broken down by district, and system. The percentage contribution for each of the seven districts toward the total for each list was calculated. A
percentage for each district based on the contributory percentage calculated for the district was selected using a table of random numbers. A table of random numbers (Borg & Gall, 1989) was used to draw a sample from the teacher lists (pp. 221, 910-912). A row was selected from the table. Then all the numbers that follow in that row were used. This continued to the next row until enough numbers had been selected for the desired sample size, a total of 1,115. Each selected teacher was mailed a cover letter with instructions, a questionnaire, a scantron answer sheet, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. After two weeks a follow-up letter was sent to non-respondents (see Appendix E). Follow-up calls and visits were made to non-respondents.

Instrumentation

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) developed by William H. Fitts was selected as the appropriate instrument for use in this study (see Appendix B). The TSCS is a versatile instrument, widely used in educational and research settings. It is supported by an impressive body of research and extensive evidence of validity (Fitts, 1991). The TSCS averages more than 200 references annually in a wide range of publications. The scale has been normed for adults.

The TSCS was developed by gathering a large pool of self descriptive items. This pool of items was derived from a number of other self-concept measures and from written self-descriptions. Seven clinical psychologists were used as judges to classify the items. Forty-five of the items were considered to be negative, a "bad" thing to say about oneself, and forty-five of the items were considered to be positive, a "good" thing to say about oneself. The judges were in total
agreement on the final ninety items used in the scale. Ten items were taken from the L-Scale of the *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory* to comprise the Self Criticism Scale (Fitts, 1991).

The counseling form of the TSCS was designed so that one might acquire information about the individual's level of self esteem, self criticism, identity, self satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self (pp. 2-4).

The dimensions of the *Tennessee Self Concept Scale* were defined as follows:

- **Level of Self Esteem**--the degree to which persons tend to like themselves, feel they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves and act accordingly.
- **Self Criticism**--the degree to which the individual possesses a normal healthy openness and capacity for self criticism.
- **Identity**--what a person is as he sees himself.
- **Self Satisfaction**--the level of self acceptance.
- **Behavior**--the individual's perception of his own behavior or the way he functions.
- **Physical Self**--the individual's perception of his body, his state of health, his physical appearance, skills, and sexuality.
- **Moral-Ethical Self**--how the individual perceives his moral worth, relationship to God, feelings of being a "good" or "bad" person, and satisfaction with his religion or lack of it.
**Personal Self**--the individual's sense of personal worth, his feeling of adequacy as a person, and his evaluation of his personality apart from his body or his relationship to others.

**Family Self**--the individual's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member.

**Social Self**--the individual's sense of adequacy and worth in social interaction with other people in general. (pp. 2-4)

The ninety items on the TSCS were classified and placed on a two-dimensional, three-by-five scheme on the score sheet. The ten items not included in the three-by-five scheme report the level of self criticism (p. 2).

Tzeng, Maxey, Fortier, and Landis (1985) computed internal consistency estimates (alpha coefficients) on subsets of the TSCS. All coefficients were above .80 in the samples. For the positively and negatively keyed items of the TSCS (45 items in each subset), alphas ranged from .89 to .94 across the three samples.

On the dimensions used in this study, the test-retest reliability coefficients reported by Fitts with a group of sixty college students ranged from .67 to .92. Table 3, shows the means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for these dimensions (p. 14).

A study of TSCS score stability was conducted for use with the TSCS revised manual. The overall change in TSCS scores upon retest in control groups is quite small. None of the content or empirical scales showed consistent trends in retest differences that were large enough to warrant interpretation at this time (Fitts, 1991). Swinn ranked the
Table 3

Tennessee Self Concept Scale*  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Coefficients on the Dimensions Used in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tennessee Self Concept Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Self Esteem</td>
<td>345.57</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Criticism</td>
<td>35.54</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity</td>
<td>127.10</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>103.67</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Behavior</td>
<td>115.01</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical Self</td>
<td>71.78</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Self</td>
<td>64.55</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Family Self</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Self</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TSCS among the better measures combining group discrimination with self-concept information (Swinn, 1972).

Procedures establishing validity for the TSCS consisted of four kinds: (1) content validity, (2) discrimination between groups, (3) correlation with other personality measures, and (4) personality changes under particular conditions. Numerous examples of studies were cited by
Fitts that indicated that validity had been established for all four of the areas shown below. In summary, Fitts stated:

There is considerable evidence that people’s concepts of self do change as a result of significant experiences. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale reflects these changes in predicted ways, thus constituting additional evidence for the validity of the instrument. (pp. 28-30)

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale answer sheets were computer scored at East Tennessee State University. The data were processed to provide a profile for each of the variables, standard deviations for each variable, and for further analysis.

Demographic Questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire was prepared to acquire the following data about each respondent: age, sex, and education level. These demographic data were analyzed for relevancy to the study.

Methodology

Having selected the sample and designed a composite of related correspondence, the actual data collection began by mailing each participant in the study a letter explaining the study and directions for completion, a copy of the TSCS, and an answer sheet (Appendices B and C).

One self-addressed envelope was included with the TSCS instrument. The respondents were asked to return the TSCS instrument and answer sheet in the envelope. The cover letter explained to all participants that their names were not to be placed on the TSCS instrument or answer
sheet. Two weeks after the initial contact with the respondents, a follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed to those who had not responded (Appendix E). Follow-up calls and visits were made to non-respondents. When the questionnaires were returned, the data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, PC version (Norusis, 1988).

Data Analysis

According to Borg and Gall (1989), the first step in an analysis of casual-comparative data is to compute descriptive statistics for each comparison group in the study. These generally will include the group mean and standard deviation. The next step is to do a test of statistical significance. The choice of a significance test depends on whether the researcher is interested in comparing groups with respect to mean score, variance, median, rank scores, or category frequencies.

In this study, a comparison of total self concept scores of two samples to determine whether they were significantly different from each other was made. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if the mean self esteem for the two groups (Career Ladder II and III and Eligible for Career Ladder II and III) were significantly different in Hypotheses 1 and 2 at the .05 level. A t-test for independent samples was used to determine if the mean for the two groups (Career Ladder II and II and eligible Career Ladder II and III) was significantly different in Hypotheses 3 through 13 at the .05 level.

Measurements for this study were made on a sample of subjects randomly drawn from a defined population and the findings from this sample were used to make inferences about the defined population. The
statistical inference procedure was used to establish a null hypothesis. After a null hypothesis was formulated, a test of statistical significance was calculated to determine whether the null hypotheses could be rejected. This was done to determine whether there actually was a difference between the groups.

The t-test was used to determine the level of statistical significance of an observed difference between the sample means. The null hypothesis would be rejected if the probability for the t value reached a significance level of .05.

The demographic items were analyzed to determine relevancy to teacher's decision whether or not to participate in the career ladder. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine where significant differences in TCSC scores existed between demographic subgroups when there were more than two groups. According to Borg and Gall (1989), this is the analysis of variance used to compare when the subgroups differ on only one factor. If there were only two groups, a t-test for independent samples was used.

Summary

The research methodology and procedures were presented in this chapter. The instrument chosen for the study was the Tennessee Self Concept Scale developed and validated by William Fitts. Career Level II and III teachers and those teachers who are eligible to apply from the seven districts in Tennessee were included in the sample. When the questionnaires were returned, the data were scored and analyzed using the t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).
CHAPTER 4
Presentation and Analysis of Data

Introduction
The results and findings obtained from the data gathered in this study are presented in this chapter. The hypotheses tested with these data are set forth in Chapter 1. These hypotheses were tested to determine differences between Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who were eligible to apply in the seven districts of Tennessee.

Procedures for the statistical treatment of the data were outlined in Chapter 3. Further explanation and clarification of these procedures will be necessary throughout this chapter.

The data collected for this study were obtained from 810 questionnaires sent to 1,115 teachers of public schools in Tennessee. The questionnaire consisted of one hundred statements related to self concept which were broken down into nine subscales and a total self esteem score. The questionnaire also contained three items related to personal data (age, sex, and educational level).

Respondents
Eight hundred ten of the 1,115 teachers surveyed in Tennessee returned the questionnaire. This figure represents 72.65% of data returned. The Career Level response rate was 75.32% and the response rate of eligible teachers was 70.23%. The questionnaires were unusable due to excessive mutilation and untraceable for follow-up. There were, therefore, 808 useable responses. Tables 4 and 5 show the seven
districts, the number sent, number returned, and percent of returns from each district represented in this study.

Table 4

Career Level II and III Response Rates by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>No. Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper East</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>409*</td>
<td>75.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 was unusable due to excessive mutilation and untraceable for follow-up
Table 5
Response Rates for Eligible Teachers by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>No. Questionnaires</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper East</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>571</td>
<td>401*</td>
<td>70.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 was unusable due to excessive mutilation and untraceable for follow-up
Comparison of Sample to National Norms

Table 6 shows the original norm sample scores for the TSCS and those obtained for Career Level II and III and eligible in this study. The original standardization group included 626 participants from various parts of the United States, with ages ranging from 12 to 88. The group was composed of an approximate balance of males and females, blacks and whites, representatives of all social, economic, and intellectual levels, and of educational levels from sixth grade through the doctoral level. The original norms have been shown to be representative. Subsequent samples tested in the United States show score distributions do not differ appreciably from the norms (Fitts, 1991).

Career Level II and III teachers scored 59.42 points, or 1.93 standard deviations, above the national norm on total self concept. Eligible teachers scored 38.48 points, or 1.25 standard deviations, above the national norm on total self concept.

Career Level II and III teachers were above the national norm on all subscales except self criticism and physical self. Eligible teachers also scored below the norm on self criticism and physical self, plus on the identity subscale.

Four years after the original norm study, Fitts (1991) conducted a study focusing on educators only (administrators and teachers) and found that as a whole they indicated higher self concepts than the original norm group. Fitts postulated that this may be due to the higher educational or occupational status of educators in comparison to the norm sample.
Table 6

Tennessee Self Concept Scale


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tennessee Self Concept Scale</th>
<th>National Norm Sample Scores</th>
<th>National Norm Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Career Level II and III Mean Scores</th>
<th>Eligible Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Self Esteem</td>
<td>345.57</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>404.99</td>
<td>384.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Criticism</td>
<td>35.54</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>34.95*</td>
<td>31.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity</td>
<td>127.10</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>114.70</td>
<td>125.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>103.67</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>114.26</td>
<td>109.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Behavior</td>
<td>115.01</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>127.56</td>
<td>122.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical Self</td>
<td>71.78</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>68.60*</td>
<td>63.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>79.29</td>
<td>75.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Self</td>
<td>64.55</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>72.05</td>
<td>68.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Family Self</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>74.42</td>
<td>70.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Self</td>
<td>68.16</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>76.22</td>
<td>69.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores below the national norm

Analysis of the Hypotheses

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for analyzing Hypotheses 1 and 2. A t-test for independent samples was selected for analyzing Hypotheses 3 through 13. In Hypotheses 4 through 13, research hypotheses are presented although the data were tested against the null hypotheses, which stated there would be no statistically significant differences. The .05 level of significance was established for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses of this study.
Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference in total Self Esteem scores between teachers of different ages.

Respondents were divided into three age subgroups: 25-44 years; 45-54 years; and 55 years or more. Of the respondents 691 (86\%) indicated their age. In age group 25-44, there were 361 (52\%) participants; in age group 45-54, there were 247 (36\%) participants; in age group 55 and above, there were 83 (12\%) participants. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences in total self esteem scores existed between different age groups. A significant difference existed between groups (F=7.3419, p=.0007). Thus, the null hypotheses were rejected. A Scheffe's post hoc multiple comparison test found ages 25-44 and 45-54 and ages 25-44 and 55 and older to be significantly different from each other. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 7. No significant difference was found between ages 45-54 and 55 and older. Teachers aged 25-44 had the lowest self esteem and age 55 and older had the highest self esteem.

Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference in total Self Esteem scores between teachers who have attained different levels of education.

Respondents were divided into five subgroups relative to highest level of education: B.S. or B.A.; M.A. or M.S.; M.A. or M.S. + 45;
Table 7

**Summary of One-Way Analysis of Variance for Mean Total Self Esteem by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 44</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>390.17</td>
<td>36.78</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>398.59</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>(p=.0007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and older</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>403.46</td>
<td>30.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ed.S.; Ed.D. or Ph.D. Two hundred nineteen (219) (30.7%) had received a B.S. or B.A.; 332 (46.6%) had an M.A. or M.S.; 124 (17.4%) had an M.A. or M.S.+45; 27 (3.8%) had an Ed.S.; and 11 (1.5%) had received an Ed.D. or Ph.D. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if a significant difference existed in total self esteem between subgroups. ANOVA for mean total self esteem by educational level indicated no two groups were found to be significantly different at the .05 level. Thus the null hypothesis is not rejected. Table 8 shows the mean total self esteem by educational level.

**Hypothesis 3**

There will be no significant difference in total Self Esteem score between males and females.

One hundred seventy-eight (24.5%) indicated they were male, and 550 (75.5%) indicated they were females. A t-test for independent samples for mean total self esteem indicated there was a significant difference
Table 8

Summary of One-Way Analysis of Variance for Mean Total Self Esteem by Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S. or B.A.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>395.7</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>.1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S.</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>394.62</td>
<td>36.31</td>
<td>(.9547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S.+45</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>396.02</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>397.07</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D./Ph.D.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>388.56</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the total self esteem of males and females, with females having a higher self esteem ($t=-2.02$, p=.045). The null hypothesis was rejected. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

Summary of t-Test for Independent Samples for Mean Total Self Esteem by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>389.87</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>396.31</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>(.045)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4

There will be a significant difference in the total Self Esteem score of Career Level II and III teachers when compared to the total Self Esteem scores of teachers who are eligible to apply.

A comparison was made between the mean total self esteem score of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who were eligible to apply. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 404.99 on the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 384.05. A statistically significant difference was found ($t = 8.61$, $p < .0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Eligible teachers were determined to have significantly lower total self esteem than Career Level II and III teachers. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers had a greater tendency to like themselves, feel they are persons of value and worth, and have confidence in themselves and act accordingly (Fitts, 1991). The results of the analysis are listed in Table 10.

Hypotheses 5

There will be a significant difference in the level of Self Criticism of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

Data analysis of the responses of Career Level II and III teachers and eligible teachers compared their mean scores on the Self Criticism subscale of the TSCS. Career Level II and III had a mean score of 34.95 on the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 31.9 on the TSCS.
There was a significant difference in the level of self criticism ($t = -6.85, p < .0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers have a greater openness and capacity for self criticism (Fitts, 1991). These results are listed in Table 10.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Career Level II and III</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Self Esteem</td>
<td>404.99</td>
<td>384.05</td>
<td>-8.61</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Criticism</td>
<td>34.95</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>-6.85</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>134.70</td>
<td>125.32</td>
<td>-9.01</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Satisfaction</td>
<td>114.26</td>
<td>109.10</td>
<td>-5.43</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>127.56</td>
<td>122.16</td>
<td>-6.75</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Self</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>63.79</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>$p = .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Ethical Self</td>
<td>79.29</td>
<td>75.67</td>
<td>-6.06</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self</td>
<td>72.06</td>
<td>68.02</td>
<td>-6.88</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Self</td>
<td>74.42</td>
<td>70.85</td>
<td>-6.60</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Self</td>
<td>76.22</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>-9.65</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses 6

There will be a significant difference in the level of Identity of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

To examine this hypothesis, the responses of Career Level II and III teachers and eligible teachers were compared. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 134.70 on the Identity subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 125.32. A statistically significant difference was found ($t=-9.01, p<.0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Career level II and III teachers were found to have a significantly higher level of identity (what a person is, as he sees himself) (Fitts, 1991) than eligible teachers. The results are listed in Table 10.

Hypothesis 7

There will be a significant difference in the level of Self Satisfaction of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

A comparison was made between the mean level of self satisfaction of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 114.26 on the Self Satisfaction subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 109.10. A statistically significant difference was found ($t=-5.43, p<.0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers had a higher level of self
Hypotheses 8

There will be a significant difference in the level of Behavior of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

Data contained in Table 10 provide the results of the analysis. Career Level II and III had a mean score of 127.56 on the Behavior subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 122.16. A statistically significant difference was found (t = 6.75, p < .0005). The null hypothesis was rejected. Career Level II and III teachers were determined to have a significantly higher level of behavior (individual's perception of his or her own behavior or the way he or she functions) (Fitts, 1991) than eligible teachers.

Hypothesis 9

There will be a significant difference in the level of Physical Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

The information listed in Table 10 shows that there were significant differences in Career Level II and III teachers and eligible teachers in the level of physical self. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 65.60 on the Physical Self subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 63.79. A statistically significant difference was found (t = 3.29, p = .001). The null hypothesis
significant difference was found ($t=-3.29, p=.001$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Career Level II and III teachers were found to have significantly higher physical self than eligible teachers. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers have a higher perception of their bodies, state of health, physical appearance, skills, and sexuality (Fitts, 1991).

**Hypothesis 10**

There will be a significant difference in the level of Moral- Ethical Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

The results of the analysis are listed in Table 10. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 79.29 on the Moral-Ethical Self subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 75.67. A statistically significant difference was found ($t=-6.06, p<.0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Career Level II and III teachers were determined to have significantly higher moral-ethical self than eligible teachers. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers have a higher perception of their moral worth, relationship to God, feelings of being a good or bad person, and satisfaction with their religion or lack of it (Fitts, 1991).

**Hypothesis 11**

There will be a significant difference in the level of Personal Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.
Data analysis of the responses of Career Level II and III and eligible teachers compared their mean scores. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 72.06 on the Personal Self subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 68.02 on the TSCS. There was a significant difference in the level of personal self ($t = 6.88$, $p < .0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers' feeling of adequacy as a person and sense of personal worth is higher than eligible teachers (Fitts, 1991). The results are listed in Table 10.

**Hypothesis 12**

There will be a significant difference in the level of Family Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

To examine this hypothesis, the responses of Career Level II and III and eligible teachers were compared. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 74.42 on the Family Self subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 70.85. A statistically significant difference was found ($t = -6.60$, $p < .0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Career Level II and III teachers were found to have a higher level of family self than eligible teachers. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers had a greater feeling of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member (Fitts, 1991). The results of the analysis are listed in Table 10.
Hypothesis 13

There will be a significant difference in the level of Social Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply.

A comparison was made between the social self score of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. Career Level II and III teachers had a mean score of 76.22 on the Social Self subscale of the TSCS. Eligible teachers had a mean score of 69.63. A statistically significant difference was found ($t=-9.65$, $p<.0005$). The null hypothesis was rejected. Career Level II and III teachers were found to have significantly higher social self than eligible teachers. This indicates that Career Level II and III teachers' sense of adequacy and worth in social interaction with other people is higher than eligible teachers (Fitts, 1991). The results of the analysis are listed in Table 10.

Summary

Chapter 4 described the characteristics of the respondents in the seven districts of the state included in the study. The null hypothesis for Hypotheses 1-3 and the declarative format for Hypotheses 4-13 were stated in Chapter 1. A series of t-tests for independent samples were used to determine if the means were significantly different between Career Level II and III and eligible teachers on the total self esteem score and nine subscales. A t-test was used to test differences on total self esteem between males and females and an ANOVA was used to test the mean total self esteem of teachers with different educational
levels and for teachers of different ages. The results on the TSCS scale are summarized in graphic form in Figure 2.

Data obtained from responses to the questionnaire indicated Career Level II and III teachers had a higher self esteem on the total self esteem score and on all nine subscales.

Additionally, females had a higher mean score on total self esteem than males. Educational levels did not differentiate. Age had an effect; older persons had higher total self esteem scores.

Both Career Level II and III and eligible teachers scored higher on total self esteem than the national norm sample, as well as on most of the subscales. Career Level II and III scored below the national norm on self criticism and physical self, whereas the eligible teachers scored lower on both of those subscales and also on the identity subscale.
Figure 2. Comparison of self esteem scales between Career Level II and III and eligible teachers.

Dimensions of the TSCS
1=Total Self Esteem
2=Self Criticism
3=Identity
4=Self Satisfaction
5=Behavior
6=Physical Self
7=Moral-Ethical Self
8=Personal Self
9=Family Self
10=Social Self

Note. All differences were found to be significant at the .05 level.
See Table 10 for t values and probabilities.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

Attention and emphasis has been given to the Tennessee Career Ladder Program during the last eight years. While this voluntary and alternative compensation plan has successfully attracted many teachers to apply for Career Level II and III, there are thousands of eligible teachers who have chosen not to participate. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a significant difference in the self concept of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply but have not elected to participate in the Career Ladder. The study was designed to compare the self concept of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply for Career Ladder II and III.

An extensive review of the literature revealed that limited research has been conducted concerning the Career Ladder Program in Tennessee. The literature was very limited on recent research information on self concept.

The dimensions of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: self criticism, identity, self satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self were selected to measure the self concept of teachers.

A questionnaire was sent to 1,115 randomly selected teachers in the seven districts in Tennessee. The random selection was stratified by the seven districts. The 608 useable respondents included 565 females,
179 males, and 64 who did not indicate their sex. Two hundred
thirty-four respondents had a Bachelor's degree, 341 had a Master's
degree, 130 had a Master's degree plus 45 hours above, 28 had an Ed.S.
degree, and 11 had an Ed.S./Ph.D. degree. There were 361 (52%) teachers
in age group 25-44, 247 (36%) in age group 45-54, and 83 (12%) in age
group 55 and older.

For analysis purposes, these participants were divided into two
groups: Group 1 (Career Level II and III teachers); Group 2 (teachers
with eight years' or more experience who were eligible to apply for
Career Level II and III). The results of these data were used in a
statistical analysis of the hypotheses of the study.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test Hypotheses 1
and 2 to determine whether significant differences in TSCS scores
existed between demographic subgroups with more than two groups (age and
education). A t-test for independent groups was used to test Hypothesis
3 to determine whether significant differences in TSCS scores existed
between demographic subgroups with only two groups (gender). The t-test
for independent groups was used to determine where significant
differences existed for Hypotheses 4 through 13. The .05 level of
significance was established for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses
of this study.

Questionnaires were received from 409 Career Level II and III
teachers: First District, 55; East District, 93; Southeast District,
53; Cumberland District, 41; South Central District, 61; Northwest
District, 25; and Southwest District, 81. Questionnaires were received
from 401 teachers eligible to apply for Career Ladder: First District,
Findings

From the results of the data analysis and interpretation, the following findings are presented. Findings are reported as they pertain to each of the hypotheses originally formulated.

1. Hypothesis 1 stated there would be no significant difference in total Self Esteem scores between teachers of different ages. This hypothesis was rejected due to significant differences ($F=7.3419$, $p=.0007$) found between the groups. There was a significant difference in TSCS scores for age with age 55 and older teachers having a significantly higher self esteem score than teachers aged 25-44. A significant difference was also found between teachers aged 25-44 and 45-54. In all, the oldest group had the highest self esteem scores and the younger group the lowest scores.

2. Hypothesis 2 stated there would be no significant difference in total Self Esteem scores between teachers who have attained different levels of education. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for mean total self esteem by educational level indicated no two groups were found to be significantly differently. This hypothesis was not rejected ($F=.1679$, $p=.9547$).

3. Hypothesis 3 stated there would be no significant differences in total Self Esteem scores of males and females. This hypothesis was rejected ($F=-2.02$, $p=.045$). The t-test for self esteem by gender
indicated a significant difference with females having higher self esteem.

4. Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be a significant difference in the total Self Esteem score of Career Level II and III teachers when compared to the total Self Esteem scores of teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference ($t = 8.61, p < .0005$) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 404.99) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 384.05) on the basis of total mean self esteem scores. Career Level II and III teachers scored significantly higher on total self esteem than eligible teachers.

5. Hypothesis 5 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Self Criticism of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who were eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference ($t = -6.85, p < .0005$) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 34.95) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 31.9) on the basis of total mean self criticism scores.

6. Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Identity of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference ($t = -9.01; p < .0005$) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 134.70) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 125.32) on the basis of total mean identity scores.

7. Hypothesis 7 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Self Satisfaction of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was
8. Hypothesis 8 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Behavior of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference (t=-6.75, p<.0005) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 127.56) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 122.16) on the basis of behavior scores.

9. Hypothesis 9 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Physical Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference (t=-3.29, p=.001) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 65.60) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 63.79) on the basis of physical self scores.

10. Hypothesis 10 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Moral-Ethical Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who were eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference (t=-6.06, p<.0005) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 79.29) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 75.67) on the basis of moral-ethical self scores.

11. Hypothesis 11 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Personal Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference (t=-5.43, p<.0005) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 114.26) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 109.10) on the basis of self satisfaction scores.
supported by the significant difference (t = -6.88, p < .0005) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 72.06) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 68.02) on the basis of personal self scores.

12. Hypothesis 12 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Family Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference (t = -6.60, p < .0005) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 74.42) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 70.85) on the basis of family self scores.

13. Hypothesis 13 stated that there would be a significant difference in the level of Social Self of Career Level II and III teachers and teachers who are eligible to apply. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference (t = -9.65, p < .0005) found between Career Level II and III teachers (mean = 76.22) and teachers who are eligible to apply (mean = 69.63) on the basis of social self scores.

Conclusions

Based upon the results of this study, the following conclusions are made:

1. Tennessee teachers, both Career Level II and III and eligible, have higher self esteem than the original norm sample of the TSCS.

2. Career Level II and III teachers have a higher self esteem score and a higher score on all nine subscales than eligible teachers. Thus, participation in the upper levels of the Career Ladder could be related to especially high self esteem of the candidates.
3. Educational level above the bachelor's degree does not have an effect on teacher's self concept. This is somewhat contrary to evidence from the general population that indicates a relationship between educational level and self concept. However, the fact that all subjects had at least a bachelor's degree and scored above the norm on self concept may explain this difference.

4. From the findings of this study it appears that age affects self concept. The older a teacher is, the higher that teacher's self concept.

5. The findings indicate that female teachers have higher self esteem than male teachers.

6. Career Level II and III teachers and eligible teachers were below the norm on physical self and self criticism. This indicates that they have a lower view of their body, state of health, physical appearance, skills, and sexuality and that they do not have a healthy and normal openness and capacity for self criticism as those reported for the norm group (Fitts, 1991).

7. Eligible teachers are also below the norm on identity, whereas Career Level II and III teachers are above the norm. Thus, eligible teachers have a lower sense of identity than do Career Level II and III teachers. In other words eligible teachers are not as sure of themselves as Career Level II and III teachers.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of this study the following recommendations are proposed:
1. Further studies on self concept of teachers should take into account the effects of sex and age on self esteem.

2. Future studies of self concept in teachers should recognize that educational level does not affect self esteem when all respondents hold at least a bachelor’s degree.

3. Since both Career Level II and III and eligible teachers scored significantly higher than the norm group scores which were established in 1965, the TSCS may need to be renormed, possibly establishing a separate norm for teachers or educators. This is consistent with Fitts' (1991) suggestion that educators score higher on self esteem due to higher occupational and educational level status.

4. Since Career Level II and III teachers possess a higher self esteem than eligible teachers, further research needs to be conducted to establish cause and effect links between Career Ladder Level II and III participation and self esteem. This could provide further information as to whether teachers enter Career Ladder Level II and III because they have a higher self esteem or whether participating in Career Ladder Level II and III raises a teacher’s self esteem.

5. Further research needs to be conducted regarding the two subscales on which Career Level II and III and eligible teachers scored below the norm mean score (physical self and self criticism) to determine causes and effects of these lower scores.

6. Since eligible teachers scored 1.78 points (-.18 SD) below the norm mean score on identity and the Career Level II and III teachers scored 7.6 points (.75 SD) above it, it is evident that a teacher’s sense of identity is higher for Career Level II and III teachers.
However, it is not clear and should be studied further as to whether Career Ladder Level II and III participation enhances a teacher's sense of identity or whether teachers with a strong sense of identity are attracted to participation in Career Ladder Level II and III.
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APPENDIX A

LETTERS REQUESTING AND GRANTING PERMISSION FOR RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
Susan Weinberg  
Western Psychological Services  
12031 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  

Dear Susan:  

I am currently involved in a research project for my dissertation leading to a doctoral degree in Supervision and Administration from East Tennessee State University. The research that I am proposing will analyze the self concept of Career Level II and III and those teachers eligible to apply in Tennessee. I am requesting permission to use the TSCS instrument in my study. I am going to have a sample of over 1,000 teachers and would like to request permission to reprint the questionnaire to meet University APA requirements.

Thank you for your cooperation in this research endeavor.

Sincerely,

Carol Myers

sw
August 7, 1992

Carol Myers
Box 139
Harrogate, TN 37752

Dear Ms. Myers:

Thank you for your letter of August 3, in which you request permission to use the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) in your dissertation research through East Tennessee State University.

WPS encourages scholarly research, and no permission from us is necessary for use of our publications, in this context, with the following stipulations:

(1) No reproduction or adaptation of the materials may be made in any format, for any purpose, electronic or otherwise, without our prior, written permission;

(2) Because you are a student, you may need to purchase and use the materials under the direct supervision of a qualified professional. If you have not done so already, please complete the enclosed "Application to Purchase and Use Assessment Materials" (note that Section E must be signed and dated by your supervising faculty member), and return it to WPS; and

(3) All materials must be used ethically and for the purposes and in the manner for which they were intended.

You have also requested permission to reprint the TSCS Test Booklet in your dissertation. Due to format requirements at your university, Western Psychological Services hereby authorizes you to reproduce a TSCS Test Booklet (W-182A) for the above-described purpose only, provided that each reprint bear the following required notice in its entirety:

"Copyright © 1954 by William H. Fitts. Reprinted for display purposes by permission of the publisher, Western Psychological Services, 12031 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90025."

Please note that this authorization does not extend to the creation of microfilmed copies; due to the public availability of microfilmed copies, WPS policy is not to authorize reproduction in this manner. While we regret any inconvenience this may cause, we hope you appreciate our concern with ethical considerations.

Your interest in the TSCS is appreciated. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you need additional assistance.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Susan DunsoVcinberg
Assistant to the President
Rights and Permissions

12031 Wilshire Boulevard • Los Angeles, California 90025-1251 • (310) 478-2061 • FAX (310) 478-7838
APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE
(Western Psychological Services authorized the duplication of the test instrument for display purposes but specifically precluded the creation of microfilmed copies due to the public availability of microfilmed copies.)
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO SUBJECTS EXPLAINING STUDY
Dear xxxxxxxxxx:

I am currently enrolled in a research project for my dissertation in Supervision and Administration at East Tennessee State University. The study that I am undertaking is to measure how teachers feel about themselves. The study will not specifically identify teachers or school systems.

For the purpose of my study, I have randomly selected more than 1,000 teachers in Tennessee. I would greatly appreciate your taking ten minutes to respond to the enclosed questionnaire. Please return the questionnaire and answer sheet within one week. Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelope that may be used to return them.

Thank you so much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Carol Myers

Enclosures

sw
APPENDIX D

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF ANSWER SHEET
DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND GENERAL PURPOSE ANSWER SHEET

I. MARKING ANSWER SHEET

A. Use No. 2 pencil.

B. Mark heavy black marks that fill circle.

C. Erase stray marks on sheet.

D. Do not use ink or a ballpoint pen.

II. INFORMATION GRID

A. The results of this research will not specify any names.

   Omit the NAME section and IDENTIFICATION number.

B. Complete BIRTHDAY, SEX, GRADE OR EDUCATION section.

   Under the GRADE or EDUCATION section, please mark 1 through 5 as applicable.

   Grade or Evaluation
   1 = B.S. Degree
   2 = M.S. Degree
   3 = M.S. + 45
   4 = Ed.S.
   5 = Ed.D.

III. QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Read the instructions listed on the questionnaire.

   Mark the degrees of each response in the appropriate circle on the answer sheet. Please respond to items 1 through 100 in the appropriate order on the answer sheet.

   ***DO NOT MARK ANY RESPONSES ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

   ***All responses should be marked in the appropriate spaces on the answer sheet.
**Please return your completed answer sheet and questionnaire forms in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by September 18, 1992.**
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP CORRESPONDENCE TO SUBJECTS
Dear xxxxxxxxxx:

Two weeks ago I mailed a letter and questionnaire materials requesting your participation in a research project designed to see how teachers feel themselves. It is important that I use your response in this study. If you have not completed the questionnaire, I would greatly appreciate your participation in this project and a return of the questionnaire and completed answer sheet at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Carol Myers
VITA

CAROL MYERS

Personal Data: Date of Birth: May 15, 1945
Place of Birth: Tazewell, Tennessee
Marital Status: Married

Education: Public schools, Claiborne County, Tennessee
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee; biology, B.S., 1965
St. Mary's School of Medical Technology, Knoxville, Tennessee; medical technologist (M.T.), A.S.C.P., 1967
Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky; education, M.A., 1971
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee; vocational and technology education, Ed.S., 1981
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; supervision and administration, Ed.D., 1992

Professional Experience: Medical Technologist, St. Mary's Hospital; Knoxville, Tennessee, 1966-1970
Teacher, Claiborne County High School; Tazewell, Tennessee, 1970-1981
Business owner

Honors and Awards: Selected Outstanding Young Educator of the Year by Tazewell Jaycees, 1976.
Outstanding Student in Medical Technology, Saint Mary's School of Medical Technology.
Outstanding Vocational Education Student, University of Tennessee, May 25, 1981.
Homecoming Queen, Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee, 1965.
Classroom Teacher of Year Award by Tennessee Education Association, Nashville, Tennessee, 1980-81.
Professional Memberships:

- American Association of School Administrators
- American Vocational Association
- American Society of Clinical Pathology
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development


Received Award at University of Tennessee Student Honors Day, 1981.

Honored as National Vica Club Advisor of Year.

Directed Claiborne County Vocation School Students through twelve national championships, 1974-1981.