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Thomas L. Good

Good discusses the types of teacher expectation effects evidenced in the classroom. Particular attention is focused on the research that addresses teachers' expectations for and interactions with individuals believed to be of high or low potential. Good presents a model for use in understanding the dynamics of expectation communication in the classroom and highlights numerous studies relating teacher expectations with student behavior. The differential treatment of students by teachers is described by the author, with special attention given to how teachers express low expectations. The article concludes with a description of future research directions.

For about two decades, educational researchers have been concerned with the possibility that teachers communicate different performance expectations for students they believe to have low versus high achievement potential. In planning for and interacting with entire classes, small groups, and individuals, teachers are guided by their beliefs about what students need and by their expectations about how students will respond if treated in particular ways. Teacher expectations are defined here as inferences that teachers make about the future behavior or academic achievement of their students, based on what they know about these students now. Teacher expectation effects are student outcomes that occur because of the actions that teachers take in response to their own expectations.

Researchers have examined two types of teacher expectation effects (Cooper and Good, 1983): the self-fulfilling prophecy effect in which an originally erroneous expectation leads to behavior that causes the expectation to become true, and the sustaining expectation effect. In the latter effect, teachers expect students to sustain previously developed behavior patterns, to the point that teachers take these behavior patterns for granted and fail to see and capitalize on changes in student potential.

Self-fulfilling prophecy effects are more powerful than sustaining expectation effects because they introduce significant change in student behavior instead of merely minimizing such change by sustaining established patterns. Self-fulfilling prophecy effects can be powerful and dramatic when they occur, but the more subtle sustaining expectation effects probably occur much more often (Good and Brophy, 1987).

Teacher Expectations as Self-Fulfilling Prophecies

About two decades ago, Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson's *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (1968) created wide interest and controversy about self-fulfilling prophecies. Their book described research in which they manipulated teacher expectations for student achievement to see if these expectations would be fulfilled. Their research indicated that in the early grades teachers' artificially high expectations (teachers were given bogus test data) for student performance were associated with enhanced student performance.

At first, conclusions from this study were accepted enthusiastically. However, secondary sources sometimes made exaggerated claims that went far beyond those made by Rosenthal and Jacobson, and critics began to attack the study (Snow, 1969; Taylor, 1970). A replication attempt failed to produce the same results (Claiborn, 1969), leading to debates.
over the merits of the Oak School experiment. Meanwhile, other investigators conducted related studies using a variety of approaches, and attention shifted from debates over the original study to attempts to make sense of a growing literature on teacher expectation effects and related topics (Braun, 1976; Brophy and Good, 1974; West and Anderson, 1976). Research has continued in the nearly 20 years since the Oak School experiment and leads to a consensus that teachers' expectations can and sometimes do affect teacher-student interaction and student outcomes, along with the recognition that the processes involved are much more complex than originally believed (Brophy, 1983; Cooper and Good, 1983; Dusek, 1985; Marshall and Weinstein, 1984). For example, research also indicates that students influence teacher behavior.

Studies show that teachers' expectations are often an accurate assessment of student ability. Hence, teachers' expectations for student behavior are not necessarily inappropriate. The problem of low teacher expectations may not be one of simple identification or labeling of students (i.e., recognition that one student is relatively less able than another) but rather of inappropriate knowledge of how to respond to students who have difficulty learning.

**Teachers' Expectations for Individual Students**

This paper focuses on teachers' expectations for and interactions with individual students believed to be of high or low achievement potential because most research has concentrated on this area. However, it is important to recognize that teacher expectations may concern either the entire class, groups of students, or specific individuals. General expectations include teachers' beliefs about the changeability versus the rigidity of students' abilities, students' potential to benefit from instruction, the appropriate difficulty level of material for students, whether the class should be taught as a group or individually, and whether students should memorize material or interpret and apply key concepts that are presented.

There are countless ways in which teacher beliefs other than expectations for individual student performance may affect student performance. For example, some teachers believe that it is important for students to be active in the classroom, discovering knowledge on their own and assuming a great deal of independence. Other teachers believe that students should learn information that teachers present. Teachers' beliefs about subject matter may also have important effects. Depending on whether teachers believe that reading instruction basically involves teaching students phonics and comprehension skills (being able to determine someone else's meaning of a written passage) or challenging students to develop their own meaning and to read to achieve self-determined goals, the way in which the curriculum is presented and the opportunities that students have will be quite different.

The point is that teachers' beliefs interact in complex ways and are at least responsive to, if not partially determined by, students' beliefs and behavior. A low-achieving student may receive quite different treatment in a class where a teacher believes in emphasizing meaning and understanding than in a classroom where a premium is placed on speed and accuracy. Students believed to possess less potential are more likely to receive an unending stream of drill assignments in the latter than in the former classroom.

Research shows that teachers' performance expectations vary in terms of student characteristics other than achievement potential per se. Brophy and Good (1974) found in one set of classrooms that low-achieving girls tended to have especially impoverished academic environments in the classroom, whereas high-achieving boys tended to be afforded productive and intellectually responsive environments, despite the fact that when general measures of classroom interaction were used, teachers were more critical of boys than of girls. Thus, depending on the questions researchers ask, different relationships can be obtained. Clearly, a teacher may treat girls and boys in the same classroom somewhat differently but still maintain sharply divergent interaction patterns with particular subgroups of students (high-achieving boys versus low-achieving girls).

The relationship between beliefs and behavior is complex in part because teachers hold multiple beliefs and because students possess numerous characteristics. Although the influence of beliefs on behavior is undeniable, the long history of the study of expectations (see Zuroff and Rotter, 1985) shows that conducting research in this area presents a difficult analytical challenge. Despite the difficulty of relating expectations to behavior, a considerable number of good classroom studies have been conducted. Discussion of this research is organized around the Brophy-Good model of expectation communication.

**Brophy-Good Model**

Much of the early classroom observational work was organized around a model used by Brophy and Good in one of the first naturalistic studies of teacher interaction with high- and low-achieving students following the publication of Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) *Pygmalion in the Classroom*. Brophy and Good (1970) suggested the following model for how the expectation communication process might work in the classroom:

1. Early in the year, teachers form differential expectations for student behavior and achievement.
2. Consistent with these differential expectations, teachers behave differently toward various students.
3. This treatment tells students something about how they are expected to behave in the classroom and perform on academic tasks.
4. If the teacher treatment is consistent over time and if students do not actively resist or change it, it will likely affect their self-concepts, achievement motivation, levels of aspiration, classroom conduct, and interactions with the teacher.
5. These effects generally will complement and reinforce the teacher's expectations, so that students will come to conform to these expectations more than they might have otherwise.
6. Ultimately, this will affect student achievement and other outcomes. High-expectation students will be led to achieve at or near their potential, but low-expectation students will not gain as much as they could have gained if taught differently.
Self-fulfilling prophecy effects of teacher expectations can occur only when all the elements in the model are present. Often, however, one or more elements is missing. A teacher may not have clear-cut expectations about every student, or those expectations may change continually. Even when expectations are consistent, the teacher may not necessarily communicate them to the student through consistent behavior. In this case, the expectations would not be self-fulfilling even if they turned out to be correct. Finally, students might prevent expectations from becoming self-fulfilling by countering their effects or resisting them in a way that makes the teacher change them. For sustaining expectations to occur, it is only necessary that teachers engage in behaviors that maintain students’ and teachers’ previously formed low expectations (e.g., low students receive only drill work, easy questions, etc.).

How Teachers Form Expectations

The model begins with the statement that teachers form differential achievement expectations for individual students at the beginning of the school year. Investigators have studied the nature of the information that teachers use to form these expectations and the degree to which the expectations are accurate.

In one type of experimental study of expectation formation, subjects (not necessarily teachers) are given only carefully controlled information about, and little or no opportunity to interact with, the “students” (usually fictional) about whom they are asked to make predictions. In such a study, all of the subjects might be given cumulative record forms containing identical test scores, grades, and comments presumably written by previous teachers, but half of the forms would be accompanied by a picture of a white child and the other half by a picture of a black child (to see if knowledge about the fictional students’ race would affect predictions about their achievement). Such experiments have shown that expectations can be affected significantly by information about test performance, performance on assignments, track or group placement, classroom conduct, physical appearance, race, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, sex, speech characteristics, and various diagnostic or special education labels (see reviews by Baron, Tom, and Cooper, 1985; Braun, 1976; Brophy and Good, 1974; Dusek and Joseph, 1985; Persell, 1977; Peterson and Barger, 1985; Rolison and Medway, 1985).

Most of the information in school records is accurate and likely to induce correct expectations in teachers who read it. Thus, teachers’ predictions about student achievement are usually quite correct, sometimes even more accurate than predictions based on test data (Egan and Archer, 1985; Hoge and Butcher, 1984; Mitman, 1985; Monk, 1983; Pedulla, Ainsian, and Madaus, 1980).

In summary, inservice teachers usually develop accurate expectations about their students, and they tend to change these expectations as more or better information becomes available. This limits the possibility for self-fulfilling prophecy effects (which are based on false or unjustified expectations) to occur, although it still allows sustaining expectation effects. Self-fulfilling prophecy effects are especially likely to occur when students are new to their teachers because it is early in the school year (especially in kindergarten and first grade and in the first year of middle school, junior high, or high school) or because they have transferred from another school.

How Teachers Communicate Expectations

Considering that teachers have formed differential expectations for various students, the next step of the Brophy-Good model postulates that teachers communicate these expectations through their behavior toward students. Researchers have documented the ways that teachers interact with students who differ in current or expected achievement. Indeed, most research on the communication of teacher expectations concerns Step 2 of the Brophy-Good model.

Good and Brophy (1987) suggest that the following behaviors sometimes indicate differential teacher treatment of high and low achievers:

1. Waiting less time for “lows” to answer (Allington, 1980; Bozsk, 1982; Rowe, 1974a, b; Taylor, 1979).
2. Giving low achievers answers or calling on someone else rather than trying to improve their responses by giving clues or repeating or rephrasing questions (Brophy and Good, 1970; Jeter and Davis, 1973).
4. Criticizing low achievers more often for failure (Brophy and Good, 1970; Cooper and Baron, 1977; Good, Cooper, and Blakey, 1980; Good, Sikes, and Brophy, 1973; Jones, 1971; Medinnus and Unruh, 1971; Rowe, 1974a; Smith and Luginbuhl, 1976).
5. Praising low achievers less frequently than highs for success (Babad, Inbar, and Rosenthal, 1982; Brophy and Good, 1970; Cooper and Baron, 1977; Firestone and Brody, 1975; Good, Cooper, and Blakey, 1980; Good, et al., 1973; Martinek and Johnson, 1979; Medinnus and Unruh, 1971; Rejeski, Darracott, and Hutsler, 1979; Spector, 1973).
7. Paying less attention to low achievers or interacting with them less frequently (Adams and Cohen, 1974; Blakey, 1970; Given, 1974; Kester and Letchworth, 1972; Page, 1971; Rist, 1970; Rubovits and Maehr, 1971).
8. Calling on low achievers less often to respond to questions (Davis and Levine, 1970; Mendoza, Good, and Brophy, 1972; Rubovits and Maehr, 1971), or asking them only easier, nonanalytic questions (Martinek and Johnson, 1979).
10. Demanding less from low achievers. This differential treatment is evidenced by a variety of behaviors. Beez (1968) found that tutors with high expectations not only taught more words, but also taught them more rapidly and with less extended explanation and repetition of definitions and examples. The studies of inappropriate reinforcement mentioned above indicate that teachers may accept low-quality or even incorrect responses from low achievers. Graham (1984)
suggests that excessive teacher sympathy or offers of gratuitous, unsolicited help may communicate low expectations, especially if these behaviors occur instead of behaviors designed to help low achievers meet success criteria.

11. Interacting with low achievers more privately than publicly, and monitoring and structuring their activities more closely. Brophy and Good (1974) discuss these differences in detail.

12. Grading tests or assignments in a differential manner, in which high achievers but not low achievers are given the benefit of the doubt in borderline cases (Cahen, 1966; Finn, 1972; Heapy and Siess, 1970).

13. Having less friendly interaction with low achievers, including less smiling and fewer other nonverbal indicators of support (Babad, et al., 1982; Chaikin, Sigler, and Derlega, 1974; Kester and Letchworth, 1972; Meichenbaum, Bowers, and Ross, 1969; Page, 1971; Smith and Luginbuhl, 1976) and less warm or more anxious voice tones (Blanch and Rosenthal, 1984).

14. Providing briefer and less informative feedback to the questions of low achievers (Cooper, 1979; Combleth, Davis, and Button, 1972).

15. Providing less eye contact and other nonverbal communication of attention and responsiveness (e.g., forward lean, positive head nodding) in interaction with low achievers (Chaikin, Sigler, and Derlega, 1974).

16. Evidencing less use of effective but time consuming instructional methods with low achievers when time is limited (Swann and Snyder, 1980).

17. Evidencing less acceptance and use of low achievers' ideas (Martinek and Johnson, 1979; Martinek and Karper, 1982).

As indicated by the numerous studies conducted, this has been a very active research area; however, it is clear that some of the 17 points have more support than others. Also, it is critical to stress that the teacher behaviors listed above do not necessarily characterize ineffective teaching; rather, they should be used as guidelines by supervisors and teachers as they analyze their behavior and study effects of teacher behavior on particular students. Some students may need more structure and easier work than others, and there is no reason to assume that teachers should treat all students alike; however, some teachers overreact to relatively small differences among students by teaching them in sharply divergent ways that are inappropriate. The key issue is the appropriateness of students' differential treatment (e.g., work assigned, frequency of public questions).

Classrooms differ, and different students in the same classroom vary in important ways. Still, it is possible to explore research findings in order to understand some of the ways in which beliefs about achievement potential may inhibit effective classroom communication. The concepts and findings associated with expectation research provide guidelines or frames of reference that allow teachers to think about and attempt to alter classroom environments. These classroom concepts can help teachers to increase the number of dimensions they use in thinking about classroom performance and the number (and range) of hypotheses or alternative strategies available. Concepts also encourage teachers to consider the possible consequences of selective actions on various students (Good and Power, 1976).

Some investigators have organized the behavioral research findings (e.g., 17 points raised above) into models. Rosenthal (1974) reviewed the research on mediators of teacher expectation effects and identified four general factors. Focusing on positive self-fulfilling prophecy effects, he suggests that teachers will maximize student achievement if they:

1. Create warm social-emotional relationships with the students (climate).
2. Give them more feedback about their performance (feedback).
3. Teach them more (and more difficult) material (input).
4. Give them more opportunities to respond and to ask questions (output).

Good and Weinstein (1985a) describe the effects of specific teaching behaviors in a more general way (see Table 1). We now turn to a discussion of research related to the remaining steps of the Brophy-Good model.

Student Perceptions of Differential Teacher Treatment

In addition to expectation effects that occur directly through differences in exposure to content, etc., indirect effects may occur through teacher behavior that affects students' self-concepts, motivation, performance expectations, or attributions (inferences about why they succeed or fail). This brings us to Step 3 of the Brophy and Good model, which postulates that students perceive differential treatment and its implications about what is expected of them.

Research by Weinstein (1983, 1985) and her colleagues indicates that students are aware of differences in teachers' patterns of interaction with different students in the class. Interviews with elementary school students show that they see their teachers as projecting higher achievement expectations and offering more opportunity and choice to higher achievers, while structuring the activities of low achievers more closely and providing them both with more help and with more negative feedback about academic work and classroom conduct (Weinstein, Marshall, and Brattesani, 1982). Furthermore, students see these differences as applying to their own personal treatment from their teachers, not just to the treatment of other students (Brattesani, Weinstein, and Marshall, 1984).

Weinstein's research clearly indicates that students' perceptions of teacher feedback could provide a missing link in understanding the transmission of expectations. In a study of the processes and outcomes associated with reading groups in three first-grade classrooms, Weinstein (1976) found that the relationship between teacher behavior and student achievement was difficult to reconcile. For example, the teacher "favored" low reading group members with more praise and less criticism than high-group members. Despite this "favorable" treatment, over the course of the school year the gap in achievement, peer status, and anxiety about school performance widened significantly between high and low reading group members. However, classroom observers noted that the praise to low achievers was qualitatively different from the praise to high achievers. Weinstein hypothesized that the more frequent critical comments concerning performance directed toward high achievers might suggest high expectations to those students and that the high rates of praise for low achievers (for less than perfect
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>Students believed to be MORE capable have:</th>
<th>Students believed to be LESS capable have:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, procedures, task definition, pacing, quality of environment</td>
<td>More opportunity to perform publicly on meaningful tasks.</td>
<td>Less opportunity to perform publicly, especially on meaningful tasks (supplying alternate endings to a story vs. learning to pronounce a word correctly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUPING PRACTICES</td>
<td>More opportunity to think.</td>
<td>Less opportunity to think, analyze (since much work is aimed at practice).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCUS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING</td>
<td>More assignments that deal with comprehension, understanding (in higher-ability groups).</td>
<td>Less choice on curriculum assignments — more opportunity to work on drill-like assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEDBACK AND EVALUATION PRACTICES</td>
<td>More autonomy (more choice in assignments, fewer interruptions).</td>
<td>Less autonomy (frequent teacher monitoring of work, frequent interruptions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>More honest/contingent feedback.</td>
<td>Less honest/more gratuitous/less contingent feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More respect for the learner as an individual with unique interests and needs.</td>
<td>Less respect for the learner as an individual with unique interests and needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answers) conveyed an indiscriminant acceptance to those from whom less was expected.

Zahorik (1970) obtained similar results that suggested that various students interpret teacher statements differently. For example, if students are to feel “good” about answers and to know that their answer is correct, the teacher’s verbal feedback must contain such words as “all right” or “good.” Although the descriptors that would be necessary to convince students that their work was adequate would probably change dramatically from grade level to grade level or from teacher to teacher even at the same grade level, Zahorik’s finding suggests that students interpret information from teachers. Along these same lines, Morine-Dershimer (1982) investigated students’ perceptions of the function of teacher praise and found that students could distinguish between praise as being deserved and praise as having instructional or motivational purposes. Students’ awareness of these differences generally matched teachers’ intended use of praise. Students’ reactions to teacher praise are a good illustration of the fact that student thinking and interpretation mediate the effect of overt teaching behavior. Brophy (1981) notes that praise may erode or enhance motivation, and Mitman (1985) reports that in some instances students may interpret teacher criticism as suggesting that the teacher cares (i.e., expects good work). It therefore is clear that in some areas of classroom life students interpret teacher behavior.

As Weinstein (1983) notes, several studies provide evidence that students make sophisticated interpretations of teacher behavior. Her own work, in particular, demonstrates that students perceive differential teacher treatment toward high- and low-achieving students in some areas but not in others. Weinstein and Middlestadt (1979a, b) asked younger and older elementary school children to rate 60 teacher behaviors as descriptive of the treatment of a hypothetical male student, either a high or low achiever. Treatment profiles of the two types of students showed that students perceived differential treatment in one-quarter of the teacher behaviors studied. In particular, student-perceived teacher treatment of male high achievers reflected high expectations, academic demand, and special privileges. Male low achievers were viewed as receiving fewer chances but greater teacher concern and vigilance. Weinstein concludes that students are clearly aware of the greater teacher help and structure accorded low achievers in contrast to the more autonomous learning context accorded high achievers.

Students’ perceptions of differential treatment at the classroom level also appear to moderate the relationship between teacher expectations and student achievement. In classrooms with perceived low differential treatment, where it was hypothesized that the teacher communicated little information about differential student ability, student achievement was best predicted by a previous measure of achievement, which accounted for 64 to 77 percent of the variance in achievement (Brattesani, et al., 1984). In other words, students continued to perform at about the same levels, relative to their classmates, as they had performed before. Other patterns were observed in classrooms with perceived high differential treatment. Because students in these classrooms reported more differential treatment of high- and low-achieving students, it was hypothesized that teachers provided more
information about various students' abilities. The researchers found that in these classrooms, student achievement was less effectively predicted by prior achievement, which accounted for only 47 to 62 percent of the variance. In these high-differentiation classrooms (as perceived by students), teachers' expectations explained an additional 9 to 18 percent of the variance in student achievement, whereas teacher expectations explained only an additional one to four percent of achievement variance in low-differentiation classrooms.

Cooper and Good (1983) report similar findings. Compared to low-expectation peers, elementary students for whom their teachers held high expectations reported themselves as engaging more often in teacher-initiated public interactions but less often in teacher-initiated private interactions, supplying correct answers more frequently, and receiving more praise and less criticism from their teachers. Actual observed differences were in the same direction but less extreme, suggesting that students not only perceive differential treatment but exaggerate the degree of differentiation that exists.

To the extent that such differentiation exists in a classroom, expectation effects on student achievement are likely to occur both directly through opportunity to learn (differences in the amount and nature of exposure to content and opportunities to engage in various academic activities) and indirectly through differential treatment likely to affect students' self-concepts, attributional inferences, or motivation.

Individual differences among students also affect the size of teacher expectation effects. Some students may be more sensitive than others to voice tones or other subtle communication cues, so that they decode teachers' communications of expectations more often and accurately (Conn, Edwards, Rosenthal, and Crowne, 1968; Zuckerman, DeFrank, Hall, and Rosenthal, 1978). Younger and more teacher-dependent students may also be more susceptible to teacher expectation effects (Persell, 1977; West and Anderson, 1976). However, as Weinstein (1985) notes, we still know too little about what makes some students more sensitive to expectation effects to make accurate predictions.

Other Models for Indirect Mediation of Expectation Effects

Considering that teachers form differential expectations for various students, that teachers act on these expectations by treating students differently, and that the students perceive this differential treatment and infer implications about what is expected of them, the stage is set for teacher expectation effects on student achievement that are mediated through effects on self-concept, motivation, expectations, and attributions. The remaining steps in the Brophy-Good model suggest that such effects occur, but do not say much about how the process might work. However, others have developed models that offer such explanations.

Cooper's Model. Cooper (1979, 1985) suggests that teachers' needs to retain predictability and control over classroom interaction cause them to treat low achievers in ways that may erode achievement motivation. He notes that predictability and control are especially important issues to teachers in public interaction situations, where a student's unexpected words or actions may disrupt lesson continuity and produce classroom management problems. Because low achievers are the students most likely to cause such problems, teachers who fear loss of control may minimize these students' potential for disrupting public interaction settings by squelching their initiations and calling on them only for very brief and tightly controlled contributions. In order to exert such control, these teachers may treat low-achieving students less warmly. In particular, they may tend not to praise strong efforts by low achievers because such praise might encourage these students to initiate interactions more often, and they may criticize low achievers' weak efforts more often because such criticism increases their control over the lows' behavior. Meanwhile, high achievers would be treated more warmly, because the teacher has less to fear from encouraging them to initiate public interactions and has less need to criticize them in order to retain control over their behavior.

Such a difference in teacher warmth alone would likely affect student motivation. In addition, however, this differential treatment might affect student motivation by decreasing low achievers' belief in a direct relationship between academic effort and achievement. Whereas high achievers would be praised or criticized in direct response to their effort (praised when efforts are strong and criticized when they do not try hard enough), low achievers sometimes would be praised or criticized more because of the teacher's desire to control their public interactions than for reasons having to do with their levels of effort. For them, good effort would often go unrecognized, and poor efforts would often be allowed because the teacher was more concerned about discouraging them from disrupting lessons than about reinforcing their learning efforts. Over time, high achievers would develop a clear sense that their learning efforts paid off, but low achievers would see less clear relationships between effort and outcome. In theory, this should lead directly to a reduction in low achievers' achievement motivation, and indirectly to a reduction in achievement itself.

Attribution Theory Models. Others (Dweck and Elliott, 1983; Eccles and Wigfield, 1985; Graham, 1984) have suggested that expectation effects are mediated by teachers' influences on students' attributional thinking about the reasons for their successes and failures. Ideally, students will believe that they have the ability to succeed at academic tasks if they apply reasonable effort ('I can succeed if I try.' ). However, some students, especially low achievers, fall into a failure syndrome/learned helplessness pattern ('I can't do the work — I'm dumb.' ). Such students are prone to discount their successes ('I was lucky.' ) and to attribute their failures to lack of ability rather than to insufficient effort or reliance on an ineffective strategy. Eventually, they come to believe that nothing they can do will enable them to succeed consistently, so they give up. Various authors have suggested that teacher communication of low expectations encourages low achievers to develop this pattern of attributional thinking. Teachers usually do not directly suggest that students do not have the ability to succeed (Blumenfeld, Hamilton, Bossert, Wessels, and Meece, 1983), but they may suggest this indirectly by minimizing demands on them, overreacting to minor successes, treating failures as if they were successes, or responding to failures with pity or excessive sympathy instead of problem identification and remedial instruction.

Eccles and Wigfield (1985) note that the attributional/motivational variables that are the key to the expectation
communication process are similar for both students and teachers. They suggest that the issue can be summarized in three questions: Can I succeed at this task? Do I want to succeed at this task? What do I need to do to succeed at this task? From the standpoint of the student, these questions are: Can I learn this material? Do I want to complete the assignment? What do I need to do in order to complete the assignment? From the teacher's standpoint, these questions are: Can I teach this child the material? Do I want to teach this child the material? What do I have to do to teach this child the material successfully?

Although relatively little research has occurred in classrooms with regard to Steps 4, 5, and 6 of the Brophy-Good model, there is growing evidence that students are sensitive to verbal and nonverbal cues from teachers; that students perceive differences in the function of teacher behavior; and that students perceive differences in teacher behavior toward high- and low-achieving students, especially in some classrooms (Weinstein, 1985).

Weinstein's (1985) work shows that students' interview responses often indicate that students make fine distinctions in a given behavior. For example, with regard to "call-on," students said that the teacher "calls on the smart kids for the right answer ... she expects you to know more and won't tell answers." With regard to the low achievers, students perceived that the teacher calls on them sometimes "to give them a chance" or "because they goofed off," or "often she doesn't call on them because she knows they don't know the answer."

Data from classroom observational studies suggest that not all teachers treat high- and low-expectation students differently (Good, 1980). The variability between classrooms and the occurrence of differential treatment have most often been explained in terms of individual differences in teacher type or personality (Brophy and Good, 1974; Cooper, 1979). However, as Weinstein (1985) notes, a growing body of research suggests that the activity structure adopted for classroom instruction can either facilitate or constrain the opportunities for certain kinds of teacher-student interaction (Bossert, 1979; Doyle, 1980). More research on students may help us to understand better how students perceive, internalize, and act on classroom events.

Group, Class, and School Effects

Expectation effects can operate at the level of groups, classes, or entire schools. Although the Brophy-Good model focused on teachers' communication to individual students, it is clear that teachers communicate expectations to entire classes and to groups of students and that these expectation effects are at least as important as effects on individuals.

Group Effects

Weinstein (1976) showed that reading group membership information added 25 percent to the variance in mid-year reading achievement that could be predicted beyond what was predictable from readiness scores taken at the beginning of the year. Placement into high groups accelerated achievement rates, but placement into low groups slowed them down (relative to the differences that would have been expected anyway due to variation in readiness).

Research comparing instruction in different reading groups (reviewed by Hiebert, 1983) suggests some possible reasons for this. Teachers tend to give longer reading assignments (Pflaum, Pasquala, Boswick, and Aver, 1980), to provide more time for discussion of the story (Bozskik, 1982), and to be generally more demanding (Haskett, 1968) with high groups than with low groups. They are quicker to interrupt low-group students when they make reading mistakes (Allington, 1983) and more likely to just give them the word or prompt them with graphemic (phonetic) cues during oral reading rather than to offer semantic and syntactic cues that might help them intui the word from its context (Allington, 1980; Pflaum, et al., 1980). Teachers are also less likely to ask low groups higher-level, comprehension questions (Bozskik, 1982).

The nature and extent of such differential treatment vary from teacher to teacher, and at least some of it can be seen as appropriate differential instruction (Alpert, 1974; Brophy, 1983; Haskins, Walden, and Ramey, 1983). However, as was the case with differential treatment of individual students, consistent patterns of such differential treatment of groups are cause for concern. Too often, low groups continually get less exciting instruction, less emphasis on meaning and conceptualization, and more rote drill and practice activities (Good and Marshall, 1984).

Eder's (1981) study of reading groups in one first-grade class indicates how the process might work, at least in some instances. She found that students who were likely to have difficulty in learning to read generally were assigned to groups whose social context was not conducive to learning. Most of the students in Eder's study had similar academic abilities (Good and Marshall, 1984). However, as was the case with differential treatment of individual students, consistent patterns of such differential treatment of groups are cause for concern. Too often, low groups continually get less exciting instruction, less emphasis on meaning and conceptualization, and more rote drill and practice activities (Good and Marshall, 1984).

Because the most immature, inattentive students were assigned to low groups, it was almost certain that these groups would cause more managerial problems than others, especially early in the year. Indeed, because the teacher was often distracted from a student reader in the low group who was responding (because of the need to manage other students in the group), students often provided the correct word for the reader. Readers were not allowed time to ascertain words on their own, even though less than a third of the students interviewed reported that they liked to be helped, and most thought that this help interfered with their learning. Eder's work indicates that low students had less time than high students to correct their mistakes before other students or the teacher intervened. Eder suggests that because of management problems, frequent interruptions, and less serious teaching, low students may inadvertently have been encouraged to respond to social and procedural aspects of the reading group rather than to academic tasks.

Grant and Rothenberg (1986) concluded from an intensive study of eight classrooms that first- and second-grade reading
groups create and perpetuate status distinctions among students. Students placed in top groups had more educational advantages than students placed in the lower groups. For example, students in the higher groups had (a) more opportunities to demonstrate competence, (b) work and task environments that were conducive to learning more academic skills, and (c) greater opportunity to practice autonomous, self-directed modes of learning. Grant and Rothenberg see their data as another illustration of the need to rethink the extensive use of ability grouping.

Allington (1983) notes that although there are some good reasons for oral reading (e.g., it gives the teacher a chance to identify a child's difficulties), low-achieving students do too much oral reading and too little silent reading. Allington contends that the focus on oral reading or silent reading exerts subtle pressure on the teacher to behave in a particular way. Because reading in low groups tends to be primarily oral, many teachers emphasize correct pronunciation, proper word sequence, etc. In contrast, teachers' questions of high readers following silent reading are more likely to focus on text meaning and student understanding. Hence, the structure of the reading group may exert subtle influences on both teachers and students.

Alloway (1984) reports that teachers may express low expectations to groups of students and that favorable expectations expressed towards individual students may be undermined by communication to students as group members. Some of the communication expressed in the classroom follows. It illustrates some of the expectations that teachers communicated to low groups: "You children are slower so please get on with your work now" (low-expectancy group); "I'll be over to help you slow ones in a moment. This group can go on with your work now" (low-expectancy group); "The blue group will find this hard." Alloway also pointed out low expectations in the form of labels teachers give to individual students: "Hurry up, Robyn. Even you can get this right"; "Michelle, you're slow as it is. You haven't got time to look around the classroom."

The Commission on Reading (1984) summarizes the problem for low-ability students in the following way.

There are qualitative differences in the experience of children in high and low reading groups that would be expected to place children in low groups at a disadvantage. Children in low groups do relatively more reading aloud and relatively less silent reading. They more often read words without a meaningful context on lists or flashcards, and less often read words in stories. Teachers correct a higher proportion of oral reading mistakes of children in low groups than children in high groups. When the mistake is corrected, teachers are more often likely to furnish a clue about pronunciation and less likely to furnish a clue about meaning for children in low groups. Teachers ask relatively more simple, factual questions of children in low groups and relatively fewer questions that require reasoning. (pp. 89-90)

Students in low groups often receive less interesting and less demanding reading instruction. Because of differences in vocabulary, rates of processing information, etc., there may be reasons to group students along ability lines for some of their instruction in reading. However, some instruction needs to occur in mixed-ability groups — such as when the meanings of stories are discussed. Too often, grouping for differential instruction is a "solution" that in a subtle fashion becomes part of the problem. Students who need a bit more structure and drill receive a curriculum that places too much emphasis on word analysis and drill.

Class Effects

Like others who have examined the literature on ability grouping and tracking, Oakes (1985) notes that there are often major differences between high- and low-track classrooms including (a) quality of knowledge, (b) amount of time assigned to learning, (c) amount of high-quality teaching, and (d) intellectual stimulation from peers. She also suggests that teachers' decisions about classroom learning opportunities are influenced by students' reactions. However, in contrast to the view of many educators that the presence of high- and low-ability students in the same class diminishes academic demands on students, she suggests that both types of students can learn in the same class.

In an empirical examination of learning time and curriculum quality, Oakes found that 35 percent of the heterogeneous classes were more like high-track than average or low-track classes. Thirty-six percent of heterogeneous classes were like average-track classes. Thus, having high and low students in the same class does not necessarily lower standards. These results are similar to those obtained by Beckerman and Good (1981), who found that low achievers can learn in heterogeneous-ability classrooms, especially when a core of high-achieving students establishes a climate that encourages learning.

Oakes also found that teacher-student relationships (e.g., extent to which teachers were positive, supportive, etc.) in heterogeneous classes were comparable to those in 46 percent of the high-track classes, 37 percent of the average classes, and only 17 percent of the lower-track classes. Thus, in 83 percent of comparisons, slower students in heterogeneous classes had more positive interactions with teachers than they enjoyed in low-track classes.

Brophy and Evertson (1976) found that a "can-do" attitude was associated with teachers' relative levels of success in eliciting achievement from their students. The more successful teachers believed that their students could master curriculum objectives and that they (the teachers) were capable of meeting the students' instructional needs. These expectations were associated with behaviors such as augmenting or even replacing the curriculum materials or evaluation instruments if these did not appear to be suited to the needs of the students.

Ashton (1985) reported similar findings for teachers who differed in sense of efficacy. Sense of efficacy was measured by the teachers' responses (on a five-point scale from "strongly agree" through "strongly disagree") to the following two statements:

1. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her own environment.
2. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.

Teachers who rejected the first of these statements but agreed with the second were classified as high in sense of efficacy. They believed that they were capable of motivating and instructing their students successfully.

Compared to teachers with a low sense of efficacy, teachers with a high sense of efficacy were more confident and at ease in their classrooms, more positive (e.g., praising, smiling)
and less negative (e.g., criticizing, punishing) in interactions with their students, more successful in managing their classrooms as efficient learning environments, less defensive, more accepting of student disagreement and challenges, and more effective in producing student achievement gains. Low-efficiency teachers revealed low expectations and a tendency to concentrate on rule enforcement and behavior management, whereas high-efficiency teachers concentrated on instructing their students in the curriculum and interacting with students about academic content. These data are correlational, but the fact that they come from parallel sections of the same courses taught to similar students in the same school suggests that they were caused by differences in the teachers rather than in the students.

As a formal research area, the relationship between teacher expectations for the class as a whole and behavior toward the class has largely been ignored. However, it seems reasonable to suggest that teachers can hold low expectations for a class as well as for individuals or groups of students. As a case in point, when R. Weinstein and I visited a school to observe differential teacher behavior toward students believed to be high and low ability, our most striking observation was the teacher’s communication of low expectations to all students (Good and Weinstein, 1986a).

We observed one combined fifth/sixth-grade language arts class where even the physical environment of the class helped to communicate low performance expectations. We were struck by the barren nature of the room. The wall clock was broken, there were few books around, virtually nothing was on the walls, and little student work was visible.

The lesson we observed also emphasized rules and procedures. The teacher dominated, quizzing the students about the meaning of topic sentences and main ideas and about the instructions for the class assignment. The task was narrowly defined. It seems inappropriate that students who had studied paragraphing and had been reviewing related material for several days were not required to write a paragraph, or at least to read several selections and identify which groups of sentences were paragraphs. Even the latter activity would have allowed active involvement and discussion among students with regard to why some groups of sentences were not paragraphs. To us, this close monitoring of student behavior and attention to minor details (i.e., demanding procedural exactness — the precise words of the text in the precise order), and the lack of any discussion of the value or meaningfulness of the topic being studied, communicated low performance expectations for these students.

Furthermore, the pace was so painfully slow that the students (and observers) either became restless or sleepy. Although the teacher was aware of these symptoms, she attributed them to the students’ lack of interest and ability. Only once did the teacher express an awareness that perhaps she was not making herself clear.

Further compounding the problem of an inappropriate task was the fact that the teacher expected students at both grade levels to cover the same material. From an inspection of the curriculum, we learned that both fifth- and sixth-graders completed the same task with similar instructions (although procedures were much clearer in the fifth-grade text) in their textbooks. The teacher also pointed out that if the fifth-grade students did not learn it now, they would have a second opportunity in sixth grade. This redundancy in curriculum, accompanied by a teacher-directed, highly passive mode of delivery, virtually assured that students would not be interested in the lesson, and they were not. Students’ boredom was obvious and it caused their failure to give the teacher the answers she wanted (at least from our perspective). Sadly, the teacher probably explained the students’ inadequate performance by assuming they lacked ability.

School Effects

Studies of school effectiveness and school improvement programs (reviewed by Good and Brophy, 1986) indicate that high expectations and commitment to bringing about student achievement are part of a pattern of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that characterizes schools that are successful in maximizing students’ learning gains. Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979), for example, found that teachers in effective schools not only held higher expectations but acted on them by setting goals expressed as minimally acceptable levels of achievement rather than using prior achievement data to establish ceiling levels beyond which students would not be expected to progress. Such teachers responded to failure as a challenge, requiring students to redo failed work (with individualized help as needed) rather than writing them off or referring them to remedial classes. They responded to mistakes and response failures during class with appropriate feedback and reinstruction rather than with lowering of standards or inappropriate praise. Similar findings have been reported by Edmonds (1979) and by Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith (1979).

In response to such findings, school improvement programs (Proctor, 1984) and professional development programs for inservice teachers (Farley, 1982; Kerman, 1979) have begun to incorporate elements designed to reduce negative expectation effects on student achievement. Furthermore, Good and Weinstein (1986b) note that high expectations for the teachability of all students are hindered by beliefs in a single intelligence that falls in a normal distribution and have challenged educators to develop school programs for students that express high expectations but allow students to fulfill those expectations in diverse ways.

Individual Differences Among Teachers

Students appear to be differentially sensitive to the communication of expectations, and some teachers are more likely than others to differ in their behavior toward high- and low-achieving students. Teachers also express low expectations in different ways.

Different Types of Teachers

Brophy and Good (1974) suggested that teachers can be thought of as being on a continuum from proactive through reactive to overreactive. Proactive teachers are guided by their own beliefs about what is reasonable and appropriate in setting goals for the class as a whole and for individual students. If they set realistic goals and have the needed skills, they are likely to move their students systematically toward fulfilling the expectations associated with these goals.
At the other extreme are overreactive teachers who develop rigid, stereotyped perceptions of their students based on prior records or on first impressions of student behavior. Overreactive teachers tend to treat their students as stereotypes rather than as individuals, and they are the most likely to have negative expectation effects on their students.

Most teachers fall in between these extremes and are classified as reactive teachers who hold their expectations lightly and adjust them to take note of new feedback and emerging trends. Reactive teachers have minimal expectation effects on their students, tending merely to maintain existing differences between high and low achievers (although these differences will increase slightly because of varied student behavior that teachers do not compensate for).

Subsequent research supports these distinctions, but with an important qualification. Unfortunately, it appears that most sizable teacher expectation effects on student achievement are negative ones, in which low expectations lead to lower achievement than might have been attained otherwise (Brophy, 1983). There is little evidence that even proactive teachers significantly augment the achievement of individual students by projecting positive expectations, but much evidence that overreactive teachers minimize student progress by projecting low expectations. Work by other investigators has shown that these overreactive teachers differ from other teachers in being more rigid, authoritarian, and prone to bias and prejudice (e.g., Babad, 1985).

**Differential Patterns of Teacher Communication**

It is important to state again that not all teachers show a consistent pattern of sharply differentiated behavior toward high- and low-potential students. Also, the type of problem behavior varies from class to class; hence, no simple presumptions are possible. One estimate based on several studies that were conducted over a number of years suggests that about one-third of the teachers observed acted in a way that appears to exaggerate the initial deficiencies of low achievers (Good and Brophy, 1980). Moreover, it is clear that there are different ways in which teachers can communicate low expectations to students.

As noted earlier, studies show that some teachers criticize low achievers more frequently than high achievers per incorrect response and praise low achievers less per correct answer than high achievers. In contrast, other teachers praise marginal or incorrect responses given by low achievers. These findings reflect two different types of teachers. Teachers who criticize low achievers for incorrect responses seem to be less tolerant of these pupils. In contrast, teachers who reward marginal or even wrong answers are excessively sympathetic and unnecessarily protective of low achievers. Both types of teacher behavior illustrate to students that effort and classroom performance are not related. As illustrated in Figure 1, both the “rejecting” and excessively sympathetic teacher styles appear to stimulate less student thinking.

Over time, such differences in the way teachers treat low achievers (for example, in the third grade a student is praised or finds teacher acceptance for virtually any verbalization, but in the fourth grade the student is seldom praised and is criticized more) may reduce low students' efforts and contribute to a passive learning style. Other teacher behaviors may also contribute to this problem. Low students who are called on frequently one year (the teacher believes that they need to be active if they are to learn), but who find that they are called on infrequently the following year (the teacher doesn't want to embarrass them) may find it confusing to respond to students who do not learn readily.

**Explanations for Differential Teacher Behavior**

Although there is good evidence that teachers' assessments of the general achievement levels of students are accurate (e.g., Brophy and Good, 1974; Egan and Archer, 1985), classroom evidence suggests that teachers' reactions (i.e., assignments) to students with less potential indicate a limited and unsuccessful repertoire of teaching strategies (i.e., drill). Thus, factors other than inaccurate assessment of students' potential account for much of the inappropriate differential behavior that occurs in the classroom. Some of these factors are briefly discussed here.

One basic cause of differential behavior is that classrooms are busy and complex environments, and it is difficult for teachers to assess accurately the frequency and quality of their interactions with individual students. Some teachers who are bright and well-prepared may behave inappropriately toward low achievers because of the complexity of the classroom.

A second explanation involves the fact that much classroom behavior must be interpreted before it has meaning. Research suggests that once a teacher develops an expectation about a
student (e.g., the student is not capable of learning), the teacher interprets subsequent ambiguous classroom events in a way consistent with the original expectation (e.g., Anderson-Levitt, 1984). Good (1980) maintains that most classroom behavior is ambiguous and subject to multiple interpretations.

A third reason why some teachers differentiate their behavior toward high- and low-achieving students is related to the issue of causality. Some teachers believe that they can and will influence student learning (for example, see Brophy and Evertson, 1976). Such teachers usually interpret student failure as the need for more instruction, more clarification, and eventually increased opportunity to learn. Other teachers, because they assign blame rather than assume partial responsibility for student failure, often interpret failure as the need to provide less challenge and fewer opportunities to learn. Teachers who do not have a strong sense that they can influence student learning are therefore more likely to overreact to student error and failure (perhaps by subsequently assigning work that is too easy) than are teachers who believe that they can influence student learning and that they are a partial cause of student failure when it does take place. Along these lines, Marshall and Weinstein (1984) argue that some teachers see intelligence as fixed; others see it as changeable. Differences in views of stability of intelligence can have important effects on teacher behavior.

Another explanation for differential teacher behavior is student self-presentation. Students present themselves in varied ways to teachers, and these self-presentation styles may influence teachers’ responses. Spencer-Hall (1981) notes that some students are able to time their misbehavior in such a way as to escape teacher attention, whereas other students who misbehave just as often are reprimanded considerably more frequently because the timing of their misbehavior is inappropriate. Carasco (1979) suggests that some students demonstrate competence in a style that escapes teacher attention. According to Green and Smith (1983), the language some students use makes it likely that teachers will underestimate their potential.

Classroom Application

This review of the literature may stimulate teachers’ thinking about the role of expectations in the classroom and the fact that classroom techniques based on research findings must be adjusted to the context of a particular classroom. As Good and Weinstein (1986a) note, teachers express expectations in so many ways (e.g., choice of curriculum topic, rationale given to students for curriculum topic, performance feedback) that it is not possible to suggest a single combination of behaviors that can lead to the communication of appropriate expectations. It is also difficult to provide advice to teachers, because the varied implications of teacher behavior (e.g., call-on, criticism, praise) depend not only on the behavior but also on the context in which it occurs (what is challenging to a sixth grader may be threatening to a first grader). The quality or style of the behavior, as well as students’ interpretations of teacher behavior, are also important factors that determine the effects of particular behaviors on students. For example, Brophy (1981) notes that praise may erode or enhance motivation, and Mitman (1985) reports that under some conditions, students may interpret teacher criticism favorably (teacher cares — expects good work).

Teachers must be decision makers and apply concepts and research findings to their own classrooms. For example, there is ample evidence noted earlier that some teachers call on low-achieving students less often than students they believe to be more capable. It makes little sense, however, to encourage all teachers to call on low-achieving students more frequently simply because some teachers call on low-achieving students infrequently.

Similarly, it does little good to call on low-achieving students more frequently if these students are generally asked only to answer simple factual questions or asked questions they cannot answer. Likewise, it is unproductive to increase the amount of time that a teacher waits for low-achieving students to respond, independent of a consideration of the particular context. If the teacher asks a factual question, simply waiting and providing clues may be an unproductive use of classroom time (the student either knows the answer or doesn’t). However, in a situation involving judgment or analysis, more time to think and more teacher clues may facilitate student response.

Still, it seems that the empirical findings and the different models that describe both teacher and student expectations provide a rich way for thinking about and stimulating student performance. The book, *Looking in Classrooms* (Good and Brophy, 1987), outlines a series of practical considerations and guidelines for teachers based on expectation research. Good and Weinstein (1986a) offer the following suggestions for improving classrooms that feature low expectations and boring, unchallenging routines.

1. Broaden the goals of lessons and activities. Students need to practice and master basic content and skills, but they also need application opportunities. Something is wrong if students are usually working on phonics skills exercises but rarely reading, usually practicing penmanship or copying spelling words but rarely writing, or usually working on arithmetic computation exercises but rarely attempting to formulate and solve problems.

2. Pay more attention to students’ ideas and interests and encourage students to play a larger role in assessing their own performance. Students are often much more passive and teacher-dependent in their learning efforts than they need to be.

3. Increase opportunities for students to participate actively in lessons and use materials in meaningful ways. Teacher-led lessons should require more than just quiet listening, and follow-up assignments should require more than just working through highly structured and routinized seat-work assignments.

4. Besides asking routine factual questions, ask students questions that require them to think, analyze, synthesize, or evaluate ideas. Include questions that have no single correct answer or that can be answered at a variety of levels and from a variety of points of view in order to encourage a greater range of students to participate and experience success.

5. Focus on the positive aspects of learning. Be encouraging and reinforcing by noting group progress toward learning goals. Minimize public comparisons of students with one another, discouraging criticism of the class as a whole or
First, the conceptualization of teacher expectation needs to become much more differentiated than it has been. Teachers' views of students include achievement, social, and developmental cues. To continue to study teachers' general expectations for high- and low-potential students seems needlessly limiting.

An interesting case study by King (1980) shows that a teacher's expectations for students and behavior toward students were more complex than simple beliefs about whether students were successful or not. In addition to judging whether students were high or low ability, the teacher appeared to judge whether the students' performance was due to ability or effort. King studied one sixth-grade teacher and two successful and two unsuccessful students in that class. The teacher often used the student whose success was believed to be due to ability as a role model (e.g., when she wanted to change the pace or direction of the lesson). In contrast, she developed a different relationship with the student whose success she perceived to be due largely to effort. For example, when this student requested help, the teacher expected the problem to be minor and gave the student minimum but direct feedback. However, this student was less likely to be called on as a way to change the direction of the lesson.

The teacher often provided additional academic support to the student whose lack of success was perceived as due to a lack of ability. The teacher would help the student to work through a problem, etc. Also, the teacher frequently interacted with this student. The teacher seldom interacted with the student whose lack of success the teacher perceived as due to lack of effort, and when interactions did occur, the teacher mainly checked the student's progress and determined whether or not the student was minimally involved in the activity.

This finding is similar to the conclusion that Prawat, Byers, and Anderson (1983) reached after studying 58 elementary school teachers. Specifically, the researchers found that teachers became angry when students made little effort. Thus, judgments teachers make about students are apt to involve complex and multiple criteria.

Second, it is important to recognize that other teacher beliefs and skills may increase or decrease the effects of teachers' expressed expectations. For example, teachers' general instructional style may affect student learning. Hines, Cruickshank, and Kennedy (1985) demonstrated that, at least under certain circumstances, teacher clarity is related positively to both student achievement and student satisfaction. Thus, it is not only the content of instruction or expectations that affects students, but the general way in which students are presented information in assignments. Students' sensitivity to expectation cues is also important; however, teachers' clarity (for better or worse) may make it more likely that students will be influenced by teachers' expectations.

Clearly, more research needs to examine students' awareness of teacher expectations as well as students' vulnerability to expectation communication. Rosenthal (1983) argues that much of the research on interpersonal expectancies suggests that mediation of these expectancies depends to some degree on various processes of nonverbal communication. There apparently are major differences among experimenters, teachers, and other people in the clarity of communication through different nonverbal channels. He suggests that if those teachers who best communicate their expectations for children's intellectual performance in the auditory channel were assigned to children whose best channels of reception were also auditory, expectation effects would be much more likely to occur than if those teachers were assigned to children who were less sensitive to auditory nonverbal communications. Although awareness or perception of expectations is a key issue, another vital issue is the susceptibility of pupils to such communication. Weinstein notes that the effects of teacher expectations that Braun (1976) suggests have not been tested. It could be that students with high and low self-concepts react differently to information from teachers. Also, minority status may also play a role in students' vulnerability to teacher expectations. Differences in cultural values may insulate some children from the effects of teachers' views of their performance or alternately heighten their susceptibility to the dominant viewpoint. Parents' beliefs may also mediate expectation effects.

Several researchers point out that product measures (student performance on IQ and achievement tests) are too narrow and too restrictive to reveal much about the relationship between expectations and classroom performance (Good and Weinstein, 1986a; Hall and Merkel, 1985; Meyer, 1985). According to Meyer (1985), the long-term effects of early education programs produced by Lazar and Darling (1982) provide important evidence showing that the early Head-Start evaluations that looked only at gains in intelligence were perhaps misplaced. The Lazar and Darling (1982) report examined data from 12 well-known preschool programs; each group was matched with an appropriate control group. Outcome measures included percent of students placed in special education classes, frequency of grade retention, and various achievement and social adjustment measures. In general, the findings suggested that those students who were receiving early education programs were higher in social competence, less likely to be placed in special education programs, and felt better about themselves (treatment children were more likely to link their positive self-evaluations to school or job achievement than the controls). Lazar and Darling concluded that pupils with early education experience were better able to adapt to the social, intellectual, and behavioral demands of their school. Meyer suggests that an additional conclusion from their work is that a narrow set of aptitude/achievement outcomes or dependent variables is likely to underestimate the beneficial effects of early school experiences as well as the negative or positive effects of something like teacher-expectation phenomena.

Meyer (1985) argues that whether or not teachers use negative approaches (that have been defined in the literature) appears to be less a function of teacher expectancy for individual students but more related to how powerful an effect teachers believe they can have on the learning of children;
the more powerful they perceive their influence on learning to be, the less likely they will be to use negative behaviors.

Meyer (1985) concludes that it is reasonable to assert that if teachers believe that a student with modest or lower skills is teachable, they will work hard to present information to the student, and in so doing, they will maintain the child's willingness to work. Thus, he suggests, the need exists to train teachers to believe that they can teach students, regardless of the students' current performance.
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