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Hypotheses regarding self-fulfilling prophecies, perceptual biases, and accuracy were tested using longitudinal data relating 98 6th-grade math teachers’ expectations to 1,731 students’ performance. Consistent with the self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis, teacher expectations predicted changes in student achievement beyond effects accounted for by previous achievement and motivation. Consistent with the perceptual bias hypothesis, teacher expectations predicted their own evaluations of students’ performance more strongly than they predicted standardized test scores. Consistent with the accuracy hypothesis, path coefficients relating teacher expectations to standardized achievement tests were about 80% lower than zero-order correlations, and the path coefficients relating teacher expectations to students’ grades were 45% to 65% lower than the zero-order correlations. These results support a weak constructivist perspective.

How are social perception and social reality related? Strong social constructivist perspectives emphasize the power of beliefs to create reality (see Jussim, 1991, for a review). According to such perspectives, for example, children become what significant others, such as parents and teachers, expect them to become. But is social reality so malleable that, because of phenomena such as self-fulfilling prophecies and perceptual biases, it is readily transformed by erroneous social beliefs?

There are few contexts more important for investigating these basic issues than teachers’ expectations for their students. Teachers develop expectations for students early in the year (Brophy, 1983; Rist, 1970), and students do indeed often confirm these expectations (Brophy & Good, 1974; Crano & Mellon, 1978; Humphreys & Stubbs, 1977; Williams, 1976). Experimental research has often examined how induction of erroneous teacher expectations influences teacher behavior and student performance (e.g., Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Sutherland & Goldschmidt, 1974; see Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Raudenbush, 1984, for meta-analyses; Jussim, 1986, 1991, for reviews). This research has shown that teacher expectations, in principle, may influence students. Because such research was not even intended to address the accuracy of teacher expectations and because accuracy limits self-fulfilling prophecies (Jussim, 1989, 1990, 1991), such research provides little information regarding the extent to which naturally developed teacher expectations influence students’ achievement.

Therefore, our research redressed this limitation by focusing on the extent to which naturally occurring teacher expectations influence student achievement. Among a sample of 98 teachers and over 1,700 students in sixth-grade math classes, we assessed the extent to which teacher expectations (a) were accurate, (b) changed students’ achievement through self-fulfilling prophecies, and (c) biased teachers’ evaluations of students’ achievement.

Overview of a Controversy

How much does social perception construct or create social reality? This issue has generated considerable controversy. Experimental studies have demonstrated many errors and biases in social perception and have also documented a myriad of ways in which social perception constructs social reality (see reviews by Hamilton, Sherman, & Ruvolo, 1990; E. E. Jones, 1986; Snyder, 1984). Consequently, the experimental research has often been interpreted as consistent with a strong social constructivist perspective that paints a grim picture: People’s expectations are allegedly highly inaccurate, likely to bias interpretations of others’ actions, and likely to create self-fulfilling prophecies. As such, expectancies are often accused of playing a major role in the perpetuation of social injustices associated with stereotypes, prejudice, and inequalities in educational and occupational opportunity (e.g., Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Hamilton et al., 1990; Snyder, 1984).

This depiction of the strong constructivist perspective is no straw man; the strong constructivist perspective has a long history and has had widespread influence in many areas of psychology (see Jussim, 1991, for a review). Consider the following...
quotes: “Events in the social world may be as much effects of individuals’ beliefs as they are causes of these beliefs” (Snyder, 1984, p. 294, emphasis in original) and “Teachers’ expectancies influence students’ academic performance to a greater degree than students’ performance influences teachers’ expectancies” (Miller & Turnbull, 1986, p. 236).

Many social–psychological perspectives claim or imply that the power of beliefs to create reality equals or exceeds the power of reality to influence people’s beliefs (Darley, Fleming, Hilton, & Swann, 1988; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Gage & Cronbach, 1955; Hamilton et al., 1990; Jones, 1986, 1990). Educational psychologists, in contrast, have reached diametrically opposed conclusions. Rather than being major agents in the construction of student achievement, teacher expectations accurately reflect student achievement, according to many educational psychologists (e.g., Brophy, 1983; Dusek, 1975; Meyer, 1985; Raudenbush, 1984; West & Anderson, 1976).

These perspectives—that teacher expectations are highly inaccurate and have powerfully self-fulfilling effects versus that teacher expectations are highly accurate and have highly limited self-fulfilling effects—are mutually exclusive. As broad generalizations, both cannot simultaneously be true. The current study, therefore, addresses the following question: How much do teacher expectations predict student achievement by creating self-fulfilling prophecies and perceptual biases rather than by being accurate?

How Much Do Teacher Expectations Create Versus Reflect Student Achievement?

Teachers’ expectations may be confirmed because they lead to self-fulfilling prophecies or perceptual biases or because these expectations were accurate. Unfortunately, however, simple correlations among teacher expectations and student achievement provide no basis for distinguishing among these three sources of expectancy confirmation (Jussim, 1989, 1991). How, then, can they be distinguished under naturalistic conditions?

Our conceptual rationale and specific procedures for disentangling these three sources of expectancy confirmation under naturalistic conditions has been extensively described elsewhere (Jussim, 1989, 1991). Therefore, we only briefly summarize that rationale. Teachers’ expectations must change students’ performance for expectancy–behavior associations to be interpretable as evidence of self-fulfilling prophecies. The occurrence of a perceptual bias means that teachers view students as performing at levels more consistent with their expectations than is warranted on the basis of students’ achievement. Assessing the accuracy of teacher’s predictions involves determining the extent to which expectations predict, without causing, students’ performance.

Jussim (1989) provided evidence for the occurrence of small self-fulfilling prophecies and perceptual bias effects and also showed that teachers’ expectations predicted students’ future achievement mainly because those expectations were accurate. Jussim’s 1989 study remains the only study that has empirically distinguished and assessed self-fulfilling prophecies, perceptual biases, and accuracy under naturalistic conditions.1 Consequently, the results should be viewed cautiously pending replication, especially because the evidence of high accuracy seems inconsistent with the strong constructivist perspective.

Overview of This Study

Purpose

The current study replicates and extends the Jussim (1989) study in several ways. First, our total sample includes a much larger number of students (1,731) and teachers (98) in sixth-grade math classes. Second, the current study includes data on students and teachers from nine different school districts in southeastern Michigan (rather than in the single district examined in Jussim, 1989). Third, the demographic characteristics of these districts are highly variable. The socioeconomic status of the districts ranges from working class to upper middle class, and the sample includes a substantial number of minority students (about 10% of the students). Because it includes a relatively large number of teachers who teach a wide variety of students in a variety of public school settings, we believe results from this study should be broadly generalizable.

Another purpose of the current study is to compare results obtained in Jussim (1989) with those obtained using a more diverse sample. Therefore, the current sample is divided into two groups: (a) the sample used in the Jussim (1989) study and (b) 1,288 students and 71 teachers in eight other school districts. Two-group LISREL analyses (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1983) are used to compare the results obtained for these two samples.

A third purpose is to explore the impact of student sex on teachers’ perceptions of students’ talent and effort. Research consistently shows that (a) by junior high school, boys perform somewhat higher than girls on standardized math tests; (b) before junior high school, boys and girls perform similarly on standardized math tests; and (c) regardless of grade level, girls tend to receive higher math grades than boys (see Kimball, 1989, for a review). Some research suggests that student sex influences teacher perceptions and leads to differential treatment (e.g., Brophy & Good, 1974; Dweck, Davidson, Nelson, & Enna, 1978; Eccles & Blumenfeld, 1985; Eccles & Wigfield, 1985; Parsons, Kazakala, & Meece, 1982; Wilkinson & Marrett, 1985). Especially in math, teachers may believe that boys have more talent than girls, despite girls receiving higher grades in elementary and junior high school (Eccles & Blumenfeld, 1985; Parsons et al., 1982). Consistent with this perspective, teachers are more likely to attribute boys’ success to ability and girls’ success to effort (Dweck et al., 1978). This suggests that teachers would have biased perceptions of boys’ and girls’ talent and effort. Previous research, however, has not been focused on testing this hypothesis. Instead, most studies have investigated whether teachers treat boys differently from girls or make dif-

---

1 There are some partial exceptions. One is a dissertation by Berman that disentangled predictive accuracy from self-fulfilling in therapist–patient relationships. West and Anderson (1976) also attempted to distinguish accuracy from self-fulfilling prophecy, but (a) did not address predictive accuracy (they only addressed accuracy in terms of the basis for teacher expectations) and (b) also ignored perceptual biases.
different attributions for the performance of boys and girls (e.g., Dweck et al., 1978; Parsons et al., 1982). Thus, there is little direct evidence indicating the extent to which teachers’ perceptions of boys’ and girls’ effort and talent are biased. Providing such evidence, then, is another goal of this study. We predicted that teachers would rate girls as performing better and exerting more effort than boys and that teachers would rate boys as having more talent than girls.

Hypotheses

Because this study uses naturalistic data, hypotheses are phrased in terms of some variables predicting rather than causing other variables. The self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis suggests that teachers’ expectations predict students’ future achievement, even after controlling for students’ prior achievement. The perceptual bias hypothesis suggests that teacher expectations predict their own judgments of students’ achievement (i.e., grades) more than they predict independent assessments of students’ achievement (standardized test scores). There are two sets of accuracy hypotheses: (a) Students’ prior achievement and motivation predict teachers’ expectations and (b) teachers’ expectations correlate with students’ future achievement at least partially because they are based on valid predictors of student achievement; controlling for those valid predictors substantially reduces the correlation of teacher expectations with student achievement.

Method

Sample

All analyses in this study are based on data obtained as part of a longitudinal study of adolescent development: the Michigan Study of Adolescents’ Life Transitions (Eccles, 1988). The total sixth-grade sample included 108 teachers and 2,625 students in math classes in 11 school districts in southeastern Michigan. Analyses required, however, that students attend these school districts for 3 consecutive years—in fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. The 531 students who did not attend any of the schools in these districts during at least 1 of these 3 years were excluded from the analyses reported in this article.

In addition, some schools did not require students to take a standardized math test in late fifth grade or early sixth grade. The additional 283 students without such information regarding past levels of achievement also were excluded from the main analyses. Initial analyses showed that there were few differences between the included and excluded students on any of the teacher expectation, student motivation, or student performance variables. All analyses reported below were based on 27 teachers and 443 students in one school district (hence referred to as Sample 1) and 71 teachers and 1,288 students in eight other school districts (hence referred to as Sample 2).

Questionnaires

Teachers evaluated each student in their class on a variety of dimensions early in the school year (generally around the first week of October). Included in the current study were teachers’ assessments of each students’ talent, effort, and performance in math—these are the three teacher expectation variables used in the current research. Questionnaires assessed students’ beliefs, perceptions, and feelings in a variety of domains. This study included students’ self-concept of ability in math, their self-reported effort in math, the time they spend on math homework, and the value they place on math.\(^2\) All measures are valid and reliable (they are presented in the Appendix; for reliability and validity information, see Eccles (Parsons) et al., 1984; Jussim, 1987; Parsons, 1980).

Measures of Student Achievement

Several measures of student achievement were used. There were two measures of past achievement: final marks in fifth-grade math classes and scores on the math section of standardized tests taken in late fifth grade or early sixth grade. Included in each student’s record was the percentile ranking of their performance on standardized tests, relative to national norms. These percentile rank scores were used to translate different standardized test scores onto the same scale.

Two measures of final achievement were used: final marks in sixth-grade math classes and scores on the math section of the seventh-grade Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP). The MEAP has been widely used since the early 1970s and is administered in early October to all Michigan public school students in seventh grade. An overview of all measures used in this study is presented in Table 1.

Results and Discussion

Analysis Overview

All models were assessed using the LISREL VI program (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1983), using covariance matrices as input. Correlations and standard deviations for all variables are presented in Table 2. All path coefficients may be interpreted identically to standardized betas from a regression equation.

Analyses are reported in three stages. In the first stage, results from estimating separate LISREL models for Sample 1 and for Sample 2 are reported. In the second stage, we used LISREL to assess directly the extent to which the Sample 2 results replicated those obtained for Sample 1. In the third stage, whether conceptualizing teacher expectations in different ways led to different patterns of results was explored.

Stage 1: Separate Model Assessment for the Two Samples

Model Assumptions

Analyses allowed (a) all student-background variables (previous grades and standardized test scores, self-concept of ability, self-perceptions of effort, time spent on homework, and gender) to predict the three teacher-perception variables and (b) all student background variables and teacher-perception

\(^2\) The current study did not assess student motivational mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies, because little evidence of such mediation was found in Jussim (1989). Therefore, in contrast to Jussim (1989), the current study did not include student motivational variables assessed during the spring in any analyses. Because there were fewer variables, there were also fewer cases with missing data in Sample 1 than in the original Jussim (1989) study. Therefore, the total size for Sample 1 is 443, whereas it was 429 in Jussim (1989).

\(^1\) Initial analyses revealed that neither intrinsic nor extrinsic value placed on math was involved in the teacher-expectation process in any way among either sample. Consequently, these variables are not discussed further.
variables to predict students' final grades in sixth-grade math classes and MEAP scores. In addition, the model assessed in Stage 1 assumed that teacher perceptions of student effort and talent could be based on teacher perceptions of student performance. Because they are difficult to observe directly, one person's judgments of another's effort and ability must depend on observable behaviors believed to be related to effort and ability. Performance is one such directly observable behavior (e.g., Heider, 1958; Nicholls, 1979; Weiner, 1979).

In this set of analyses, self-concept of ability was the only variable assessed with two measures: How good students felt they were at math and how they ranked themselves in comparison with other students in their math class. All analyses assume, therefore, that self-concept of ability is a latent variable with these two indicators. All other variables had only single indicators. Therefore, measurement error is estimated and removed only for self-concept of ability. The use of single items for most variables represents an important limitation to this research: The extent to which measurement error affected the results is largely unknown.

Organization and Presentation of Results

Because results involve 11 variables and 24 paths, results are depicted in two separate figures. However, this is to simplify presentation; results were obtained by assessing the full model (described in the previous section on Model Assumptions). Because of the large sample, some trivially small coefficients were statistically significant. Therefore, paths are shown only when the coefficient was at least .07 in at least one of the two samples. In the figures and in the subsequent text of this article, except where otherwise indicated, all reported paths are significant at \( p < .05 \). All figures display path coefficients and multiple correlation coefficients for both samples. Sample 1 coefficients are presented first, followed by a slash, followed by Sample 2 coefficients (e.g., in Figure 1, the .28/17 coefficient relating standardized test scores to teacher perceptions of talent means that the path coefficient was .28 for Sample 1 and .17 for Sample 2). Similarly, in the text below, when we present pairs of coefficients, the first represents the result for Sample 1 and the second represents the result for Sample 2.

The results for Stage 1 are presented in four sections: (a) assessment of the bases of teacher expectations, (b) assessment of the self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis; (c) assessment of the perceptual bias hypotheses; and (d) assessment of the extent to which teacher perceptions predicted, without influencing, students' grades and MEAP scores.

Bases of Teacher Expectations

Teacher perceptions of performance. Results assessing the bases of teacher perceptions are depicted in Figure 1. In both samples, results showed that teacher perceptions of student performance are largely based on appropriate factors. The main

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past performance</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Teachers' expectations</th>
<th>Future achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized math test scores*</td>
<td>Self-concept of math ability*</td>
<td>Perceptions of math performance*</td>
<td>MEAP math scores*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final math marks in fifth grade</td>
<td>Effort in math</td>
<td>Perceptions of math talent*</td>
<td>Final math marks in sixth grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on math homework*</td>
<td>Intrinsic and extrinsic value of math*</td>
<td>Perceptions of effort in math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Different districts administered different tests in late fifth grade or early sixth grade. Percentile ranks were used to render the tests comparable. Self-concept of ability was measured by a scale consisting of two items: how good students think they are at math and how good they think they are in comparison with other students. The motivational variables were assessed in early October. All teacher expectation variables were assessed in October, within a few days after the assessment of student motivation. The MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program) is a standardized test taken in October of seventh grade.
predictors of teacher perceptions of students' performance are students' previous standardized test scores ($\beta$s = .24 and .39), final marks in fifth-grade math classes ($\beta$s = .21 and .21), and students' self-concept of math ability ($\beta$s = .29 and .23; see Figure 1).

As predicted, teachers perceived girls as performing better than boys; although this relation is not significant in Sample 1 ($\beta = -.06$), it is significant in Sample 2 ($\beta = -.10$, $p < .001$). When the two samples are combined, this relationship is significant ($\beta = -.08$, $p < .001$). This result obtained despite there being no differences between boys and girls on either their previous standard test scores or their MEAP scores (all $\beta$s ranged from -.04 to .03, $ns$). Thus, this result does not seem to represent accuracy; teachers perceived girls as performing more highly than boys despite the absence of objective evidence (in terms of standardized test scores) supporting this perception.

**Teacher perceptions of talent.** Teacher perceptions of talent are also largely based on appropriate factors (see Figure 1). The two largest predictors are teachers' own perceptions of students' performance ($\beta$s = .53 and .64) and previous standardized test scores ($\beta$s = .28 and .17). There also are small effects of previous grades ($\beta$s = .07 and .05, $ps < .1$ and .05, respectively). These results are consistent with much educational research suggesting that teacher expectations are usually based on valid information (Brophy & Good, 1974; West & Anderson, 1976; see reviews by Brophy, 1983; Cooper, 1979; Dusek, 1975).

As predicted, teachers believe boys have more talent than girls ($\beta$s = .06 and .08, both $ps < .05$). This result does not seem to represent accuracy because it is inconsistent with the lack of difference between boys' and girls' standardized test scores and teachers' own beliefs that girls perform more highly than boys.

**Teacher perceptions of effort.** Teacher perceptions of effort are only minimally based on the two student effort variables (for self-perceptions of effort, $\beta$s = .08 and .06; for time spent on homework, $\beta$s = -.07 and .04). The largest influence on perceptions of effort is teachers' own perceptions of students' performance ($\beta$s = .58 and .68, see Figure 1). To a small extent, teacher perceptions of effort also are related to final marks from fifth grade ($\beta$s = .10 and .06). It seems, therefore, that teachers assume that students who perform better are exerting more effort and that teachers were nearly oblivious to how hard students think they are trying.

Although it may be appropriate for teachers to base their perceptions of students' effort most heavily on their own perceptions of students' performance, our data and other research show that the relation between effort and performance often is weak or nonexistent (Schuman, Walsh, Olson, & Etheridge, 1985). Students' self-perceptions of effort correlated .07 ($ns$) and .09 with MEAP scores and .07 ($ns$) and .19 with final grades in math. Time reportedly spent on homework, however, correlated negatively with performance: -.07 ($ns$) and -.13 with MEAP scores and -.05 ($ns$) and -.15 with grades. Thus, the
relation between effort and performance is neither as powerful nor as direct as many teachers seem to believe.

In addition, as predicted, teachers rated girls as trying harder than boys ($r_s = - .15$ and $- .11$). Because student gender was unrelated to either self-perceptions of effort or time spent on homework in either sample ($r s$ ranged from $- .04$ to $.01$), the effect of student sex on teacher perceptions of effort again seems to represent a bias rather than accuracy.

**Self-Fulfilling Prophecies**

If teacher expectations lead to self-fulfilling prophecies, they should predict changes in student achievement. Figure 2 summarizes the results obtained regarding final marks and MEAP scores, respectively. Results consistent with the self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis were obtained for both samples. In Sample 1, the clearest evidence of self-fulfilling prophecies was obtained regarding teacher perceptions of talent, which predicted both final marks ($\beta = .13$) and MEAP scores ($\beta = .18$). Although teacher perceptions of performance had no direct effects on either outcome, it had significant indirect effects (as mediated by teacher perceptions of talent and effort) on both grades ($\beta = .17$) and MEAP scores ($\beta = .10$).  

Results consistent with the self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis were also obtained in Sample 2 (see Figure 2). Teacher per-
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Figure 2. Predictors of students' final grades and MEAP scores. (Paths are shown only when the coefficient was at least .07 in at least one sample. For each path, two coefficients are shown: The first shows the relation for Sample 1 and the second shows the relation for Sample 2. MEAP refers to scores on the math section of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program. All coefficients are standardized. All coefficients greater than .08 are significant at p < .05.)

ceptions of performance significantly related directly both to final marks in sixth grade ($\beta = .21$) and MEAP scores ($\beta = .20$). In addition, teacher perceptions of performance indirectly related to final grades (through their relation to teacher perceptions of effort), so that the total effect of teacher perceptions of performance on grades was .34. Because teacher perceptions of talent ($\beta = -.02, ns$) and effort ($\beta = -.067$) had small negative relations with MEAP scores, the total effect of teacher perceptions of talent on MEAP scores was actually somewhat smaller than its direct effect ($\beta = .15$). Neither of the other teacher-perception variables significantly related to both grades and MEAP scores.

In both samples, therefore, results showed that the more favorably teachers viewed students in October, the more those students increased their grades and standardized test scores above the levels predicted by prior performance and motivation. The same pattern was also found for teacher perceptions of students' math talent in Sample 1.

Because the teacher expectation variables correlated substantially with one another (6 to .8), these analyses have one potential limitation. Correlations among predictors may lead structural equation techniques to underestimate their independent effects (e.g., Gordon, 1968; Pedhazur, 1982). Consequently, a second set of analyses was performed to identify the extent to which the three teacher-expectation variables in combination predicted changes in student achievement. First, a model was estimated that included only students' past achievement and motivation as predictors of their future grades and MEAP scores. The multiple correlation coefficients in this analysis were then compared with the multiple correlation coefficients obtained in the first models that also included the teacher expectation variables as predictors. The relation of the three teacher-expectation variables to student achievement in this analysis is represented by the multiple semipartial correlation (Pedhazur, 1982), which is simply the square root of the increment in the multiple correlation (this renders its interpretation similar to that of the path coefficients obtained in the earlier analyses). In these analyses, these relations are .13 and .12 for MEAP scores; they are .23 and .29 for final grades. These results are similar to those obtained in models assessing the independent effects of each of the three teacher-expectation variables because (a) both showed significant effects of teacher expectations on student achievement, (b) the effect on MEAP scores was small, and (c) the effect on grades was greater than the effect on MEAP scores.

Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Limitations

The correlational nature of the study leaves open alternative explanations. Although a reverse causal direction is not plausible (e.g., final marks in sixth grade did not cause teacher expectations at the beginning of sixth grade), accuracy cannot be eliminated conclusively as an alternative to the self-fulfilling prophecy interpretation. Perhaps teachers used some type or
types of information not included in this study that enabled them to predict student performance beyond levels accounted for by students' prior grades, standardized test scores, self-concept of ability, time spent on homework, effort, and intrinsic and extrinsic value placed on math.

Although the accuracy explanation cannot be conclusively eliminated, several factors limit its viability. First, these results are consistent with a long history of laboratory research, field experiments, and naturalistic studies of interpersonal expectations (e.g., Berman, 1979; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977; West & Anderson, 1976; see reviews by Jussim, 1991; Miller & Turnbull, 1986). The modest effect sizes obtained are also consistent with those obtained in nearly all previous studies of the effects of naturally developed teacher expectations (Brattesani, Weinstein, & Marshall, 1984; West & Anderson, 1976; Williams, 1976).

Second, this study included controls that were more complete than those used in nearly all previous research on naturally developed teacher expectations. Few studies have used both past grades and standardized test scores as controls, few have used student motivation as a control, and none have included as broad a variety of student motivational factors as included here (with the exception of Jussim, 1989). A strength of this approach is that by virtue of controlling for students' previous performance (in terms of grades and standardized test scores), significant coefficients mean that teacher expectations predicted changes in student achievement. Furthermore, such predictive validity cannot have resulted from teachers accurately assessing students' motivation (at least in terms of any of the motivational constructs included in the analyses).

Furthermore, no matter how many potential sources of accuracy we assessed, if teacher perceptions predicted changes in student achievement, it would still be possible that "we just did not get the right ones." This is a fundamental limitation to this type of naturalistic study: The obtained path coefficients represent causal effects only if all relevant causes of outcome variables have been included in the model. And no matter how many potential sources of spurious relations one assessed, one can never know whether one assessed them all. Therefore, such research can never conclusively demonstrate causal relationships.

Nonetheless, an effort can be made to include as many potential sources of spurious relations as possible. Because of the large number of such variables included in the current study, we conclude that it provides some of the clearest evidence to date that naturally occurring teacher expectations led to self-fulfilling prophecies. Such a conclusion will warrant revision when future research demonstrates empirically that there are important sources of accuracy in teacher perceptions other than those we assessed.

Perceptual Biases

If teacher expectations lead to perceptual biases, they should more strongly relate to grades than to standardized test scores (see Jussim, 1989, 1991, for more extended discussions of this issue). In both samples, the clearest evidence of a perceptual bias occurred for teacher perceptions of effort (see Figure 2). In both samples, teacher perceptions of effort predicted final grades ($\beta = .17$ and .20) but had little relation to MEAP scores ($\beta = -.03$ and -.067).

Results consistent with a perceptual bias also occurred for teacher perceptions of performance (total effects on final grades = .17 and .34; total effects on MEAP scores = .10 and .15), although this pattern was much stronger for Sample 2. In both samples, however, the direct effect of teacher perceptions of performance on grades ($\beta = .00$ and .20) was similar to its effect on MEAP scores ($\beta = .00$ and .21). The main reason for the increased total effect on grades was because there was also an indirect effect on grades, mediated by teacher perceptions of effort.

Perceptual Biases: Limitations

Teacher perceptions of effort. To interpret these results as representing perceptual biases, one must rule out the accuracy explanation. Perhaps rather than biasing their evaluations of students' achievement, teachers simply rewarded students they accurately perceived as exerting strong effort by increasing their grades, and perhaps they punished students accurately perceived as lazy by lowering their grades. How accurate, then, were teacher perceptions of effort? Hardly accurate at all, according to the criteria available in our data. Teacher perceptions of effort were minimally related to students' global self-perceptions of effort, how much time they spent on homework, or their self-perceptions of math ability.

Strictly, however, the minimal association between teacher perceptions of effort and students' self-perceptions represents only a lack of agreement regarding students' level of effort. It represents inaccuracy on the part of teachers only if students' self-perceptions of effort were accurate. How good, then, are these criteria?

Additional analyses supported the validity of students' self-reported effort. The correlations of student effort with self-concept of ability were .22 in Sample 1 and .31 in Sample 2 (both $p < .001$). This is precisely the type of relation one would...
expect if, as many theorists have proposed, high self-concept of ability enhances motivation (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Dweck & Elliot, 1984; Eccles & Wigfield, 1985). Furthermore, self-perceptions of ability play a major role in motivating effort (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Dweck & Elliot, 1984; Eccles & Wigfield, 1985; Harter, 1984; Marsh, 1990; Weiner, 1979). Therefore, if teacher perceptions of students' effort were accurate, they should have been strongly related, at least, to students' self-concept of ability. This was not found.

Furthermore, we know of no evidence in the more general literature on attributions and person perception to suggest that observers are generally better judges of effort than do observers (Monson & Snyder, 1977). Previous research has demonstrated that teachers' beliefs in strong associations between effort and intelligence are largely illusory (e.g., Barnard, Zimbardo, & Sarason, 1968; see Brophy & Good, 1974, for a review). Finally, our results showed that teachers inferred students' effort almost entirely from their performance—an inference that is not justified by evidence showing that students' self-perceptions of effort were only slightly positively related to grades and that the time they reported spending on homework was negatively related to MEAP scores.

We feel that these results, in conjunction with previous research documenting the illusory nature of teacher beliefs in strong associations between achievement and effort, are sufficient to warrant at least tentatively concluding that teacher perceptions of effort are largely inaccurate and thus produce a biasing effect on grades. This conclusion would warrant revision if future research, using demonstrably superior criteria, shows that teacher perceptions of effort predict grades more than standardized achievement test scores because these perceptions are accurate.

**Teacher perceptions of performance.** Teacher perceptions of performance predicted grades more strongly than MEAP scores primarily because of the biasing effects of teacher perceptions of effort. The direct effect of teacher perceptions of performance on grades and MEAP scores was similar in both samples. However, the model also assumed that teacher perceptions of performance influenced teacher perceptions of effort, and results showed that teacher perceptions of effort predicted grades more than MEAP scores. Therefore, teacher perceptions of performance also predicted grades more than MEAP scores because of the indirect effects mediated by teacher perceptions of effort.

This pattern challenges the plausibility of an accuracy interpretation. The accuracy interpretation proposes that teachers are particularly astute in their observation of the students in their classrooms and are better at predicting in-class performance than predicting standardized achievement test scores. Therefore, the accuracy explanation predicts that the direct relation of teacher perceptions of performance to grades should exceed the direct relation to MEAP scores (because they are better at predicting in-class performance). This pattern was not found. In contrast, it seems that teachers (a) simply assumed that higher achievers exerted more effort, (b) rewarded students who were already high achievers with even higher grades (or punished students who were low achievers with even lower grades), and (c) were largely oblivious to the actual effort students believed they exerted.

**Why an effort-based bias?** Several factors may underlie an effort-based bias. First, effort probably is difficult to observe directly. Therefore, it may be necessary for teachers to infer effort on the basis of some observable behavior. Performance is one directly observable behavior that seems especially likely to influence teachers' perceptions of students' effort. People often assume effort strongly influences performance (Covington & Omelich, 1979; Heider, 1958; Schuman et al., 1985; Weiner, 1979). Perhaps because they believe in the American work ethic (see, e.g., Schuman et al., 1985) or in a just world (Lerner, 1980), people assume that hard work pays off. According to this naive theory, it is reasonable to infer that high achievement generally reflects strong effort and therefore to reward those who are believed to try hard or to punish those seen as lazy. This effort-based bias, therefore, seems to operate in such a way that the academically rich get richer and the academically poor get poorer.

Because these perceptions influenced students' grades, they are of some practical importance. Decisions to place students in high or low tracks are often based at least partially on grades, and once placed, students rarely change tracks (Brophy & Good, 1974). Track placement, in turn, has implications for several future opportunities, including ease of getting into college.

**Predictive Accuracy**

Predictive accuracy refers to predictive validity without influence; the path coefficients obtained in the analyses described above are intended to represent influences. Consequently, the difference between the zero-order correlations (overall predictive validities) and path coefficients (predictive validity due to influence) relating teacher expectations to student achievement is an index of the extent to which teacher expectations predicted, without influencing, student achievement (i.e., accuracy).

Results show considerable accuracy in teachers' expectations among both samples (these are summarized in Table 3). Zero-order correlations of the individual teacher-perception variables with grades range from .51 to .71; the structural equation analyses, which controlled for potential sources of accuracy, reduced these correlations to path coefficients of .04 to .34. Similarly, the multiple correlations of the three teacher-perception variables with grades are .64 and .73; the multiple semipartial correlations, obtained after controlling for potential sources of accuracy, are .23 and .29. On average, the zero-order correlations of teacher expectations with students' final grades were reduced by about 60% to 65% in analyses that controlled for
had the same structure (i.e., the same pattern of coefficients all, some, or no identical relationships characterized both samples. The first two-group analysis assumed that the two models had the same structure (i.e., the same pattern of coefficients all, some, or no identical relationships characterized both samples. The first two-group analysis assumed that the two models had the same structure (i.e., the same pattern of coefficients).

Table 3

Construction and Reflection of Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Teachers' perceptions of students' performance</th>
<th>Teachers' perceptions of students' talent</th>
<th>Teachers' perceptions of students' effort</th>
<th>All three</th>
<th>Latent teacher-perception model</th>
<th>Induced teacher-perception model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>Sample 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation with grades</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on grades</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation with MEAP scores</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on MEAP scores</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Effects refers to standardized total effects. The difference between correlations and path coefficients is an index of predictive accuracy (see text for explanation). The column titled All three reports the multiple correlation of all three teacher-perception variables with grades and MEAP scores in the correlation rows and reports the multiple semipartial correlation (controlling for the student background variables) with grades and MEAP scores in the effect rows. All coefficients greater than .03 are significant at p < .05. MEAP = Michigan Educational Assessment Program.

Results provide even greater evidence of accuracy in predicting MEAP scores. Zero-order correlations of the individual teacher-perception variables with MEAP scores ranged from .36 to .57; path coefficients ranged from -.07 to .18. The multiple correlation of the three teacher-perception variables with grades were .58 and .55; the multiple semipartial correlations were .13 and .12. These results show that, on average, the zero-order correlations of teacher expectations with MEAP scores were reduced by about 80% in analyses that controlled for potential sources of accuracy in those expectations.

Stage 2: Direct Comparison of Sample 1 and Sample 2

The broad pattern of results across the two samples is quite similar: (a) Consistent with the self-fulfilling prophecy hypothesis, teacher expectations significantly predicted both final grades and MEAP scores; (b) consistent with the perceptual bias hypotheses, teacher expectations predicted final grades more strongly than MEAP scores; (c) teacher perceptions of performance and talent are largely based on appropriate factors; (d) teacher perceptions of effort are almost completely unrelated to students' perceptions of their effort; (e) students' gender, independent of their performance, related to all three teacher perceptions; and (f) zero-order correlations between teacher expectations and student achievement were reduced by 60% to 80% in the analyses that controlled for potential sources of accuracy.

Nonetheless, there were also some differences between Samples 1 and 2 (see Figures 1 and 2 and Table 3). Therefore, two-group LISREL analyses assessed the viability of assuming that all, some, or no identical relationships characterized both samples. The first two-group analysis assumed that the two models had the same structure (i.e., the same pattern of coefficients underlying the analyses presented thus far), but made no assumptions regarding the value any coefficient might take. This is the least restrictive model and provided a basis for comparing models that assume some or all paths are identical across the two samples. The most restrictive model assumes that all coefficients are identical across the two samples.

A series of analyses assessed how well each of these models fit the data. Because different fit measures provide different information, three global measures of fit were used in the current analyses. The chi-square assesses the probability that a model fully accounts for all covariances among the observed variables. In essence, the chi-square answers the question "Is this model significantly different from a perfect model?" With large samples, virtually any deviation from perfection may pro-

Table 4

Summary of Fit Assessment for Two-Sample Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>9933.27</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No invariances</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only factor invariant</td>
<td>91.84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole invariant</td>
<td>323.74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariant phis</td>
<td>95.39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariant gammas</td>
<td>126.41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariant pias</td>
<td>122.02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariant betas</td>
<td>80.30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table displays the chi-squares obtained when assuming that various sets of coefficients are identical for the two samples. All Ns = 1,731. No invariances means that no coefficients were assumed to be identical; whole model invariant means that all coefficients were assumed to be identical. Phis, gammas, pias, and betas all refer to subsets of LISREL coefficients (see Joreskog & Sorbom, 1983). All chi-squares are significant at \( p < .001 \). GFI = goodness of fit index; NFI = normed fit index.
duce a statistically significant chi-square. Consequently, we also used two other global measures of fit that are independent of the number of subjects in a particular sample (Bollen, 1990). LISREL VI provides its own goodness-of-fit index (GFI), which reflects the relative amount of covariances accounted for by the model. We also report the normed fit index (NFI; Bentler & Bonett, 1980), which reflects the extent to which a model improves on a null model (as is most common, our null models assume complete independence among all variables). Both the GFI and NFI have upper limits of 1.0, and values exceeding .9 are generally assumed to reflect well-fitting models. Table 4 summarizes the results for all two-sample analyses.

**Baseline Model**

The baseline for comparison is the model making no assumptions regarding the values of any of the coefficients in the two models (which we refer to as the no invariances model; this model, which was described in the section titled Model Assumptions, simply combines Figures 1 and 2). The chi-square for this model is actually the sum of the chi-squares for the two separate models. Although this model significantly deviates from perfection, \( \chi^2 (18, N = 1,731) = 47.63, p < .001 \), it accounted for nearly all of the covariances and variances among the variables (GFI and NFI = .995).

**Is It Appropriate to Assume That All Path Coefficients for the Two Samples Are Identical?**

The most stringent model requires that the path coefficients are the same in the two samples. We refer to this as the completely invariant model. In general, the coefficients generated by this model fall between those obtained when estimating the model separately for Sample 1 and Sample 2, although they also tended to be closer to the values obtained in Sample 2 because of its greater sample size.

This model significantly deviated from a perfect model, \( \chi^2 (87, N = 1,731) = 323.74, p < .001 \), and significantly worsened the fit of the model, \( \chi^2 (69, N = 1,731) = 276.11, p < .001 \). According to LISREL's GFI, however, these restrictions only slightly worsened the fit of the model (which decreased from .995 to .987). The NFI indicated a somewhat more substantial reduction in fit (from .995 to .967, although even .967 is generally considered very good fit; see Bentler & Bonett, 1980).

**Is a Particular Subset of Coefficients Primarily Responsible for the Discrepancies Among the Two Samples?**

Further analyses explored whether the discrepancies between the samples occurred primarily among a particular subset of coefficients. Consequently, models assuming identical coefficients only among the factor loadings and measurement errors, phi matrix (covariances of the exogenous variables), beta matrix (path coefficients relating the endogenous variables to one another), gamma matrix (path coefficients relating the exogenous variables to the endogenous variables) and psi matrix (variance–covariance matrix of the error terms of the endogenous variables) were assessed. These results are summarized in Table 4. Although all such restrictions produced significant worsening of fit according to the chi-square criterion (all \( p < .001 \)), the overall fit of all models as indicated by the GFI and NFI is quite good (around .99, see Table 4). These results further support the conclusion that the patterns of coefficients obtained for the two samples are similar. However, because of the large sample, even small differences are statistically significant.

**Stage 3: Alternative Conceptualizations of Teacher Expectations**

All results thus far reported allowed each of the three teacher-perception variables to have unique relations with other variables in the model. This “three separate variables” approach was previously used in Jussim (1989). There are, however, at least two other ways to conceptualize the teacher-perception variables: a “latent variable” model and an “induced variable” model. The latent teacher-perception model assumes that each of the three teacher-perception variables represents indicators of an underlying teacher-perception factor. This model estimates and removes measurement error from the underlying teacher-perception factor. It is identical to the three separate variables model, except that only the latent teacher-perception variable has direct relations with student background variables, future grades, and MEAP scores (the three measured teacher-perception variables are directly linked only to the latent teacher-perception variable).

A second alternative is that the three teacher perception variables caused an unmeasured teacher-expectation factor and that this factor influenced student achievement. This induced variable model (e.g., Bollen, 1989; Heise, 1972) assumes that the

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1 (( N = 443 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>2481.18**</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three separate variable</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent teacher perception</td>
<td>134.05**</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced teacher perception</td>
<td>18.47*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2 (( N = 1,288 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>7362.61**</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three separate variable</td>
<td>39.24**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent teacher perception</td>
<td>244.41**</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced teacher perception</td>
<td>60.25**</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** GFI = goodness of fit index; NFI = normed fit index. * \( p < .10 \). ** \( p < .001 \).
three measured teacher-perception variables are sources of teacher expectations. It specifies three stages of relations: (a) Student background variables influence the three teacher perception variables (it assumes no causal relations among teacher perceptions), (b) the three teacher perceptions influence an unmeasured global teacher-expectation variable, and (c) the unmeasured teacher expectation variable influences final grades and MEAP scores.

When predictors are correlated (as are the three teacher-perception variables), separate path estimates may be inappropriately small (Gordon, 1968; Pedhazur, 1982). By combining the teacher-perception variables into a single induced or latent variable, these models might provide a more accurate (and larger) estimate of relations of teacher expectations to student achievement than obtained using the three separate variables approach. Table 5 summarizes the fit assessment of these models. The latent teacher-perception model failed to fit the data for Sample 1, \( \chi^2(25, N = 443) = 134.05, p < .001, \text{GFI} = .952, \text{NFI} = .946 \), or Sample 2, \( \chi^2(25, N = 1,288) = 244.41, p < .001, \text{GFI} = .969, \text{NFI} = .967 \). Although the GFI and NFI indicate adequate fit, the highly significant chi-square for even the smaller Sample 1 strongly suggests that this model is not viable. The induced variable model fit the data almost, but not quite, as well as the three separate variable model. For Sample 1, \( \chi^2(11, N = 443) = 18.47, p = .071, \text{GFI} = .993, \text{NFI} = .993 \); for Sample 2, \( \chi^2(11, N = 1,288) = 60.25, p < .001, \text{GFI} = .992, \text{NFI} = .992 \). Table 3 shows that the general pattern of results representing reflection and construction of student achievement obtained for the latent variable model and induced variable model were similar to those obtained in the three separate variable model.

Conclusion

Teacher Expectations

This study provided several significant contributions. First, it showed that (a) the main reason teacher expectations predicted student achievement was because they were accurate; (b) there were small self-fulfilling prophecy effects on standardized math test performance; and (c) there were somewhat larger expectancy effects on grades. Path coefficients relating teacher expectations to standardized achievement tests were about 80% lower than zero-order correlations. This means that about 80% of the correlations between teacher expectations and standardized achievement test scores represents predictive validity without influence (accuracy), and about 20% represents self-fulfilling prophecy.

Path coefficients relating teacher expectations to students' grades were 45%–55% lower than the zero-order correlations. This means that about 45%–55% of the correlations between teacher expectations and grades represents predictive validity without influence (accuracy), and about 35%–55% represents expectancy effects. The finding of path coefficients of 3.–4 relating teacher perceptions of performance to grades represents one of the largest expectancy effects yet obtained in a naturalistic study that controlled for previous performance.

Because grades reflect teachers' judgments about students' performance, path coefficients relating teacher expectations to grades combine two different types of expectancy effects: self-fulfilling prophecies (teachers' expectations may influence students' actual performance) and perceptual biases (teachers' expectations may influence their own judgments of students' performance). A reasonable heuristic for approximating the self-fulfilling prophecy effects on grades is to assume they are similar to self-fulfilling prophecy effects on MEAP scores (which is indicated by the path coefficients relating teacher expectations to MEAP scores). On this basis, the last three columns of Table 3 (which show relations to grades and MEAP scores of all three teacher-perception variables together) suggest that about 25%–55% of the expectancy effect on grades is self-fulfilling prophecy and about 45%–75% is perceptual bias.  

A second contribution of this study is that it showed that these results replicated across two samples, including 98 teachers and over 1,700 students. Furthermore, they replicated across a variety of conceptualizations of the nature of teacher expectations. This is important because it attests to the robustness of findings that provide further evidence against the strong claims regarding the prevalence and power of expectancy effects that are frequently found in many social–psychological reviews (e.g., Hamilton et al., 1990; Jones, 1986; Miller & Turnbull, 1986; Snyder, 1984) and empirical articles (e.g., Frieze, Olson, & Russell, 1991; Skov & Sherman, 1986; Snyder et al., 1977), while supporting claims regarding the accuracy of teacher expectations and limited extent of self-fulfilling prophecies often found in the educational literature (Brophy, 1983; Dusek, 1975; Meyer, 1985; West & Anderson, 1976).

Gender Bias

The third contribution of the study was its exploration of the role of student sex in the teacher-expectation process. As predicted, student sex was related to teacher perceptions in a manner that suggests perceptual bias. Teachers rated boys as having more math talent than girls and rated girls as trying harder than boys. Neither of these differences appears to reflect accurate perceptions of gender differences. Furthermore, these results contribute to understanding why girls often receive higher math grades than boys (Kimball, 1989). Specifically, teachers erroneously assume that girls try harder than boys and then reward girls for their (misperceived) higher effort with higher grades.

Teacher perceptions were generally consistent with stereotypes of gender differences: Boys have more talent and girls compensate by working harder. These beliefs are quite common: Adolescents hold similar beliefs regarding their own tal-
and abilities (Eccles [Parsons], 1983; Parsons et al., 1982), and parents hold similar beliefs regarding the abilities and efforts of their own children (Yee & Eccles, 1988). Furthermore, this bias in parents' perceptions of their children's talent and effort in math appears to be linked to the parents' own category-based, gender role stereotypic beliefs regarding the general distribution of math talent between boys and girls (Eccles, Jacobs, & Harold, 1990). Future research should determine whether a similar mechanism underlies the apparent gender role stereotyped bias in teachers' perceptions of their students' talent and effort.

**Strong and Weak Constructivist Perspectives**

Results generally supported a weak version of social constructivism, which argues that although beliefs sometimes create social reality, people's perceptions usually accurately reflect social reality. These results do not support the strong social constructivist perspective, which assumes that social perception creates social reality as much or more than it reflects social reality. We do not claim that expectancies are always accurate or never have large self-fulfilling or biasing effects. Attributes with less objective criteria than math achievement, such as attitudes and personality dispositions, may be more subject to biases in social perception (e.g., Cronbach, 1955; Funder, 1987; Jussim & Osgood, 1989). One should not generalize from this study to different grade levels or to different types of social interaction (e.g., between friends). Nonetheless, results of the current study are consistent with the effect sizes of between .1 and .3 obtained in virtually all path-analytic and meta-analytic studies of expectancy effects (Cooper & Hazelrigg, 1988; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Jussim, 1989; Raudenbush, 1984; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1978; Smith, 1980; West & Anderson, 1976; Williams, 1976).

**Accumulation of Expectancy Effects**

Even small effects may lead to large differences if they accumulate over a sufficiently long time. Thus, part of the accuracy of sixth-grade teacher expectations may have been based on an awareness of the results of previous expectancy effects. The current study, however, did not attempt to assess whether expectancy effects occurred before sixth grade. Our purpose was to assess the extent of accuracy, self-fulfilling prophecy, and perceptual bias within a single social context—from a given starting point to a particular endpoint among a particular set of perceivers and targets (see Jussim, 1991, for a more extended discussion of "single social context"). Our approach is not useful for identifying the "ultimate" extent to which individual differences in students' achievement result from social constructive processes.

Furthermore, the little research on the accumulation of expectancy effects has yielded a mixed picture. Both Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) field experiment and West and Anderson's (1976) naturalistic study found that, rather than accumulating, teacher-expectation effects dissipated after the first year. In contrast, an observational study by Rist (1970) suggested that the accumulation of such effects may be quite powerful. However, because Rist provided no objective or quantitative assessment of the accumulation of teacher-expectation effects, identifying naturalistic conditions conducive to powerful expectancy effects remains a challenge for future research. For both the practical purpose of understanding how teachers enhance or undermine students' achievement and the theoretical goal of understanding how much social perception constructs and reflects social reality, empirical research on the accumulation of expectancy effects is sorely needed.
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Appendix

**Measures**

**Teacher Expectations**

1. How much natural mathematical talent does this student have?
   - very little math talent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 a lot of math talent

2. How hard does this student try in math?
   - does not try at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 tries very hard

3. Compared to other students in this class, how well is this student performing in math?
   - near the bottom of the class 1 2 3 4 5 above the one of the best in the class
   - below the middle of the class 2 in the middle of the class 4 above the middle of the class

**Students' Self-Perceptions of Effort and Time on Homework**

1. How hard do you work in math?
   - a little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 a lot

2. How much time do you spend on math homework? (Check one answer)
   - 1) less than 15 minutes a day
   - 2) 15 to 30 minutes a day
   - 3) 30 minutes to an hour a day
   - 4) an hour or more a day

**Students' Self-Concept of Math Ability**

1. How good at math are you?
   - not at all good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very good

2. If you were to rank all the students in your math class from the worst to the best in math, where would you put yourself?
   - the worst 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 the best
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