ISSN 2278-8808 IMPACT FACTOR: 1.38
An International Peer Reviewed
SCHOLARLY RESEARCH JOURNAL
FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOOL TYPES AS SOURCES OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

Vidyanand Khandagale
Assistant Professor, Department of Education
Shivaji University,Kolhapur.

Shefali Pandya
Professor & Head, Department of Education
University of Mumbai

Abstract

Teachers' expectations about their students' abilities affect classroom interactions and influence students performance in various ways. The investigations was aimed at comparing teacher expectations of student performance in existing secondary school students on the basis of school types. Hence, it has adopted the descriptive method of the causal-comparative type. It may be termed as synchronic in nature as data were collected at one point in time. The researcher has adopted the value added model in the methodology of the present study. The value added model was used to study the value added by the school by adjusting for the effect of the SES on teacher expectations of student performance.

In order to select the sample of the study, the researchers adopted a four stage sampling procedure. At the first stage, schools affiliated to the Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education (MSBSHE) and situated in Greater Mumbai were selected using stratified random sampling where the strata included the geographical location of the schools namely, South Mumbai, North Mumbai, and Central Mumbai. At the second stage, schools were selected using stratified sampling where the strata include the type of management of schools namely municipal, private-aided and private-unaided. At the third stage, individual classrooms from the selected schools were selected using simple random sampling (lottery method) technique. At the fourth stage, individual students were selected from the classroom using incidental sampling technique due to reasons beyond the researcher's control.

The sample included 1209 students from standard X from English medium schools situated in Greater Mumbai. However, even when SES is controlled, students from municipal schools have significantly lower teacher expectations of student performance than those from private-aided and private-unaided schools. Thus, it may be concluded that rather than SES of

students, lower teacher efficacy and highly bureaucratic structure could be the reason for lower teacher expectations of student performance in municipal schools.

Key words: *Teacher expectations, Socio-economic status, School types.*

INTRODUCTION

Every year, students enter and exit the education system; many with very positive experiences, while numerous others, generally those with common attributes and personal situations, endure a very negative educational process. This brings to question what factors influence or contribute to these experiences and the successes or failures of certain students. Many students from low socio-economic status (SES) homes respond negatively to the educational process, typically resulting in low achievement and high drop out rates. This low performance is perpetuated by the self-fulfilling prophecy of low teacher expectations for these low SES students. It is an unfortunate reality to face to realize that the current education system closely resembles Paulo Freire‟s depiction of the "educational banking" format. Many teachers, often unknowingly, stereotype or judge students by appearance, family dynamics, and personal experience; this judgment then creates an opinion of that student and an expectation of the student‟s capabilities to sufficiently fit into the societal mould of success (Freire 1993). At the core of the concept of self-fulfilling prophecy is the assumption that "one person's prediction of another person's behaviour somehow comes to be realized" and that these expectations are communicated "in quite subtle and unintended ways" (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 2000: 286). In essence, this theory states that: a) teachers form different expectations for their students, b) these expectations are communicated to students, and c) teachers' expectations impact, either positively or negatively, on student behaviour and performance. The term teacher expectations refers to everything from predictions to beliefs about current levels of ability and performance, to beliefs about students' normative behaviour (essentially, cooperativeness, rule-following, etc.). This application of the term has been justified because such perceptions and beliefs are often the foundations for predictions, and, to the extent that they are inaccurate, may also produce expectancy effects, a term that refers to either of two related yet very different phenomena. There are two types of expectation effects. (a) Erroneous expectations which may bias or distort the expectancy-holder's judgments. This phenomenon is sometimes referred to as expectancy-confirming bias, perceptual bias, or confirmatory bias. Sometimes teachers' erroneous expectations lead them to judge, evaluate, interpret, or explain students' behaviour in ways consistent with those expectations. (b) The second type of expectancy effect is a self-fulfilling prophecy, which occurs when a teacher's originally false expectation leads to its own actual (not merely perceived) confirmation. A teacher's erroneous expectation leads to its own fulfilment when it leads a teacher to behave differently towards high and low expectancy students, and when those students' achievement changes to confirm the teacher's (originally false, but now true) expectation Both, expectancy-confirming biases and self-fulfilling prophecies are involve expectations causing their own confirmation in some sense. However, they differ in that expectancy-confirming biases occur entirely in the mind of the teacher, whereas the confirmation in self-fulfilling prophecy occurs as a result of an actual change in the behaviour (or achievement) of the target (or student). Sources of teacher expectations are primarily based on student prior achievement and marks and

students' socio-economic status which helps account for their relatively high levels of predictive accuracy.

Review of Related Literature

Rosenthal and Rubin (1978), in their meta-analysis of the first 345 studies of interpersonal expectancy effects, conclusively demonstrated the existence of self-fulfilling prophecies. The overall expectancy effect size was equal to a correlation of about .30 between teacher expectations and student achievement, and the probability of finding the observed expectancy effects, if the phenomenon did not exist, was essentially zero. Much research has addressed how teachers act on their expectations in such a manner as to produce a self-fulfilling prophecy. This research has shown that teachers hold high expectancy students to higher standards of performance and, at the same time, provide a warmer and more supportive environment to them. Differential treatment can lead to self-fulfilling prophecies through either or both of two general routes. High standards means providing high expectancy students with more opportunities to master difficult material. When coupled with the support for doing so, highs may simply learn more material more quickly. In addition, however, differential treatment also may indirectly affect achievement, by enhancing or undermining student motivation. High standards and emotional support are likely to increase students' psychological investment in school, intrinsic motivation, and self-expectations, all of which have well-established beneficial effects on achievement (and, of course, low standards and a cold emotional environment are likely to be demotivating). Research has explored the complex factors and the many potential sources that affect the formation of teacher expectations. For example, Alderman (2004) provides a useful summary of the major sources of the expectations that teachers hold for their students based on research by Alvidrez & Weinstein (1999) and Baron, Tom & Cooper (1985). First, a significant source is related to teachers' beliefs about students' ability and their beliefs about intelligence. Alderman (2004: 174) explains that when teachers consider intelligence as a fixed student characteristic, they are more likely to label students as "smart or dumb and teach them according to the label". Weinstein argues that "one contributor to teacher judgments of ability is student performance" (Weinstein, 2002:54). Another source of teachers' expectations can be students' socioeconomic background, gender and ethnicity. Dusek and Joseph conducted a meta-analysis of research on teacher expectancies and conclude that student characteristics such as student's conduct in the school, race, classroom conduct, and social class "were related to teacher expectancies" (Dusek and Joseph, 1983: 327). Finally, students' test scores, and/or previous academic achievement can be influential in teachers' expectancies. Rivers (1980) quoted in (Dusek and Joseph, 1983) has found that in the early elementary school years an older sibling's performance may influence teachers' expectancies (either positive or negative) for a younger sibling's performance. In addition, van Matre et al (2000) suggest that teachers held higher grade, graduation, and college attendance expectancies for females than for males and for middle-socio economic status (SES) than low-SES students.

Need of the Study

A review of related literature indicates that there are several sources of teacher expectations of student performance. Most of this literature has been produced in the developing countries. the social context in India differs from these countries. In India, school types have been found to influence several student outcomes. However, there is very little

research evidence on school types as a source of teacher expectations of student performance after adjusting for students' SES. Hence the researchers decided to undertake this study.

Definition of the Terms

Teacher Expectations of Student Performance : It refers to the verbal and/or non- verbal indications that teachers give to students regarding their opinion and future potential of students' performance.

School Types : It refers to the agency that establishes and administers the school. In the present study, it includes private-aided, private-unaided and municipal schools.

Socio-Economic Status : It refers to the wealth, power and prestige enjoyed by a student (and his family) and includes size and nature of the family, the type of accommodation, facilities, and services available in the home, articles and assets possessed, total family income, literacy level of parents, occupation of parents, exposure to mass media, library/club membership and interaction among family members.

Methodology of the Study : The investigation was aimed at comparing teacher expectations of student performance in existing secondary school students on the basis of school types. Hence, it has adopted the descriptive method of the causal-comparative type. It may be termed as synchronic in nature as data were collected at one point in time. The researcher has adopted the value added model in the methodology of the present study. The value added model was used to study the value added by the school by adjusting for the effect of the SES on teacher expectations of student performance.

Sample and Sampling Techniques : In order to select the sample of the study, the researchers adopted a four stage sampling procedure. At the first stage, schools affiliated to the Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education (MSBSHE) and situated in Greater Mumbai were selected using stratified random sampling where the strata included the geographical location of the schools namely, South Mumbai, North Mumbai, and Central Mumbai. At the second stage, schools were selected using stratified sampling where the strata include the type of management of schools namely municipal, private-aided and private-unaided. At the third stage, individual classrooms from the selected schools were selected using simple random sampling (lottery method) technique. At the fourth stage, individual students were selected from the classroom using incidental sampling technique due to reasons beyond the researcher's control.

Initially, the data were collected from 1231 students of standard X^{th}. Of these, 22 forms were discarded as they were found to be incomplete. Thus, the final sample size of students was 1209. The wastage arte was 1.78% which is very low. The data were collected from 14 schools with English as the medium of instruction situated in Greater Mumbai and were affiliated to the MSBSHE. The study included 767 boys (63.4%) and 442 girls (36.6%). It consisted of 66 (5.46%), 820 (67.83%) and 323 (36.6%) students from municipal, private-aided and private-unaided schools respectively.

Instruments Used in the Study

1) **Teacher Expectations of Student Performance Scale :** This scale was prepared by Chaurasia (2008). The internal consistency reliability of this tool after modification as

calculated by the split-half method was found to be 0.83 and the test-retest reliability was found to be 0.79. It consists of 32 statements with a four point scale.

2) **Personal Data Sheet for Students :** The tool was developed by the researcher to collect personal information regarding the respondent such as the name, age, gender, the class and division in which he/ she are studying, name and the type of the school.

Data Analysis :

1. **Research Question 1** : Do the Mean Teacher Expectations of Student Performance Scores differ by school type?

Table 1 shows the Mean TESPS and sample size of students from different school types.

Table 1 : Descriptive data of TESPS by school types

School Types	N	Mean
Private-Aided	820	90.78
Municipal	66	85.97
Private-Unaided	323	92.74
Total	1209	91.04
		SD =4.02

The mean TESPS were compared on the basis of school type using the technique of one-way ANOVA. The mean TESPS of private-aided schools, municipal schools and private-unaided schools were compared and the F-ratio was found to be 96.28 ($p<0.0001$) and was found to be significant. It may be therefore concluded that there is a significant difference in the teacher expectations of student performance of students from different school types. Further analysis of the data using t-test revealed that (i) the Mean TESPS of private-aided and private-unaided schools do not differ significantly. (ii) The mean TESPS of students from municipal schools is significantly less than those from private-aided and private-unaided schools.

2. **Research Question 2** : Do the Mean Teacher Expectations of Student Performance Scores differ by school type after adjusting for their socio-economic status?

Table 3 shows the observed and adjusted Mean TESPS from different school types.

Table 3 : Observed and Adjusted Mean TESPS by school types

School Types	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Private-Aided	90.78	91.74
Municipal	85.97	87.23
Private-Unaided	92.74	90.80
Total	91.04	91.04
	SD =11.43	SD =11.07

The Mean TESPS by school type (after adjusting for their SES) were compared using the technique of ANCOVA. The Pearson's r between SES and TESPS was found to be 0.50. The Mean TESPS from private-aided schools, municipal schools and private-unaided schools were compared after adjusting for their SES and the F-ratio was found to be 47.52 ($p<0.0001$) and was significant. It may be therefore concluded that there is a significant difference in the teacher expectations of student performance from different school types after adjusting for their socio-economic status. Further analysis of the data using the t-test revealed that (i) the Mean TESPS of private-aided and private-unaided schools do not differ significantly. (ii) The mean TESPS of students from municipal schools is significantly less than those from private-aided and private-unaided schools.

3. **Research Question 3 :** What is the effect size of school type on teacher expectations of student performance before and after adjusting for their socio-economic status ?

This research question was answered by estimating the effect size of school type on TESPS using Cohen's d which was found to (a) 0.59 when TESPS was compared by school type and (b) 0.41 when TESPS was compared by school type after adjusting for students' socio-economic status.

Conclusions :

1. The Mean TESPS of students from municipal schools is significantly less than those from private-aided and private-unaided schools.
2. The Mean TESPS of students from private-aided and private-unaided schools do not differ significantly.
3. This conclusion remains unaltered even after adjusting for students' socio-economic status.
4. Moreover, the effect size of school type on teacher expectations of student performance is moderate when raw scores are compared but reduces (becomes low) once students' SES is adjusted for.

Discussions : In Mumbai, students going to municipal schools are usually from lower SES and teachers have complete knowledge of this. However, even when SES is controlled, students from municipal schools have a significantly lower teacher expectations of student performance than those from private-aided and private-unaided schools. Thus, it may be concluded that rather than SES of students, lower teacher efficacy and highly bureaucratic structure could be the reason for lower teacher expectations of student performance in municipal schools.

References

1. Alderman, M. K. (2004). *Motivation for achievement: possibilities for teaching and learning*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
2. Alvidrez, J., & Weinstein, R. S. (1999). Early teacher perceptions and later student academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 731-746.
3. Andres, V. (2002). The Influence of Affective Variables on EFL/ESL Learning and Teaching, *The Journal of the Imagination In Language Learning and Teaching*, [Online] Available: http://www.njcu.edu/CILL/vol7/andres.html (29 January 2010)
4. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

5. Boehlert, M. (2005). Self-fulfilling prophecy. In S. W. Lee (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of school psychology*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
6. Brophy, J. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*, 631–661.
7. Brophy, J. (2004). *Motivating students to learn*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
8. Brophy, J. E. (1985). teacher-student interaction. In J. B. Dusek, V. C. Hall and W. J. Meyer, (Eds.), *Teacher expectancies* (pp. 303-327). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
9. Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1974). *Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
10. Harris, M. J., & Rosenthal, R. (1985). Mediation of interpersonal expectancy effects: 31 meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 363–386.
11. Jussim, L. (1986). Self-fulfilling prophecies: A theoretical and integrative review. *Psychological Review, 93*, 429–445.
12. Jussim, L., & Harber, K. (2005). Teacher expectations and self-fulfilling prophecies: Knowns and unknowns; resolved and unresolved controversies. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9(2)*, 131–155.
13. Rosenthal R., & Rubin, D. B. (1978). Interpersonal expectancy effects: The first 345 studies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3*, 377–386.
14. Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and student intellectual development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.