UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AND STUDENTS'

ACHIEVEMENT IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE MFANTSEMAN

MUNICIPALITY

BY

THEOPHILUS ANTAH

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration,

of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the award of Master of Philosophy Degree in Educational

Administration

APRIL 2010

i

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original work and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature:……………………… Date:…………………

Name: Theophilus Antah

Supervisors' Declaration

We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature:…………………… Date:………………

Name: Dr. A. L. Dare

Co-Supervisor's Signature:…………………… Date:………………

Name: Mr. J. M. Dzinyela

ABSTRACT

Teachers in the classroom portray varying degrees of expectation levels in terms of students' achievement. The way that a teacher feels toward the ability of a student can greatly impact the academic growth of that student. The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in junior high schools in the Mfantseman Municipality of the Central Region of Ghana.

The study was a correlational one. The unit of analysis was the school not the individual. In all, 36 schools were selected for the study comprising 18 rural schools and 18 urban schools in the municipality. A total of 205 respondents were randomly selected from the 36 schools. They responded to teachers' and headteachers' questionnaires on their expectations for their schools and the students' in their schools. The BECE result of 2007/08 was used proxy for students' achievement. Descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, Point biserial correlation coefficient and the one-way ANOVA were used to analyse the data of the study.

From this study, no significant relationships exist between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in junior high schools in the Mfantseman Munnicipality. Although weak correlations were found between the variables, it was recommended that in-service training should be organized for heads and teachers of Junior High Schools to sensitize them on the possible unconscious biases.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

To my parents and my siblings Esther, Alfred and Beatrice

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

All over the world, education is accepted as the process by which individuals acquire knowledge, skills and attitudes which enable them to develop their faculties in full. As Agyeman, Baku and Gbadamosi (2000) noted, "it is universally accepted that one of the benefits of good education is that it enables individuals to contribute to development and improvement in the quality of life for themselves, their communities and the nation as a whole" (p.9).

As a result of widespread belief in the potency of education to enhance a people's lifestyle, prosperity and happiness, every nation believes in the need to provide education for its people. Adentwi shared this view by stating that, "much attention has been focused not only on the need to ensure that a greater number of people have unhampered access to education but also that the right quality and relevant education is provided by means of a nation's school system" (Adentwi, 2002, p.2). Especially, in developing countries including Ghana, education is expected to serve as the major means of social change and national development in all its manifestations. It is expected to give the people a better taste and outlook

1

on life and to equip them to better handle the affairs of everyday living. Schools, for that matter, are society's hope for a better future through change.

Basic education is expected to provide a range of basic knowledge and skills, which lay the foundation for further education and training. The significance attached to basic education is clear. Not only is it expected to produce literate and numerate citizens that can effectively deal with everyday life challenges both at work and at home, but also, it serves as a foundation upon which the entire education system is built. It is therefore imperative that countries establish a basic education system that caters for universal access to all children of school going age.

With the nation-wide implementation of the Junior Secondary School (JSS) concept since the latest reforms began in 1987, the country has faced the spectre of a large number of late teenage school leavers the majority of whom are deficient in basic numeracy and literacy skills. The consensus among government, educational professionals, parents and employers is that the innovation of a three-year JSS system to cap a six-year primary education programme has failed to deliver its promise of comprehensively equipping the youth of age bracket with directly employable skills for the world of work (MOE, Youth & Sports, 2004).

In view of this, the Government of Ghana, in 1987, embarked on an Education Reform Programme aimed at improving access to, and quality of education at the basic level. The Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (FCUBE) was introduced as a constitutional mandate and sought to improve quality of teaching and learning as well as quality of education management.

The implementation of Ghana's most recent education reforms, which began in 1987, brought to the fore many problems in the objectives, content, administration and the management of education. There were other major weaknesses in the system which includes poor academic preparation of teachers in the various subject areas and absence of performance standards to guide teaching and learning. A report released in 2002 by The Anamuah-Mensah committee in Ghana noted that the quality of basic education in the country is poor. The report pointed out that the 1987 system had failed to meet expectations in terms of its coverage, quality, equity and economic utility. This underscores the importance of expectations and outcomes in educational systems.

Across the nation, decisions about students and schools are made based upon test scores. Placement within a programme or class, promotion into the next grade level, and receipt of a high school certificate are major judgements that may depend on a student's score on a test that measures the student's level of knowledge in relation to learning standards (Heubert & Hauser, 1999).

The success or failure of students in terms of academic achievement can be attributed to various factors, ranging from the type of educational system being practised, student's health, the degree of family involvement in school, the school environment itself, the expectations that teachers have of each individual student, as well as the student's own ability to learn. Though other reasons could be advanced for students' achievement in school, teachers in particular are often blamed and held accountable for the poor performance of students. It is not surprising therefore that, in Ghana, the Ministry of Education introduced a

measure to demand accountability from school administrators and teachers in a bid to achieve excellence in the public schools following the growing concern throughout the country about low achievement among pupils in public basic schools (MOE, 2000). There is now increased official and public pressure on the teachers to do more effective teaching. One possible factor that has received relatively little attention is the impact of teacher expectations.

Teachers in the classroom portray varying degrees of expectation levels in terms of students' achievement. The way that a teacher feels toward the ability of a student can greatly impact the academic growth of that student (Brophy, 1983; Cooper & Good, 1983; Cooper & Tom, 1984; Dusek, 1985; Good & Brophy, 1997). In addition, the level of efficacy that a teacher has in terms of his/her ability for effectiveness can also make a difference in academic performance, and can influence student achievement in both positive and negative ways (Brophy & Emerson, 1976; Saks, 1995; Weber & Omotani, 1994).

It is important to note, however, that clear evidence indicates that the children who attend school do possess the capacity to learn and that many teachers believe that the students in their classes can learn (Bamburg, 2000). Most important of all is that many schools can be found in a situation where all of the students experience high academic success but in another school the situation will be vice versa. Every dedicated teacher, counsellor and administrator wants all students to learn and achieve their highest possible level. However, not much thought has been given to the part that teacher expectations played in the students' achievement. Emphases are put on other factors which influence academic

achievement such as instructional strategies, social class, student-teacher ratios, students' feeling of self-directed competence, instructional materials and the academic proficiency of the learners (Spinthal & Spinthal, 1990).

Research in the last 20 years has been conducted regarding teacher expectations and their impact on student achievement. Brophy (1983), Cooper and Good (1983), Cooper and Tom (1984), Dusek (1985), and Good and Brophy (1997) reported studies in which the interaction between student and teacher is influenced by the expectations that the teacher develops toward the student. A student tends to fulfil the expectation level developed by the teacher, regardless of whether the expectation is accurately based on the student's abilities. Teachers have also held tightly to their original expectations for students, which can prevent teachers from noticing changes in students' potential during the year (Cooper & Tom, 1984; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1997).

Extensive research shows that expectations exert powerful influences upon both student and teacher behaviour whether the expectations come from external source or are held internally as self-expectations. In America, Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) conducted dozens of controlled experiments to test the power of expectations of teachers on student performance. In their landmark book, *Pygmalion in the Classroom*, they present case after case where teachers were told that a student, or sometimes a whole class, was extremely bright and was predicted to make quantum leap in academic performance in the coming year.

Even though the students were chosen from the school population at large, as long as the teachers believed that these students were exceptional, and the

teachers expected them to do well, the students performed vastly better than other students in the same or similar classes and vastly better than could have been predicted by previous grades or behaviour. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) stated that students' intellectual development is largely a response to what teachers expect and how expectations are communicated. Teachers' expectations are inferences that teachers make about present and future academic achievement and tend to be self-sustaining, affecting both teachers' perception and interpretation of students' action (Bamburg, 2000). Achievement refers to how much a student has learnt as determined by an achievement test. In education, students' achievement can be categorized into three: cognitive or academic (example, reaching levels of competence in say Mathematics); Affective or development of personal social adjustment (feelings, emotions and attitudes); Psychomotor or development of motor skills (reaching specific levels of skills such as in physical education).

Nearly all schools claim to hold high expectations for all students. In reality, however, what is professed is not always practised. Ankomah (2002) investigated factors that account for the high academic achievement of some selected private schools in the Cape Coast Municipality. He identified strong leadership, shared vision and goals, availability of teaching and learning materials, clear focus on teaching and learning, strong teacher affiliation, high expectations for teachers, pupils, and parents, cooperation among staff and orderly environment among other things as essential elements that contributed to the academic success of those schools. The study was an exploratory one and no correlation was established between the factors and the level of student

achievement. The characteristics of the private basic schools studied give an indication that the schools are effective. It takes effective schools to be successful. High expectations are a critical component of effective schools. Edmonds and Frederiksen (1978) stated that teachers in instructionally effective schools have high expectations for all their students. Lumsden (1997) asserted that a characteristic shared by most highly effective teachers is their adherence to uniformly high expectations.

Although some schools and teachers maintain uniformly high expectations for all students, others have "great expectations" for particular segments of the population but minimal expectations for others. Lumsden (1997) suggested that teachers' expectations and beliefs can and do affect students' achievement. Their unconscious biases and assumptions about student potentials have a substantial effect on performance, as low expectation students are given fewer opportunities to perform.

Hilliard (1991) stated that the risk for children learning is not a risk associated with their intelligence. Their failures have nothing to do with poverty, race, language, new pedagogy, or children's family. Studying them may ultimately lead to some greater insight into the instructional process. He suggested that schools can improve student learning by encouraging teachers and students to set their sights high. By expecting high performance from students, by setting high but achievable goals, and by positively reinforcing students, high level learning can be achieved and performance recognized. One thing is certain, if teachers do not expect much from their students, their students will not disappoint

7

them. Low expectations are deadly for student performance. Studies have found out that teachers often behave differently toward students on the beliefs and assumptions they have about them. Moreover, teachers engage in affirming nonverbal behaviours such as smiling, leaning toward, and making eye contact with students more frequently when they believe they are dealing with high ability students than when they believe they are interacting with "slow" students (Bamburg, 1994). Teachers' expectations can predict changes in students' achievement and behaviour beyond effects accounted for by previous achievement and motivation.

Throughout the researcher's teaching experience in the Mfantseman municipality, he has observed that students' failure does not have much effect on the teacher. Most teachers normally put the blame on the student for low performance. Some schools in the municipality have a long tradition of high academic achievement whereas others are noted for poor performance. It is not certain whether the cause of these varying levels of academic achievement has been investigated in the municipality. Now that the Mfantseman Municipal Directorate of Education as well as stakeholders of education in the municipality are looking to improve student achievement and also help all students succeed, there arises the need to focus attention on teachers' expectation since a number of studies have demonstrated its importance in predicting student achievement. Also, teachers need to find out whether high expectations have any relationship with students' achievement.

Though some studies have been undertaken on teachers' expectations and students' achievement, particularly in the U.S. (Brophy, 1983; Cooper and Good, 1983; Cooper and Tom, 1984; Dusek, 1985; Good and Brophy, 1997; and Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968), it appears no such studies on teachers' expectations and students' achievement have been conducted in the Mfantseman Municipality as a way of finding out the relationship that exists between teachers' expectations for students in both urban and rural areas and students' achievement in both areas in the municipality. In view of the issues outlined so far, a research into the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in Ghana is deemed a very useful venture.

Statement of the Problem

Though schools are organized for the development of students, academic achievement remains an important objective for all. Many teachers believe that they can judge ahead of time, sometimes by just a glance, the first day of school, how certain students are likely, over time, to achieve and behave (Bamburg, 2000).

Research has established that the expectations teachers have about their students' behaviour can wittingly or unwittingly influence such behaviour. When teachers expect students to do well, they tend to do well; when teachers expect students to fail, they tend to fail (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

In the Mfantseman municipality, while some schools consistently record high levels of academic achievement, others continue to experience low levels of academic achievement. For instance, in the 2006/2007 academic year, eight

9

schools classified as rural schools scored zero percent in the Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE), while majority of the urban schools scored hundred percent (Municipal Directors' 1st Quarterly Report, 2008).

We do not know whether these differences in students' achievement can be related to teachers' expectations. In other words, it is not certain whether the expectations of teachers in the municipality have any relationship on students' achievement. Neither the proposition that teachers' expectations have a significant relationship with students' achievement is true in the case of schools in the Mfantseman municipality. These were the issues that the study intended to investigate.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate any possible relationships which might exist between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in junior high schools in the Mfantseman Municipality.

Hypotheses

Expectations play an important role in the design for a comprehensive school improvement. Teacher expectations have been shown to have an indelible effect on student achievement. Jussim (1991) argued that children become what significant others, such as parents and teachers, expect them to become. Similarly, Bamburg (1994) noted that teacher expectations do play a significant role in determining how well and how much students' learn. Teacher expectation effects play a fairly significant role in both teaching and learning. But teachers often fail

to take conscious advantage of teacher expectation strategy, which is as a result, unlikely to play its full potential in their everyday teaching (Sweatt, 2000).

According to the perceptual bias hypothesis, teacher expectations predict their own judgements of student achievement (i.e, grades) more than independent assessments of achievement (i.e, standardized test scores) (Jussim, 1991). Thus, teacher expectations may predict grades even when controlling for student achievement because these lead to biased evaluations of student achievement, and not because they have influenced student achievement (Jussim, 1986).

To gain a better understanding of why urban schools make dramatic improvement in achievement than rural schools, a review of the literature indicated that more students in urban schools than rural schools have teachers who expected them to achieve at a high level. Cooney and Bottoms (2002) stated that students in urban schools have high standards in achievement than those in rural schools. They argued that educators expected much from students they thought had the ability to learn. They stated further that students whose teachers demand a lot from them have higher achievement than students who are not expected to do well. On this view, Ferguson (1998) stated that race, socio-economic level, ethnicity, type of school are some of the important part of the information teachers use to form an impression of a student and his or her potential. He argued further that this sort of information may stem not from any dislike of one group or other on the part of the teacher but may simply be conditioned on teachers' previous experience with different types of students.

Additionally, if a teacher knows that a student or a school has performed poorly in the past, then he or she may base his or her predictions on how a student or a school will perform on those factors. Ferguson asserted that teachers' expectations for a student do affect student performance. This, he said, is truer for students in rural schools than students in urban schools. Thus, based on a review of the literature, it was plausible to hypothesise that:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations of students in urban schools and students in rural schools.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of urban pupils and rural pupils.

Good (1987) stated that teacher expectations have a significant relationship with students' achievement. A similar view is shared in the works of Cotton (1989), Bamburg (1994), and Johnson, Livingston, Schwartz, and Slate (2000) cited in Ozturk & Debelak, (2005). Ferguson (1998) observed that teachers have different perceptions and expectations for rural students than urban students. He argued that these differing expectations lead to different teacher behaviours that, in turn, reinforce lower rural students' performance.

A recent work by Strayhorn (2008) in the U.S found that teachers have lower expectations for Black men in rural schools when compared to white male counterparts. Schmoker (2001, cited in Ozturk & Debelak, 2005) argued that schools with exceptional levels of academic achievement consistently demonstrate high expectations and goals supported by data-driven collaboration and ongoing assessment. Within the individual classroom, there is a clear

correlation between teacher expectations and student achievement. Stronge (2002, p. 37 as cited in Ozturk & Debelak, 2005) stated that:

> High expectations represent an overall orientation toward improvement and growth in the classroom, which has been demonstrated to be a defining characteristic of Benchmark school... Effective teachers not only express and clarify expectations for student achievement, but also stress student responsibility and accountability for striving to meet those expectations.

The argument is that students with perceived low ability are given less autonomy when it comes to working on tasks (Saracho, 1991). This would communicate to the student that not much is expected of them because they are incapable of doing well. Here, then, low ability is equated with low expectancies for achievement. Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbacker (1979), Cooper (1984) and Good (1987), as cited by Cotton (1989) have identified numerous factors which can lead teachers to hold lower expectations for some students than others. Among these factors are gender, socio-economic status and type of school. On the type of school, students from rural schools are sometimes presumed to be less capable than students from urban schools. Girls from urban schools also perform better than their counterparts in rural schools. Based on these findings, it is hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of boys in urban schools and boys in rural schools.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of girls in urban schools and girls in rural schools.

Significance of the Study

The study may provide useful information and an empirical basis for the improvement in performance of schools in Ghana. The outcomes may be utilized as explanatory measures of the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievements in schools and may be used by policy-makers as well as researchers alike for identifying certain problem areas in schools when monitoring the performance of the learners within urban and rural schools in Ghana.

The present study may be of benefit to the Mfantseman Municipal Directorate of Education, heads of junior high schools as well as their teachers, in their bid to enhance student achievement in the municipality. The outcomes of the study may provide the directorate with relevant information about teachers' expectations that exist in both urban and rural junior high schools in the municipality. The findings may also help the directorate know which expectations will relate to a high student achievement; hence it will be able to take the necessary measures that will help promote high expectations which will lead to high academic achievement in both urban and rural schools.

Furthermore, the findings may provide information to heads of junior high schools on the kind of expectations that their teachers have about their students in relation to their academic achievement. Moreover, the study will give direction to teachers of junior high schools as to what kind of expectations can promote higher student academic achievement in their schools. Finally, the study will add to the existing knowledge on teachers' expectations and students' achievement.

Delimitation

The study investigates the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in the Mfantseman Municipality in the Central Region of Ghana. Teachers' expectation is a broad concept which can be related to expectation in terms of student behaviour, student success in sporting activities, student academic achievement and others. Student achievement on the other hand can be classified into cognitive (academic), affective (behaviour), and psychomotor (development in sports) achievement.

However, the focus of this study was on teachers' expectations in terms of outcomes or performance of students in the BECE and the students' achievement was related to students' aggregate score in the BECE. This kind of teacher expectation was selected because the present study is concerned with finding its relationship with academic achievement. Also, earlier researchers had demonstrated its superiority in predicting student achievement (Beez, 1968, Cooper, 1984 & Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

The study was delimited to basic schools in the municipality. The rationale for this was that basic education provides the foundation for quality manpower

production in the future. Moreover, it has been central to the educational reform movement in Ghana in recent times. The Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education policy is also an indication of the need for educational researchers and policy makers to redirect attention to this level of education. It is in the light of this that junior high schools have been selected for the study. The study was further delimited to the Mfantseman Municipality in order to find out the relationship that exists between expectations of teachers in the urban areas and that of the rural areas in terms of the achievement of their students in the BECE.

Limitations

One limitation of this study was the measurement of teacher expectations. Teachers had to use their present expectations to predict previous student achievement in BECE and this may have given biased results because the outcomes of students who completed their BECE some years ago might differ from the present students' outcomes in BECE.

Also, some of the schools studied had less than the required number of teachers to be used for the study. This reduced the sample size for the study, and hence might have affected the results.

Operational Definition of Terms

In the study the terms and their explanations as they pertain to the study is as follows:

1 Urban school: these are schools situated within the major towns with
   population over ten thousand in the municipality.

2 Rural schools: these are schools situated in the villages described as deprived communities in the municipality.

3 Teacher expectation: teacher-made predictions about the future behaviour or academic achievement of students, based upon teacher perceptions of the student. For purposes of this study, teacher expectation is defined to include:

4 The grade that teachers expect students to obtain in the Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE).

5 High expectations: teachers exhibit the majority of the attributes for expectations measured, with survey scores above the median.

6 Low expectations: teachers exhibit fewer than half of the attributes for expectations measured, with survey scores below the median.

7 Teacher expectation effects: student outcomes that occur because of the actions that teachers take in response to their own expectations.

8 Self efficacy: the belief an individual has about his/her ability to perform certain tasks successfully.

9 Students' achievement: students' performance in the Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE).

10 Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE): it is the final examination taken by every junior high school student at the end of the three year post primary education.

Organisation of the Thesis

This thesis is developed in five chapters. The first chapter focuses on the background, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, hypotheses, and significance of the study, delimitations and limitations as well as definition of terms. Chapter two covers the review of related literature while chapter three discusses the methodology used in this study. Chapter four presents the results of the analysis and discusses the findings. Chapter five contains the summary of the major findings, conclusions, recommendations and areas for further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews related literature for the problem under study. The study examines the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement. The review was carried out under the following sub-headings:

How expectations are formed by teachers

How expectations influence teacher behaviour and how expectations are

communicated to students

How students interpret and internalize perceived differential teacher treatment

How teacher expectancy effect impacts group, class, and school

How teacher efficacy affects expectations

Expectation implications for the Classroom

The concept of student achievement

Factors that affect student achievement

Measures of student achievement

Studies on teacher expectations and student achievement

Summary

How Expectations Are Formed By Teachers

In the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1995), expectation is defined as "the firm belief that something will happen" (p.404). Lawler, cited in Saracho (1991), defined expectancy as "the persons' estimate of the probability that he will accomplish his intended performance, given the situation in which he finds himself" (p. 27). Saracho (1991) then went on and stated that teacher expectation is the "teachers' estimate of the child's academic performance within the classroom" (p. 27). To expect something is to look forward to its probable occurrence or appearance. With respect to this, Cooper and Good (1983) defined teacher expectation as inferences that teachers make about the future academic achievement of students. Good (1987) also defined teacher expectations as "inferences that teachers make about the future behaviour or academic achievement of their students, based on what they know, or think they know, about these students," and teacher expectation effects as "students' outcomes that occur because of actions that teachers take in response to their own expectations" (p.32). Teacher expectations are, of course, a component of school wide expectations.

Within any classroom, teachers form expectations about the students in the class. These expectations usually form the basis by which students are treated and addressed. Although "teacher expectations" has many definitions, Cooper and Good (1983) and Cooper and Tom (1984) identify three general types of expectations. The first refers to the teacher's perceptions of where a student is "at the present moment." While not really a statement about expectations of future

performance, it does help identify expectation effects. The second type of expectation involves a teacher's prediction about how much academic progress a student will make over a specified period of time. It appears that "expected" improvement is only weakly correlated with a teacher's present assessment of the student. The third, natural discrepancies between teachers and tests, describes the error, either above or below student ability, that a teacher makes in predicting students abilities.

Teachers usually form expectations about students from a variety of sources. They make these expectations based on their "beliefs" concerning whether or not students can change their ability, whether students will benefit from instruction, by their choices in the level of difficulty of student materials, by the grouping structure for classroom instruction, and whether memorization or interpretation and application of concepts is the mode of learning (Good, 1987). Good stated that these beliefs are quite complex and usually are a response to students' beliefs and behaviours. Some expectations are accurate; others are not.

Babad (1985) identified teachers most likely to have biased expectations as those who are less experienced, prefer the lecture method, and have extreme beliefs that integration of students with limited abilities would either be highly successful or have no affect at all on student achievement.

Expectations that are accurate can lead to normal achievement levels that students would have reached based on their prior progress. However, if expectations are not appropriate, the learning level of such students can be significantly hindered (Good, 1987). Tauber (1998) reported that teachers form

21

expectations often during the very first day of school. If first impressions are lasting impressions, then some students are at a definite advantage, while still others are at a definite disadvantage.

The impact that expectations have on students, referred to as teacher expectation effect, occurs in two types: self-fulfilling prophecy effect and sustaining expectation effect (Cooper & Tom, 1984; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1997). Self-fulfilling prophecy effect results when a teacher sets expectations for a student and the student fulfils the expectation. These are the most powerful effects because they result in significant change in student behaviour instead of sustaining students' established patterns. Cooper and Tom believed that severe self-fulfilling prophecy occurs rarely, while mild self-fulfilling prophecies occur more often. The sustaining expectation effect results when teachers base expectations on past behaviour and/or performance, to the point of taking such behaviour for granted, and are then blind to changes in student potential. Usually occurring with students for whom teachers have made low expectations, this effect allows teachers to continue to treat the student in ways that maintain the teachers' low expectations. Cooper and Tom contended that mild sustaining effects are commonly found in classrooms. Cooper and Tom (1984) described research findings on expectation effects in a variety of settings. Statistically significant differences supporting the existence of teacher self-fulfilling prophecies were found in 40% of the studies. Of the 340 teachers who participated in the studies, 70% of them showed student achievement effects in the direction that their expectations predicted.

Experiments have shown that expectations can be based on test results, classroom performance on assignments, group placement, conduct in the classroom, physical appearance, race, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, gender, speech characteristics, or various diagnostic or special education labels (Good, 1987; Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, & Gottfredson, 1995). These erroneous or accurate expectations for students can be either high or low. Good attributed the formation of some low expectations to the teacher's inappropriate knowledge of how to respond effectively to students who are having difficulty learning.

Raudenbush (1984) found that teachers who were familiar with students had expectations for the students which were more accurate. Brophy and Good (1970) developed a model describing how teachers form expectations. The model basically states that teachers form expectations for student behaviour and achievement early in the year, resulting in differing expectations, which cause the teachers to behave differently toward individual students. This differential treatment of the individual student sends a nonverbal message to students as to how they are expected to perform and behave in the classroom. If the teacher consistently interacts with individuals based on expectation, and students passively accept such interactions, the students' self concepts, achievement motivation, level of aspiration, classroom conduct, and interactions with the teacher will all be affected. The effects support the expectations of the teacher, resulting in the students conforming to the expectations more so than they might have if the expectations were different or not present. This sequence will affect student achievement and other outcomes. Perceived high achievers will come

close to their potential, but perceived low achievers will not gain as much as they could have, if they were taught differently. Good (1987) believed that when all of the elements of this model are present, the self-fulfilling prophecy effect occurs.

Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, & Gottfredson (1995) attributed the expectancy effect model to Rosenthal and Jacobson, as based on their Pygmalion hypothesis. This model consists of three parts: the accuracy of teacher expectations, teachers' behaviour based on expectations, and the way that students interpret and internalize teacher expectations and behaviours. Many teachers form expectations about students even before they meet the students. They review school records, which reflect accurate student information, and can usually make correct expectations about the students. After meeting and working with the students, effective teachers can usually change their expectations as more or better information becomes available, which limits the self-fulfilling prophecy effects, although sustaining expectation effects can still be expected (Good, 1987).

Omotani and Omotani (1996) characterized highly effective teachers as those who believe that every student has the potential to learn. No matter what the race, life experiences, interests, family wealth or stability, they do not waiver in their belief. They never use students' less than ideal backgrounds or home life as an excuse for non-performance. In these classrooms, all students will learn.

Cotton (1989) stated that the presence of high expectations is cited at or near the top of each investigator's list of essential elements, along with such related factors as strong administrative leadership, a safe and orderly environment, school-wide focus on basic skill acquisition above all other goals,

24

and frequent monitoring of student progress. Low-achieving schools, meanwhile, are usually found to lack several of these elements. Staff members in these schools generally view their students as being quite limited in their learning ability and do not see themselves as responsible for finding ways to raise those students' academic performance. Low achievement levels are usually attributed to student characteristics rather than the school's managerial and instructional practices.

How Expectations Influence Teacher Behaviour and How
Expectations are Communicated to Students

A teacher's behaviour is influenced by the expectations he or she holds for students. According to Good (1987), most of the research on teacher expectations involves communication of the expectations. Many behaviours have been identified as being present when differential treatment occurs for both high and low achievers. Three major studies by Good (1987) and Good and Brophy (1987, 1997) yielded several characteristics about teacher expectation. Teachers do not give feedback to public responses of low achievers; they seat low achievers farther away from the teacher's desk; they interact with low achievers more privately than publicly, and they monitor and structure low achievers' activities more closely. Teachers also grade tests or assignments in a differential manner in which high achievers are given the benefit of the doubt in borderline cases while low achieving students are not; they provide less quality feedback to questions of low achievers, and they tend not to use effective, but time consuming, instructional methods with low achievers when time is limited. Teachers also

exhibit less acceptance of and use of low achievers' ideas. Studies by Cooper and Tom (1984), Good (1987), and Good and Brophy (1987, 1997) corroborated the following findings about teacher behaviour and expectations: teachers tend to call on low achievers less often to respond to questions and provide less eye contact and other nonverbal communication of attention and responsiveness.

There are several other relevant findings in this area. Teachers tend to wait less time for perceived low achievers to answer (Cooper & Tom, 1984; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987, 1997), give perceived low achievers answers or call on someone else rather than trying to improve the responses to low achievers by giving clues, repeating or rephrasing questions (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987, 1997), and reward inappropriate behaviour or incorrect answers by low achievers, more or less as compensation for not being able to perform as well as high achievers (Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Eccles & Wigfield, 1985; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987, 1997; Graham, 1984). These teachers are also critical of low achievers more often for failure, as compared to high achievers (Cooper, 1979, 1985; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987, 1997).

Additional characteristics have been identified as well. Teachers tend to offer praise more often for high achievers than low achievers (Cooper, 1979, 1985; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987, 1997). They pay less attention to low achievers by interacting with them less frequently (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987, 1997); and they demand less from low

achievers by excessive teacher sympathy or offers of gratuitous, unsolicited help instead of behaviours that should help low achievers meet success criteria (Eccles, & Wigfield, 1985; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987, 1997; Graham, 1984). These teachers have less friendly interaction with low achievers, including less smiling and fewer other nonverbal indicators of support (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987, 1997; Cooper, 1979, 1985; Cooper & Tom, 1984), and use drill assignments for students perceived as low achieving (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good 1987; Good & Brophy 1997).

Good (1987) noted that some of these items have more research support than others. He believed that these behaviours do not indicate teachers are not teaching or are ineffective. He suggested that they be used as guidelines for changing classroom or school environments and by supervisors to analyze behaviours and study effects of teacher behaviour on particular students. Omotani and Omotani (1996) identified three variables that effective teachers modify instead of watering down, changing, or adapting curriculum as they help individual students achieve mastery.

The first variable involves varying the time allocated for the learning of the concepts. Since students learn at different rates, effective teachers manage students who are at varying points in the curriculum, instead of requiring that all students be on the same page at the same time. The second variable involves grouping practices. Effective teachers do not maintain fixed groups, as they realize the impact such groupings can have on students, especially those considered to be slower learners. They employ large-group, heterogeneous

27

instruction with individualized assignments, peer assistance and tutoring, and in-class support services. The third and last variable is methodology. Effective teachers know that one size does not fit all; consequently, they use a variety of strategies to meet each student's needs.

Sometimes, teachers' needs to maintain control and predictability in classroom interactions may promote actions toward low achievers that reduce academic achievement for that group. Teachers who are fearful of losing classroom control may choose to ignore low achieving students when they try to respond to general questions, or they may only call on these students in situations in which the responses are brief and can be tightly controlled. In order to maintain control, these teachers may treat low achievers with less warmth than high achievers. They may not praise the contributions of low achievers as strongly as those of high achievers, as they do not want to encourage low achievers to interact more often, increasing the unpredictability of the students. In addition, they may criticize the weak efforts of low achievers as a means of classroom behaviour control. Just the difference in teacher warmth to students may significantly alter motivation, as low achieving students may not believe that there is a relationship between academic effort and achievement (Cooper, 1979; Cooper, 1985).

Another cause of differential behaviour is linked to how busy the teacher is in the classroom. Most teachers have difficulty monitoring their own responses to various students. A third cause may be related to the difficulty in changing original expectations for students. Most teachers interpret interactions and classroom evidence as supportive of their original assessment of the students. A

fourth reason may be linked to causality. Some teachers firmly believe that they will increase student achievement, and see failure as a need for more instruction, clarification, and increased opportunities to learn.

Teachers who assign blame for failure to learn believe that they should provide less challenge and fewer opportunities to learn. They are more likely to overreact to student failure than teachers who believe they can make a difference. Usually the difference between types of teachers centres around the core belief in the stability of intelligence (Good, 1987). Some teachers believe that students' intelligence is static, while others believe that it can change. Those teachers who see intelligence as fixed tend to blame failure on the child, while teachers who believe intelligence is not fixed tend to blame themselves for a student's failure (Good, 1987).

In a study conducted by Goldenburg (1992), a reciprocal relationship between students and teachers showed that such a relationship influences student achievement to the extent that teacher expectation may not have as much influence on achievement as do teacher actions. In this study, two first grade Hispanic girls in the same classroom were studied for a year. The teacher held high expectations for one child, who actually performed poorly, while holding lower expectations for the other child, who ended the study with high performance levels.

The interactions of the teacher with these two students made the difference in their performances. Since she held high expectations for one child, the teacher assumed that this child could do well on her own, which resulted in the teacher's

failure to intervene when this child fell behind academically. The teacher believed that the young girl was capable of overcoming the difficulties by herself. The other child in the study received more of the teacher's attention and assistance, even though the teacher held low expectations for this child. This student eventually excelled in the classroom. In this case, the expectancy effect had a direct bearing in the achievement level of these two students, with opposite results than what was originally predicted.

Even though the teacher had low expectations for one of the students, she spent more time with this student, which affected the student's self-efficacy. Because she believed the other student more capable, she did not spend as much time with the other student. Her response was contrary to the responses of most teachers involved in the research studies, and illustrates the potential impact a teacher's actions may have in changing the outcome of teacher expectation effect.

Fuchs, Fuchs, and Phillips (1994) conducted a study of classroom expectations, teacher standards, and differential treatment of intact classes. They found that teachers with high standards and strong beliefs about student work habits and classroom behaviour promoted higher student achievement and more individualized planning at the classroom level. These teachers appeared to use better instructional methods and to affect student achievement positively, even though they had students of varying intellectual ability.

How Students Interpret and Internalize Perceived

Differential Teacher Treatment

According to Weinstein (1983, 1985) and Weinstein, Marshall, Brattesani and Middlestadt (1982), students are aware of differences of treatment by the teacher for different individuals in classrooms. Elementary school children see their teachers as projecting higher academic expectations, offering more opportunities and choices for higher achievers, while low achievers get more structured activities, more help from the teacher, and more negative feedback on academic work and classroom conduct. These students also identified where they fit in with the treatment of the teacher. 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" (p.38). Regarding low achieving students, students feel like 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" (p. 38).

Weinstein (1976) also identified reading groups as settings in which students perceived differential teacher treatment. Teachers favoured low reading groups with more praise and less criticism than high groups. Weinstein found the gap in achievement, peer status, and anxiety about school performance between the students in these reading groups increase significantly. The quality of the feedback to the low achievers was found to be different from the feedback for high achievers. Weinstein hypothesized that when high achievers are constantly criticized for their performance, a signal goes out from the teacher that she

31

expects more from them. With fewer criticisms for low achieving students, accompanied by high rates of praise for mediocre work, the teacher communicates to low performers that mediocre is good enough, and that the teacher does not have as high expectations for them as she does for high achievers.

Morine-Dershimer (1982) reported that students can distinguish between praise that is deserved and praise that is motivational or instructional in nature. Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, and Gottfredson (1995) did not distinguish this perception ability by grade level. They found that even within the primary grades, students can tell differences between teacher expectations for their own performance and the performance of other students in the class.

Student perceptions of differential treatment may mediate the relationship between teacher expectations and student achievement. In classrooms with little or no observed differential treatment, student achievement was predicted by previous measures of achievement, which accounted for 64% to 77% of the variance in achievement (Brattesani, Weinstein, & Marshall, 1984). This means that students, in relation to their classmates, continued to perform at about the same levels that they had been performing. In classrooms with high differential treatment, Brattesani, et al. (1984), found student achievement was less effectively predicted by prior achievement, which accounted for only 47% to 62% of the variance. Teachers' expectations explained an additional 9 to 18% of variance in student achievement as compared to 1 to 4 % of achievement variance in low-differentiation classrooms.

According to Cooper (1979, 1985), low achievers' good efforts may go unnoticed in these classrooms with differential treatment, while poor efforts are recognized as the teacher interacts or criticizes the efforts in an attempt to control the behaviour of the low achievers. High achievers begin to see that their efforts pay off, but low achievers have difficulty seeing the relationship between effort and outcome. Theoretically, this should lead to reduction in achievement motivation for low achievers, which would indirectly cause a decrease in achievement.

Good (1987) cited studies by Dweck & Elliot (1983), Eccles & Wigfield (1985), and Graham (1984) in which teacher expectation effects were mediated by teachers' influences on students' attributional thinking, i.e. their thoughts about the reasons for their successes and failures. Low achievers fell into a failure syndrome/learned helplessness pattern, as they believed that they could not do the work because they were dumb. The students believed that their successes were caused by luck, while failures were the result of the lack of ability rather than lack of effort or the reliance on ineffective strategies. Over time, these students came to believe that they could do nothing that would allow them to succeed, so they quit trying. The researchers attributed the reinforcement of this belief by students to the indirect actions of teachers, as they minimize demands on students, overreact to minor successes, treat failures as if they were successes, and respond to failures with pity or excessive sympathy instead of problem identification and remedial instruction. Peterson and Barger (1984) also show that teachers attribute the success of high achievers to ability, while the success of perceived low

achievers is attributed to luck. This attitude makes it difficult for teachers to change their expectations for low achieving students.

How Teacher Expectation Effect Impacts Group, Class and School

In understanding teacher expectation effect, the following shows how student outcomes are affected in groupings within the classroom, as a classroom and in school settings by the actions of teachers in response to the expectations that the teachers have formed. Weinstein (1976) found that reading group membership information contributed 25% to variance in mid-year reading achievement that could be predicted beyond readiness scores from the beginning of the year. High reading groups experienced accelerated achievement rates, while low groups had a much slower achievement rate than what was expected due to variation in readiness. Weinstein offered several possible explanations. He stated that good groups tend to get longer reading assignments, have more time to discuss stories, and are more demanding than low groups. Teachers tend to interrupt low group students more often when they make reading mistakes, giving them word or prompt with graphemic cues instead of offering semantic and syntactic cues that would help the lower students figure the word out from its context. In addition, teachers do not ask higher-level, comprehension questions with the low groups. Also, low groups usually receive less exciting instruction, have less emphasis on meaning and conceptualization, and more time on rote drill and practice activities.

The Commission on Reading (1984) in U.S summarized the problem for low achieving students. These students are involved in reading words more often

from lists or flashcards than within context or within stories and teachers tend to ask them factual questions that do not require reasoning. Other studies have had similar results. Grant & Rothenberg (1986) conducted a study of first and second grade reading groups, and found that students in higher groups had more opportunities to demonstrate competence, their work and task environments were conducive to learning more academic skills, and they had greater opportunities to practise self directed learning. Allington (1983) found that a focus on oral or silent reading forces a teacher to behave in particular ways. Lower groups tend to experience more oral reading, with emphasis on correct pronunciation and proper word sequence. Higher groups tended to experience more silent reading, with the teacher asking questions leading to text meaning and student understanding.

In terms of class effects, Good (1987) and Good and Brophy (1997) found that most formal research concerning student achievement by class or group has been ignored, but predicted the relationship would probably be the same as for expectations and behaviour toward individual students. In this respect, Oakes (1985) found that major differences exist between high- and low-track classrooms. These differences contributed to the quality of knowledge, the amount of time assigned to learning, the amount of high quality teaching, and intellectual stimulation from peers. She found that 35% of heterogeneous classes were more like high-track than average or low-track classes; 36% of heterogeneous classes were like average-track classes (total of 71%). She also found that teacher-student relationships were comparable in 46% of high-track classes, 37% of average classes, and only 17% in lower-track classes. In 83% of

the comparisons, slower students experienced positive and supportive interactions with teachers when in mixed ability classrooms.

Beckerman and Good (1981) found mixed ability grouping works in a classroom when high achieving students establish a climate that encourages learning. Cooper and Tom (1984) found that expectation effects are more likely found in content areas that allow the greatest variation in instructional styles. Good and Brophy (1997) identified classrooms that have uniform goals, a narrow range of activity structures, norm-referenced achievement standards, a competitive atmosphere, public performance evaluation, an emphasis on achievement instead of effort, and differential treatment of high and low achievers as classrooms with the greatest potential for expectation effects.

High expectations and a commitment for increasing student achievement are a part of the beliefs, attitudes, and behavioural patterns that exist in successful schools (Brophy, 1986; Good & Brophy, 1997). Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbacker (1979) found that teachers in effective schools set goals that were minimally acceptable, which allowed them to act on their expectations for students. These teachers were challenged by student failures, which meant that they required students to redo work that was not acceptable, instead of overlooking the assignment or sending the students out for remediation elsewhere. They responded in class to mistakes and failures with appropriate feedback and reinstruction instead of lowering standards or using inappropriate praise.

How Teacher Efficacy Affects Expectations

Teachers who consistently respond to students positively, regardless of the expectations they have for the students, believe that they can assist students in the learning process. Brophy and Emerson (1976) taught that successful teachers believed that their students could master curriculum objectives and that they as teachers meet the instructional needs of their students. These teachers supplemented classroom material when needed, including evaluation methods if existing materials did not seem to meet the needs of the students. Ross (1995) defined this belief as teacher efficacy.

Ashton (1985) measured teachers' sense of efficacy by their response to the following statements. The first stated that teachers really can not do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends upon his or her own environment. The second stated that if a teacher tried really hard, he or she could get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students. High efficacy teachers rejected the first statement and agreed with the second.

High efficacy teachers are more at ease in the classroom, they smile more, provide students with more positive interactions, manage their classrooms more successfully, are less defensive, more accepting of student disagreement and challenges, and more effective in producing student achievement gains. They spend more time teaching curriculum and interacting with students on academic content. Low efficacy teachers expressed lower expectations and focused on rule enforcement and behaviour management (Ashton, 1985).

Efficacy can be divided into two main categories; the first of which is teaching efficacy. This label describes the attitude that any teacher's ability to bring about student achievement is limited by external factors surrounding the personal circumstances of the student. The second term, personal efficacy, is the belief that the individual teacher can influence student learning. The degree of success depends on the efficacy of the teacher. High efficacy teachers usually produce high achieving students, as they take responsibility for the learning of their students. If the students do not learn, these teachers find a more appropriate method of instruction. Conversely, low efficacy teachers usually produce lower achieving students, as they place the responsibility for learning solely on the student (Weber & Omotani, 1994).

Expectation Implications for the Classroom

Much of the research conducted on teacher expectations has occurred within the classroom environment, focusing on the interactions between the teacher and individual students or groups of students. The teacher significantly impacts on the achievement level of the students, therefore implications for the classroom teacher have been identified.

Brophy and Good (1974) and Good and Brophy (1997) identified a reactiveness continuum for teachers. The continuum goes from proactive to reactive to over-reactive. Proactive teachers intuitively determine what is reasonable and appropriate as goals for the class as a whole as well as for individual students. If their goals are realistic, and they possess the needed skills, they will move their students toward fulfilling the expectations associated with

38

their stated goals. Over-reactive teachers set rigid, stereotyped perceptions of their students based on prior records and/or first impressions. These teachers treat students according to their stereotype, and are most likely to have negative expectation effects on their students. Reactive teachers fall in between these two types, and most teachers can be found here. They hold their expectations lightly and adjust them according to new feedback and trends. These teachers have little expectation effect on their students, as they maintain existing differences between high and low achievers.

Brophy (1983) and Good and Brophy (1997) found that the largest expectation effect that teachers have on students is negative, as they set low expectations and therefore get low achievement. There is little evidence that proactive teachers significantly effect the achievement of individual students by setting positive expectations, while there is substantial evidence that over-reactive teachers minimize student achievement by setting low expectations.

Good (1987) found that overall, teachers' reactions to low achievers indicate limited and unsuccessful repertoires of teaching strategies such as more rote memorization and endless seat work. Teachers who tend to be less tolerant of low achievers criticize low achievers more than high achievers, and praise low achievers less than high achievers. Teachers who tend to be excessively sympathetic and protective of low achievers tend to praise marginally correct or incorrect responses of low achievers. Both types of teachers send signals that effort and classroom performance are not related, and tend to stimulate less

student thinking. This can contribute, over time, to low achievers developing a passive learning style.

Good and Brophy (1997) identified personal characteristics that are likely to be found in classrooms where differential treatment of students occur. In these classrooms, teachers tend rigidly to maintain expectations, tend to disown the responsibility for mastery learning, view student ability as uniform and fixed with little room for improvement due to instruction and frequently comment on student ability differences. These teachers repress and/or rationalize instructional failures instead of trying to overcome and improve them, and display poor classroom management and instructional skills. The degree to which these traits exist in any one classroom has a direct bearing on the negative expectation effects that will result in the classroom. The younger the students, the more powerful the effect.

Effective schooling research indicated that teachers in effective schools hold high expectations for students and act in ways that mirror those expectations (Good & Brophy, 1997). These teachers shared ideas and educational materials as they collaborated to bring about improved student performance. Cotton (1995) substantiated these characteristics as well as others in her research synthesis on effective schooling practices. In terms of teacher-student interactions in effective schools, teachers indicate high expectations for student learning in that they (p. 17-18):

1   set high standards for learning and let students know they are all expected
     to meet them. They assure that standards are both challenging and
     attainable.

40

2 expect *all* students to perform at a level needed to be successful at the

   next level of learning; they do not accept that some students will fail.

3 hold students accountable for completing assignments, turning in work,

   and participating in classroom discussions.

4 provide the time, instruction, and encouragement necessary to help lower

   achievers perform at acceptable levels. This includes giving them learning

   material as interesting and varied as that provided for other students, and

   communicating warmth and affection to them.

5 monitor their own beliefs and behaviour to make certain that high

   expectations are communicated to all students, regardless of gender,

   socioeconomic status, race, or other personal characteristics. Teachers avoid

   unreliable sources of information about students' learning potential, such as

   the biases of other teachers.

6 emphasize that different students are good at different things and reinforce

   this by having them view each other's products and performances.

   According to Good (1987), asking questions of low achieving students more often will not improve student achievement unless the quality of questions improves. Increased wait time across the board is not effective, as the type of question asked should determine the amount of wait time and the cues that are needed to prompt a low achiever to find the answer.

   From the research, Good and Weinstein (1986) recommended that teachers:

1 broaden the goals of lessons and activities to include application

opportunities as well as practice and mastery of basic content and skills.

2   pay more attention to students' ideas and interests and encourage

students to play a larger role in assessing their own performance.

3   allow more opportunities for students to participate actively in lessons

and use materials in meaningful ways.

4   improve the quality of questions, using higher levels of Bloom's

taxonomy.

5   focus on the positive aspects of learning by encouraging groups to

move toward learning goals.

Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, and Gottfredson (1995) studied the Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA) Programme, which is a model used in classrooms to reduce disparity in educational achievement across race and gender. The model identified fifteen classroom behaviours that are implied by research to be effective practices. Categorized into three types, the behaviours were monitored and found to be used more often with perceived high achievers. Those behaviours identified as response opportunities include equitable distributions of response opportunities, individual helping, response latency, delving, and higher level questioning. Behaviours identified as feedback include affirmation of correct performance, praise, reasons for praise, listening, and accepting feeling, while behaviours listed as personal regard include proximity, courtesy, personal interest, touching, and desisting.

Weber and Omotani (1994) reported that certain attitudes will be present in the classrooms of low efficacy teachers: Low academic standards are held for

low achieving students; there is less monitoring of on-task behaviour of low achieving students; negative attitudes toward low achieving students are present; negative means are used to manage low achievers, and low achievers are sorted and stratified.

Weinstein, Madison, and Kuklinski (1995) suggested that preventive action for increasing student expectations must move beyond teacher-student interactions so that the understanding of the context in which expectations for students, teachers and schooling are embedded can occur. This two year study focused on at-risk ninth graders in an inner city high school. The researchers identified perceived constraints inhibiting change. These constraints were attributed to negative attitudes, negative behaviours and climate, insufficient resources of ability and skill level of students as well as physical classroom conditions, and school policies that supported tracking and prevented innovations.

In order to address these perceived obstacles, the teachers began to meet regularly, and as a group, began to exchange, plan, take action, and evaluate the circumstances that prevented positive change from occurring. With this collaborative effort, obstacles became opportunities, and teachers began to take more ownership in developing alternative strategies, which resulted in more positive expectations. The teachers began to understand that they had a major influence in student learning, and student performance increased. Not only did teacher efficacy and positive teacher expectation effect increase, but the infrastructure necessary to support the collaborative environment was established.

The research on teacher expectations and the impact on student

achievement is abundant and the findings are repetitious. Enough evidence has been collected to show support for the importance of examining the expectations that teachers have for the students in their classrooms. The research available regarding teacher attitudes toward standardized testing is not nearly as plentiful.

Student Achievement

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1995) defined achievement as a thing done successfully especially with effort and skills. Spinthal and Spinthal (1990) asserted that academic achievement is what a student is able to achieve when he is tested on what he has been taught. Similarly, Anastasi (1984) explained academic achievement as being determined by intelligence and therefore measures it in terms of intelligence quotient scores.

Achievement is a global concept which enshrines several diffused major purposes, for example, transmitting the culture, establishing basic educational skills, enabling people to earn a living, enriching people's personal development, providing a variety of learning experiences, enhancing capacity for choice, promoting social awareness and social behaviour and the likes.

Sadker and Sadker (1984) noted that learning is enhanced when students understand what is expected of them and get recognition for their work, learn about their errors and receive guidance in improving their performance. They further note that pupil achievement is likely to increase when students get clear instruction and are given specific feedback about their answers.

Sadker and Sadker have outlined three models of teaching that enhance student achievement. These are direct teaching, co-operative learning and mastery

learning. In direct teaching, they note that the teacher has to exhibit skills of a strong leader, structure the classroom and sequence the subject matter to reflect a clear academic focus. To them, the direct teaching is based on the principle of presentation of new information followed by student practice and teacher feedback. They further note that "with direct instruction teachers explain what students must do to accomplish a task, then present carefully structured lesson that is usually broken down into small manageable steps"(p.57). Direct instruction works better when one is teaching skill subjects such as grammar and Mathematics.

Six principles of direct teaching have been outlined by Sadker and Sadker. These are:

1 Daily review of previous lesson which is focused on assigned homework, clarifying points of confusion, and extra practice for facts and skills that need more attention.

2 New material that is presented to students by letting them know the objectives to be attained. The new information is broken into smaller steps and is covered at a brisk space. Main points are illustrated by use of concrete examples and the teacher asks questions frequently to check for student understanding to make sure that students are ready for independent work using new skills and knowledge.

3 Guided Practice, where students use new skills and knowledge under direct teacher supervision. Teachers ask a lot of questions at this stage and use

the students' responses to check for understanding and evaluation of the progress made.

4 Corrective and feedback: Here, correct answers to questions are acknowledged clearly for students to understand when their work is accurate, when student answers are hesitant, the teacher provides process feedback as in "yes, that is correct because……."

5 Independent Practice: Here students work by themselves at their seats or at home. Independent practice continues until responses are assured, quick, and at a level of approximately 95 percent accuracy.

6 Weekly and monthly reviews which offer students opportunity for more practice, a strategy that is related to high achievement. Rosenshine (1968) cited in Sadker and Sadker (1984) recommends weekly review on every Monday and monthly review on every forth Monday.

For co-operative learning, Sadker and Sadker (1984) noted that students depend on one another and work together to reach shared goals. The group should therefore be heterogeneous and small, limited to two or six members in a circular arrangement to permit easy conversation. According to Sadker and Sadker, increased achievement by an individual student at any level contributes to the overall performance of the group which results in equal opportunity for success. Sadker and Sadker further note that:

1 Students taught within this structure make higher achievement gains in Mathematics in the elementary grades.

2 Students who participate in co-operative learning have higher levels of self-esteem and greater motivation to learn.

3 Students have a stronger sense that classmates have positive regard for one another.

On mastery learning, Sadker and Sadker noted that it is based on the principle that all children can learn. In mastery learning students are taught the skill or material in the objective, and then they are given a test to determine if they have met the objective. When students complete a test successfully they go on for an enrichment exercise whilst those who fail to demonstrate mastery of an objective participate in corrective instruction. A retest is done to ascertain which group needs additional instruction.

To Sadker and Sadker "all students in a regular classroom can master academic objectives if they are given sufficient time" (p.56). Their view is based on the mastery learning model for effective instruction or teaching. They further note that the success of mastery learning rests on a close match between what is taught and what is tested. It is also observed that in mastery learning students work at their own pace as in individualized programmes and they go to new materials only when mastery of previous work has been demonstrated while the teacher merely provides assistance, and the teacher plays a vital role in determining the pace of instruction.

Sadker and Sadker indicated that homework influence students' achievement, particularly when it is accomplished by teacher feedback. In view of this, Pascal, Weinstein and Walberg, (1984) noted that homework assigned with

teacher feedback raises the score of the typical student from 50th to 60th percentile. They noted further that when graded exercises are provided and feedback is given to pupils on homework it increases achievement levels from 50th percentile to 79th percentile.

Flanders (1960) cited in IDRC-Manuscript Report (1981), observed that various aspects of praise and corrective feedback are positively correlated with pupils' achievement. Furthermore, they note that the way teachers respond to pupils learning by summarizing, applying ideas, building on them or asking questions based on what they have been taught contributes positively to pupil's achievement and positive attitude to learning.

Factors That Affect Students' Achievement

The success or failure of students in terms of academic achievement can be attributed to various factors, ranging from the type of educational system being practised to the students' own ability to learn. The first factor which creates barriers to student achievement is student attitudes and beliefs. Students with low expectations for themselves become frustrated and give poor effort, a cycle called failure syndrome (Brophy, 1998). Students' lack of confidence in their own ability to learn and to be successful as well as their disengagement, or lack of connection with the learning leads to low achievement (Arroyo, Rhoad and Drew, 1999, cited in Baird, Pavelsky, Savage, & Valburg, n.d). Lack of self-efficacy, one's own belief that one has the power to achieve, also results in poor achievement.

Coleman (1966) found that a student's personal feeling or self-directed competence was the most important factor determining academic achievement. It

was seen to be more important than a whole host of seemingly crucial variables like social class differences, race, and pupil-teacher ratio, number of books in the library and even the background of the teachers. Thus, academic achievement depended heavily on the student's personal conviction of being in charge of his or her own fate and not "chance" or "luck". White (1959) stated that strong personal desires to master one's environment affect one's achievement. To him, competence motivation can drive an individual to be the author of his own life.

Another key determinant of students' achievement is the quality of teaching. An effective teacher should possess at least a thorough knowledge of the subject matter being taught, an appropriate repertoire of pedagogical skills and motivation. The teaching force in many developing countries fails to meet standards. Governments that are serious about achieving an effective primary education system will have to commit themselves and their resources to solving this problem. One study that appears to support the back-to-basis movement found that children show higher level of overall achievement when teachers spend larger amount of time in directing teaching of Reading, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies than in Music, Art or social awareness (Rosenshine, 1980).

Parental attitude to formal education is another factor which affects student academic achievement. Parents have a major role to play in the education of their children. For pupils to be serious and committed to their academic work, parents should prepare and coax them to be committed to their school work. This could be done through the provision of their school needs, payment of fees, helping them to learn after school hours and others. Mittler and Mittler (1982)

noted that, particularly for children with difficulties, there is the need for parental involvement in the assessment and diagnosis of the child's skills, abilities and teaching requirements and indeed this is enshrined, albeit in bureaucratic obfuscation in the 1981 Education Act. The implication is not that parental observation should be acquired and shifted by professionals, but information giving to mental and mutually accountable. Thus, parents should have access to school records and the facility for commenting on these.

Teaching and learning are considered as opposite sides of the same coin because teaching is held to be a process that facilitates learning. But for effective learning to take place, motivation and better conditions of service for teachers is required. Agyeman (1993) noted that teachers everywhere in the world have had very bad service conditions compared to other professions. He further explained that teachers generally receive less salary than their counterparts even in the administrative positions. Thus, a teacher who is academically and professionally qualified but works under unfavourable conditions of service would be less dedicated in his work and thus be less productive than a teacher who is both academically and professionally qualified but works under favourable conditions of service. Dzobo (1972) indicated that to attract qualified teachers into teaching, it is very necessary to enhance the image and standard of teachers in the society by improving the academic and professional qualification of teachers and also by providing conditions of service that are comparable to those in other professions. The above statements show that, to attract teachers and maintain them in the

classroom, their conditions must be improved upon. This, in my view would motivate teachers more in order to give out their best.

Finally, the school culture itself can create barriers to student success. If curriculum fails to have meaning and relevance for students, those students simply do not try (Arroyo, Rhoad and Drew, 1999, cited in Baird, Pavelsky, Savage, & Valburg, n.d). Schools must provide academic opportunities for all students and visibly promote the expectation that all students, regardless of individual circumstances, can succeed.

Measures of Student Achievement

The common measure of student achievement is the achievement test. Achievement tests are used to measure what an individual has learnt and to determine his or her present level of performance. They are also used to determine individual or group status in academic learning. Achievement test scores help to place, advance or retain students at a particular grade level. They also serve as instruments for assessing strengths and weaknesses and provide a basis for awarding prizes, scholarships, or degrees.

According to Best and Kahn (1998), most of the achievement tests used in schools are nonstandardized; they are most often teacher-designed tests. They also pointed out that there are standardized tests used to compare schools and school districts. These include tests such as California and Iowa Achievement Test Batteries, the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), The Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) and the World Knowledge Tests (Thorndike, 1973).

In Ghana, there are two major assessment methods used in junior high schools to evaluate students' academic achievement. These include the Continuous Assessment (CA), and the Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE). The continuous assessment is an important component of students' final examination grade at the end of the junior high school. This type of assessment is formative and is designed to diagnose students' difficulties, identify their talent and develop them. It seeks to collect information on pupils' performance throughout their studies in a systematic and cumulative way in order to obtain more comprehensive information on their abilities and attainments.

The Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE) is used to select pupils into Senior High School. It is the final examination taken by every junior high school student at the end of the three year post primary education. It is conducted once every year by the West African Examination Council (WAEC). This final assessment affords the students the opportunity to gain admission into senior high schools. It is by far the main standardized instrument used to assess the academic achievement of junior high schools in the country.

Studies on Teachers' Expectations and Students' Achievement

Beginning with *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968), an extensive body of research has been developed that describes how teachers' expectations have a significant relationship on students' performance. *Pygmalion in the Classroom* describes an experiment carried out in an elementary school (which the authors call Oak School) to test the hypothesis that in any given

52

classroom there is a correlation between teachers' expectations and students' achievement.

In the experiment, Rosenthal and Jacobson gave an intelligence test to all of the students at an elementary school at the beginning of the school year. Then, they randomly selected 20 percent of the students - without any relation to their test results and reported to the teachers that these 20% of students were showing "unusual potential for intellectual growth" and could be expected to "bloom" in their academic performance by the end of the year. Eight months later, at the end of the academic year, they came back and re-tested all the students. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968, p.viii) stated that:

> Those labeled as "intelligent" children showed significantly greater increase in the new tests than the other children who were not singled out for the teachers' attention. This means that "the change in the teachers' expectations regarding the intellectual performance of these allegedly 'special' children had led to an actual change in the intellectual performance of these randomly selected children.

The teachers were also asked to rate students on variables related to intellectual curiosity, personal and social adjustment, and need for social approval. In what can be interpreted as a 'benign cycle,' those average children who were expected to bloom intellectually were rated by teachers as more intellectually curious, happier, and in less need for social approval.

A study conducted by the Center for Effective Schools (CES) in 1992 as cited in Bamburg (1994), at the University of Washington surveyed the staff of 87

elementary and secondary schools in four urban school districts (Chicago, Detroit, Indianapolis, & Milwaukee) as part of the data collection activities of the Academy for Urban School Leaders, which was sponsored by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL). The surveys, based on CES research, were designed to assess staff perceptions of their school on nine school variables (instructional leadership of the principal, staff dedication, high expectations for student achievement, frequent monitoring of student progress, and early identification of students with special learning needs, positive learning climate, multicultural education, and sex equity). The survey results on the high expectations for student achievement variable indicated that a large percentage of the 2,378 teachers who responded did not have high expectations for the academic achievement of students in their schools.

The study compared the mean score on the high expectations for student achievement variable for all of the schools that CES had surveyed during the past seven years (N of schools = 800) with the mean score for the schools surveyed in this project (N of schools = 87). On a five-point scale (1 = low, 5 = high), the mean score for all schools was 3.61, while the mean score for the 87 schools in this project was 3.01. Percentile norms established by the Center showed that the average mean score for the 87 schools in this study would place them at the seventh percentile in comparison with all schools. This result suggested that teachers in urban schools - regardless of grade level have lower expectations for their students. These results, which include responses from both elementary and secondary teachers, clearly indicate that the teachers in these urban schools do not

expect their students to be successful even though they believe that the students possess the potential to learn.

A study conducted by Shupe (1997) illustrates the impact of teacher expectations on students. The study was conducted on a middle school in Florida (USA) that had the lowest standardized test scores in the district in 1992-1993. The school received students from nine feeder schools, with 40 % of the students coming in with academic deficiencies. Staff at the school developed an immersion programme that placed 75 sixth grade students in a curriculum centred on the basic four core areas, with Science and Social Studies being taught thematically. The daily schedule was not dictated by regimented time allotments to each subject. The teachers decided when to move from subject to subject. What is important about this study is the attitude of the teachers involved in the project. They did not believe that learners differ by intelligence; they believed it merely took some students longer to learn than others. Shupe (1997) reported that these teachers believed that 95% of their students could reach mastery learning as defined by Bloom's mastery learning concept, if adequate time and appropriate instruction were provided. This meant that teachers would not move on to another concept until 95% of the students mastered the current material. Upon closure of a concept unit, the students were tested, and those students who had mastered the material moved on to enrichment activities on the same topic. The teachers worked with the other students on remediation, until these students also achieved mastery. The teachers truly believed they were the key to providing the right instruction to enable these slower students to learn the material.

Failure rates at this school dropped from 28% to 7%. Interestingly, the honour roll increased from 22% to 40% each grading period. The school made the largest gains on the California Test of Basic Skills in the district, in addition to showing the highest cumulative gain on a statewide eighth-grade assessment of writing skills of any school. The study purported that the high expectations and belief systems of the teachers at this school were largely responsible for the success of these students.

Sweatt (2000) conducted a study on "The Relationship among Teacher Expectations, Teacher Attitudes towards the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS), and Student Achievement". The teacher expectations for students data was collected from a survey. Students' achievement information was collected from average Texas Learning Index Score for students by classroom over a two year period. The sample consisted of 22 4th, 8th, and 10th grade reading and/or Mathematics teachers who had taught in the same Texas, mid-sized, rural schools district for at least two years. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, a one-way ANOVA and the t-test.

The study revealed that a majority of teachers have high expectations for students to learn while in their classes so that the students are prepared for the next level of education, and feel very responsible for making sure that the students master their basic skills, although they are ambiguous in terms of the impact they have against outside influence that affect students. However, teachers in this study do not have the same level of expectation for all students. They believe students can learn at or above grade level. All of the teachers encouraged low-achieving

students to elaborate on ideas, ask questions, and seek assistance. It appears in the study that no relationship exists among teacher expectations for students and student achievement on the TAAS.

Strayhorn (2008) carried out a study to measure the relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement among urban Black males. The study adopted ex-post facto survey design using data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS:1988/2000) sponsored by the U.S Department of Education, National Centre for Education Statistics (NCES). The NELS: 88/00 consists of over 6,000 variables and includes surveys from students, teachers, parents, and administrators in a series of data collection waves. The analytic sample consisted of African males (based on responses to the demographic section of the survey) whose living arrangement was described as an "urban" setting. The students were selected to represent the national population of 8th graders.

It was found out that teachers have lower expectations for Black men when compared to their White male and Black female counterparts. Sixteen percent (16%) of Black men reported that their teachers recommend work rather than school. The study used bivariate correlation and regression tests to measure the strength and direction of the relationship between teacher perceptions and academic achievement, as measured in the 8th grade. The study revealed that African America males' math achievement had a strong, positive relationship with their science achievement ($r = 0.74$, $p < 0.01$). And, as expected, students who reported being "put down" by their teachers in class had statistically

significantly lower math (r = 0.21, p < 0.05) and science (r = 0.26, p < 0.05) scores than their peers.

Trouilloud, Sarrazin, Martinek and Guillet (2001) explored the relation between teacher expectations and student achievement in physical education classes during a 10-week session, in the light of three hypotheses. Study data were obtained from 173 students and 7 teachers. Path analysis revealed that teacher expectations have weak self-fulfilling effects, strongly predicted student achievement mainly because they are accurate, and have no biasing effects on teacher judgements. Results also bring evidence concerning the role of partial mediator of student perceived ability in the confirmation process of teacher expectations.

Summary

The literature has shown that a teacher expectation does not lend itself to one definition. Each author approaches it from different perspective or focuses on a different element. Some researchers view teacher expectation as inferences that teachers make about the future (Good & Cooper, 1983). Others examined teacher expectation in terms of the teacher's estimate of the child's academic achievement (Saracho, 1991, Cooper, 1984).

Since *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968), a wealth of research has accumulated concerning the effects of teacher expectations on students' achievement. This study fostered the expectation research explosion that emerged in the mid 1970s and 1980s. Throughout the research, the findings tend to be repetitious. Most studies focus on the communication of expectations to

students by the teacher, and how students interpret the signals sent by teachers regarding expectations.

Again, most studies are centred around expectations for individual students and not whole groups or classrooms. The majority of results indicate the existence of a direct correlation between how a teacher sees a student in terms of their ability and the performance level of the student. This is a complex issue, because of the multiple ways in which teachers develop and convey expectations for students. This expectation effect can be positive or negative, depending on the original expectations of the teacher, and the ability of the teacher to be flexible and constantly re-evaluate his or her original expectations in relation to more accurate and practical expectations. Teacher and student efficacy are vital components to student achievement and teacher expectation effect.

From the literature reviewed, the research indicates that teachers' expectations can and do affect teacher-student interaction and student outcomes. The literature attempted to explain the relationship in a more succinct and detailed manner by attributing the relationship to one or more of a perceptual bias, sustaining expectation effect and a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Numerous studies have shown that high and low expectations on the part of the teacher lead to observable differences in achievement. High expectations and standards are necessary and all students, except those with specific disabilities, should be able to meet those expectations and standards. Studies have also shown that the perceived cause of the event will influence the expectations

for future success or failure and that these perceived causes can be transmitted from teacher to student.

Finally, the literature has shown that expectations arise from the misguided behaviour of stereotyping and labeling and also influences like gender, race, and socio-economic background of students.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methods for the study. The rationale was to provide an approach that helped the researcher to study the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement. The research design, population, sample and sampling techniques, research instruments for data collection, pre-testing of instruments, data collection procedures, and the plan for analysis of the data were described.

Research Design

This research explored the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in junior high schools in the Mfantseman Municipality in the Central Region of Ghana. The correlational design was deemed appropriate for the study. Correlational research attempts to investigate possible relationship among variables without trying to influence them. It tries to determine whether and to what extent a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables (Gay, 1987). It also describes the degree to which two or more quantitative variables are related by using the correlational coefficient.

Generally, correlational studies are carried out to explain important human behaviours and characteristics in quantitative terms, and how they relate. In addition, correlational studies help in the prediction of events, that is, if a relationship of sufficient magnitude exists between two variables, it becomes possible to predict a relationship on either variable if a score on the other variable is known. However, correlation does not necessarily establish cause-and-effect relationship. The fact that there is a relationship between two variables does not imply that one is the cause of the other.

The Product-Moment Correlation coefficient, usually referred to as the Pearson correlation coefficient, symbolized by r, is an index of strength of relationship (Sarantakos, 1988). This is appropriate when both variables to be correlated are expressed as ratio or interval data to determine the correlation between the two variables. Since most instruments used in education, such as expectations and achievement are expressed in the form of interval data, the Pearson computation was considered to be the most appropriate method used in this study. Teacher expectations levels were identified from scores on a teacher expectation questionnaire, again using the median score to distinguish high and low expectations. These data were compared among two variables to determine if relationships existed among any of the variables.

Population

The population for the study was made up of teachers and headteachers in both urban and rural junior high schools in the Mfantseman Municipality. The study was basically about teachers' expectations of students' achievement and the

62

population should definitely involve the teachers. Teachers who teach at the junior high level were the target for the study. The inclusion of the headteachers of the schools in the municipality was to enable the researcher to get an objective basis for verifying the responses of teachers vis-à-vis those of the headteachers to determine whether the views of teachers matched with or were different from those of the headteachers. There were a total of 93 Junior High Schools and 8 circuits in the Mfantseman Municipality.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample for the study was made up of a selected number of junior high school teachers and headteachers in the municipality. Out of the 93 junior high schools in the municipality, 36 schools from all the 8 circuits were selected for the study in proportion to the total number of schools in the municipality. The break down involved 18 urban schools and 18 rural schools. The selection of this sample size was based on the fact that the number of schools in the rural areas was very small and therefore all of them needed to be included in the study. The schools were selected based on their classification level as urban school or rural school. There were 75 urban schools and 18 rural schools in the municipality; and while all of the latter were used, only 18 of the former were selected. This was a major limitation of the study.

The school was the unit of sampling for the study. The headteacher of each of the selected schools was involved in the study. This means a total of 36 headteachers were used for the study. A total number of 169 teachers were selected from all the schools in the 8 circuits. In all, 205 respondents were

selected to answer the questionnaire. These respondents were selected because they were considered to possess the needed information for the study.

Multi-stage sampling procedure was followed. This consisted of stratified random sampling, census selection, proportionate sampling and the random numbers methods. The schools were stratified according to their locations as urban or rural. There were 8 circuits in the Mfantseman Municipality. The rural schools were 18 in number and the urban schools were 75. Because all the 18 rural schools were used in this study, the researcher used census selection in selecting all of them. The circuits did not have the same number of urban schools. Some had more urban schools than the others. The random numbers method was used to select 18 schools from which respondents were used.

In order to obtain the proportion of each circuit for the selection of urban schools, the total number of urban schools in each circuit was divided by the total number of urban schools (75) and multiplied by the number of schools to be selected (18). The Anomabo circuit for example had 12 urban schools divided by 75 urban schools in the municipality and multiplied by 18 urban schools to be selected. This gave 2.88, which was approximated to a total of 3 urban schools selected for this circuit (Cohen & Manion, 1995). Table 1 presents the breakdown of schools selected in the municipality.

Table 1

Breakdown of Selected Schools in the Municipality

Circuit	No. of Schools	No. of Urban Schools	No. of Urban Schools Selected	No. of Rural Schools
Saltpond	16	16	4	0
Anomabo	17	11	3	6
Yamoransa	5	4	1	1
Essarkyir	11	8	2	3
Eyisam	10	8	2	2
Dominase	8	7	1	1
Narkwa	10	7	2	3
Mankessim	16	14	3	2
Total	93	75	18	18

Source: G.E.S- Mfantseman Municipal Education Statistics Office

After the total number of sampled schools for each circuit was calculated, the researcher proceeded with the selection of the schools from each circuit. The random numbers method was used for the selection. A list of names of all schools (from the sampling frame) was obtained, numbered and ordered accordingly. A list of random numbers that contains all numbers included in the sampling frame was used. The researcher pointed a pen at the list of random numbers, the number

that was under the pen point was recorded. The name on the school list that was next to that number was identified. This was the first school. This process went on until the required number of urban schools for each circuit was achieved. All the 18 urban schools selected for the study were obtained through this procedure. Table 2 presents the profile of the selected schools.

Table 2

Profile of Selected Schools

Serial No.	School code	Circuit code	Name of School	Teacher population
1	R1	01	Mampong D/A JHS	6
2	R2	01	Asafora Cath. J.H.S.	5
3	R3	01	Akraman Cath. J.H.S.	4
4	R4	01	Buranomoa D/A J.H.S	6
5	R5	01	Daadaagua D/A J.H.S.	4
6	R6	01	Obuadze D/A J.H.S.	6
7	R7	02	Amisakrom Ekroful	6
8	R8	03	Gyinankoma Cath. J.H.S	4
9	R9	03	Asaman Buadukwa J.H.S	6
10	R10	03	Egyankwa Owuyaa J.H.S	6
11	R11	05	Twa Dunkwa D/A J.H.S	6
12	R12	05	Suprudu D/A J.H.S	6
13	R13	06	Kwasil Ansah D/A J.H.S	6
14	R14	07	Ebiram D/A J.H.S	6
15	R15	07	Srafa-Immuna D/A J.H.S.	6
16	R16	07	Srafa-Wesley J.H.S.	6

Table 2 continued

Serial No	School code	Circuit code	Name of School	Teacher population
17	R17	08	Kuntu D/A J.H.S	5
18	R18	08	Eshiro D/A J.H.S	6
19	U1	01	Anomabo Meth. J. H. S	6
20	U2	01	Anomabo Cath. J. H. S.	6
21	U3	01	Biriwa Meth. J.H.S	6
22	U4	02	Yamoransa Cath. J.H.S	6
23	U5	03	Essarkyir D/A J.H.S	4
24	U6	03	Esuekyir D/A J.H.S	5
25	U7	04	Saltpond Meth. J.H.S	6
26	U8	04	Saltpond Ahm. J.H.S	6
27	U9	04	Komantse D/A J.H.S	6
28	U10	04	Abandze Meth. 'A' J.H.S	6
29	U11	05	Nanaben D/A J.H.S	6
30	U12	05	Dominase Ang. J.H.S	6
31	U13	06	Eyisam D/A J.H.S	6
32	U14	07	Narkwa D/A J.H.S	6
33	U15	07	Ekumpoano Cath. J.H.S	6
34	U16	08	Mankessim Meth. 'B'	6
35	U17	08	Mankessim D/A 'A'J.H.S	6
36	U18	08	Baifikrom D/A J.H.S	6

A sample size of 169 teachers and 36 headteachers was used for the study.

Because all the teachers and the headteachers in the selected schools were

involved in the study, the census selection was used in selecting all of them. Five teachers and a headteacher were selected from each school to respond to a questionnaire. In a school where the teachers were not up to 5, all of them were involved in the study. The headteachers of the selected schools were automatically included in the study because all of them were needed to provide information for the study. Only teachers who teach in the junior high school level were involved in the study. The choice of the number of teachers in a school was based on Ghana Education Service quota for a total number of teachers to be at post in a single school. In a double stream school, five of the teachers were randomly sampled to respond to a questionnaire. The results of all 2858 students who completed their BECE in 2007/08 academic year in the selected schools were used in the study.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire was the main research instrument designed to gather data for the study. The questionnaire was designed for both teachers and headteachers. The items in the teachers' questionnaire were similar to those in the headteachers' questionnaire. The questionnaire measured respondents' expectations of students in their school and their expectations for boys and girls in relation to their achievement in BECE in their schools.

The questionnaire for both teachers and headteachers was divided into four sections. Section A consisted of 8 items (item 1-8) that sought the demographic data of respondents. The section was deemed necessary because independent variables like sex, age, highest academic qualification, and others can

cause variations in teachers' expectations of students in schools. The section consisted of a number of alternatives from which respondents were to select the applicable ones.

Section B comprised 10 items structured to find out teachers' and headteachers' expectations of students in their respective schools. Section C and D consisted of 6 items each, structured to find out teachers' and headteachers' expectations for both boys and girls in their respective schools.

All the 22 items which formed the section B through to section D of the present study were simple descriptive statements. The basic structure of the questionnaire was based on the Likert scale format, which was seen as the most simple but equally efficient approach for studies in social research (Oppenheim, 1973). Respondents indicated the extent to which each statement best described their response on the occurrence of each of them on a 5-point Likert-type scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The respective weights for the responses were as follows:

5   Indicates 'strongly agree'

4   Indicates 'agree'

3   Indicates 'undecided'

2   Indicates 'disagree'

1   Indicates 'strongly disagree'

Few items in the questionnaire were obtained from Bamburg (2000) and Cotton (1995) on teachers' expectations for students' learning. Some of the items were either changed or slightly modified to accommodate inter-cultural and

69

structural differences and to avoid item repetition and logical inappropriateness.

Items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 were obtained from Bamburg (2000). The item 8 "Most students in my school are capable of mastering grade level academic objectives", was modified to read, "Most students in my school are capable of attaining grade level academic objectives".

Furthermore, items 14, 15, 16, and 17 were obtained from Cotton (1995). The items "Set high standards for learning and let students know they are all expected to meet them", "Expect all students to perform at a level needed to be successful at the next level of learning", "Provide the time, instruction, and encouragement necessary to help lower achievers perform at acceptable levels", "Monitor their own beliefs and behaviour to make certain that high expectations are communicated to all students, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, race, or other personal characteristics", and "Emphasize that different students are good at different things and reinforce this by having them view each other's products and performance", were respectively modified to read "Teachers in my school set high standards for learning and let students know they are all expected to meet them", "Teachers in my school expect all students to perform at a level needed to be successful at the next level of learning", "Teachers in my school provide the time, instruction, and encouragement necessary to help lower achievers perform at acceptable levels which will improve performance", "Teachers in my school monitor their own beliefs and behaviour to make certain that high expectations are communicated to all students, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other personal characteristics", "Teachers in

70

my school emphasize that boys are good and reinforce this by having them view each other's performance", and "Teachers in my school emphasize that girls are good and reinforce this by having them view each other's performance". The BECE result of the sampled schools in 2007/08 academic year was obtained from the Mfantseman Municipal Education Office.

Pre-Testing of Instrument

In order to check for the appropriateness of the data collection instrument and data procedures, a minor preliminary study was conducted before the main study. Questionnaire was administered and collected within one week for appraisal. Questions which were found to be ambiguous and those not suitable to the local conditions were reconstructed. Other items which were found to elicit similar responses were either eliminated or restructured. The relevant corrections were made before the final administration.

The research instrument was pre-tested in four schools within the Komenda Edina-Eguafo-Abirem District. The selected schools had comparable characteristics as the target population. The schools were selected from both urban and rural areas in the district. All teachers who teach at the junior high level and the headteacher in each of the schools responded to the questionnaire.

Furthermore, the instrument was shown to my Principal Supervisor in the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (I.E.P.A) for his expert advice in order to establish content validity. To establish the reliability of the instrument, the Cronbach's alpha, a measure of internal consistency was used. This was deemed appropriate since the items in the questionnaire were multiple

scored on a Likert-type scale. Its application is endorsed by Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh's (1985) view that "Cronbach alpha is used when measures have multiple scored items such as attitudinal scores" (p.235). The value for the alpha was determined using the SPSS (version 16) programme. The reliability for the instrument was 0.731 (See Appendix E).

Data Collection Procedure

Before going to the field to collect data, the researcher required introductory letter from the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA), University of Cape Coast. On arrival in each of the schools, the researcher first introduced himself to the headmaster/headmistress and then handed over to him/her a copy of the introductory letter obtained from the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA). This was followed by a brief explanation about the purpose of the visit. Each head of school was briefed on the objective of the research on teachers' expectations and students' achievement.

After the introduction of the researcher to the staff, the selected respondents were assembled and the purpose of the study was explained to them. They were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. The importance of candid responses was emphasized. Immediately after the briefing, the researcher personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents. They were given some few days to fill them since most of them were not ready to do it on the spot. In order to ensure a high return rate of the answered questionnaires, follow-up

visits were made to the schools to collect questionnaires from those who were unable to respond during the first visit.

Data on students' achievement in Basic Education Certificate Examinations (BECE) in 2007/08 academic year was obtained from the Examination Unit of the Mfantseman Municipal Education Office and from the various schools selected. The collection of all data was carried out by the researcher himself so as to ensure maximum reliability. About 95% of the questionnaires were returned.

Data Analysis Plan

The unit of analysis in this study was the school and not the individual. This study was a correlational study since it aimed at finding out the relationship between the two phenomena, teachers' expectations and students' achievement. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used. The Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient was computed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS version 16).

Several statistical procedures were used in the analysis of the data. These statistics provided a holistic picture of the sample and some determined whether significant relationships existed between the variables. The frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for the majority of the data. Frequency indicated the number involved in a particular measurement, while percent showed this number relative to the total involved.

This information provided a more in-depth understanding of the sample, as percentages can sometimes be misleading if the number of individuals included

in the calculation are not provided. The mean was important because it is a measure of central tendency and is considered to be stable for the scores in a group. The standard deviation measured the extent to which the scores in a distribution deviated from their mean. Combined, mean and standard deviation provided a good description of how the individuals within the sample scored for a particular measure.

The sample was analyzed by frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation according to the pre-established categories within sex, age range, highest academic qualification, highest professional qualification, total teaching experience, total years in present school, status in GES, and rank in GES in both urban and rural schools. These statistics provided detailed data about the sample and were used to determine whether the demographic category of the respondents influenced their expectations and student performance.

Teacher expectation responses were analyzed by frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation to determine the distribution of responses. In addition, the item means of the teachers' expectation questionnaire of individual school were summed up to provide schools' scores on these variables. The median scores for expectations were calculated, and the various schools' scores were compared against the median to determine those with high expectations and low expectations. This allowed each school to be rated according to their level of expectation for students towards the BECE.

To test for a significant relationship among teachers' expectations for students in urban schools and students in rural schools, teachers' expectations and

academic achievement between urban and rural pupils, teachers' expectations and academic achievement between boys in both urban and rural schools, and teachers' expectations and academic achievement between girls in both urban and rural schools, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used. This statistic indicated the degree of relatedness between the factors being correlated.

A perfect correlation would have a correlation coefficient of ± 1.00. As the correlation coefficient moves toward 0.00, the relationship diminishes (Sarantakos, 1988). The interpretation of the values was based on Cohen (1988) guidelines, thus, $r = 0.10$ to 0.29 or -0.10 to -0.29 (small), $r = 0.30$ to 0.49 or $r = -0.30$ to -0.49 (medium), and $r = 0.50$ to 1.0 or $r = -0.50$ to -1.0 (large).

A 0.05 level of significance was used with this coefficient, which means that if the null was rejected at the .05 level, the difference between the observed statistic and the hypothesized value of the parameter was statistically significant at the .05 level. Most research studies use the .05 level of significance, as it signifies that the decision to reject the null hypothesis may be incorrect five percent of the time, or the decision to not reject the hypothesis may be correct 95% of the time (Sarantakos, 1988). The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was also used to determine the degree of relatedness between each demographic category and teacher expectations, and student achievement. The .05 level of significance was used.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed on the means of teacher expectation scores and student achievement scores, in relation to the demographic categories determined if significant differences existed between

these groupings. The .05 level of significance was used. This procedure was used in order to compare the amount of variance for between-groups in individual scores to the variance within-groups. A high ratio of between-groups variance to within-groups variance would have indicated that there was more difference between the groups in their scores on a particular variable than there was within each group. If this analysis was not significant, additional t-tests would not be needed.

A point biserial correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between teachers' expectations and their sex. This result indicated whether there was significant relationship between teachers' expectations and their sex for the sample being measured. A .05 level of significance was used.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides the analysis of the field data. The focus of the study was on the relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in junior high schools in the Mfantseman Municipality. The study was built on the proposition that there will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in urban and rural schools. It was postulated that the expectations that teachers hold can and do affect students' achievement. In other words, when teachers expect students to do well, they tend to do well; when teachers expect students to fail, they tend to fail. The unit of analysis in this study was the school. In addition, relationships were explored between the demographic data of teachers involved in the study and the two variables, in order to determine whether these variables differed according to category groupings of the sample. Data were collected using 30 statements on the questionnaire, 22 measured teachers' expectations for students in both urban and rural schools. Data on students' achievement in 2007/08 BECE was also collected from the Mfantseman Municipal Directorate of Education for the schools selected.

Demographic Data of Respondents

Demographic information was obtained from the sample group in terms of sex, age range, highest academic qualification, highest professional qualification, total teaching experience, total years in present school, status in GES, and rank in GES. Frequencies and simple percentages have been used in representing the demographic data of respondents. The statistics of respondents in respect of sex is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Sex of Respondents

	Urban		Rural	
Sex	No	%	No	%
Male	62	59.0	85	85.0
Female	43	41.0	15	15.0
Total	105	100	100	100

Table 3 indicates that the majority of the respondents in both urban and rural schools were males. Thus, the views of teachers' expectations expressed in this study were predominantly that of men. The demographic data of respondents was further analyzed in terms of age. Table 4 presents the findings.

Table 4

Age of Respondents

	Urban		Rural	
Age	No	%	No	%
Under 30	25	23.8	47	47.0
30-40	50	47.6	28	28.0
41-50	20	19.0	15	15.0
Over 50	10	9.6	10	10.0
Total	105	100.0	100	100.0

Results from Table 4 reveal that the modal age group for urban schools was between 30-40 years and this constituted 47.6% and for the rural schools it was below 30 years and this constituted 47% indicating that most of the teachers used in the study were relatively young especially those in the rural schools. Only 9.6% and 10% of teachers were over 50 years in both urban and rural schools respectively.

Table 5

Highest Academic Qualification

	Urban		Rural	
Qualification	No	%	No	%
Master's degree	0	0	0	0
Bachelors degree	20	19.0	1	1
Diploma (without edu.)	10	9.5	8.0	8.0
SSSCE/'O'/'A'Level	69	65.7	84	84.0
Any other	6	5.8	7	7.0
Total	105	100.0	100	100.0

Results from Table 5 show that the majority of the respondents in both urban and rural schools possessed SSSCE/'O'/'A' level certificate. Only 1(1%) person possessed the First degree in the rural school but in the urban schools 20 (19%) possessed the First degree. No respondents from both schools possessed Master degree. One could infer from the table that those teachers with any other qualification was 6 (5.8%) in urban schools and 7(7%) in rural schools.

The highest professional qualification of the respondents was also examined under the demographic data. This is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Highest Professional Qualification

	Urban		Rural	
Qualification	No	%	No	%
PGDE	1	1.0	1	1.0
Bachelor (Edu.)	20	19.0	2	2.0
Diploma (Edu.)	28	26.7	18	18.0
Cert 'A' 3-year	40	38.1	60	60.0
Cert 'A' 4-year	0	0.0	1	1.0
Any other	16	15.2	18	18.0
Total	105	100.0	100	100.0

Table 6 indicates that the majority of the respondents in urban schools 40 (38.1%) and rural schools 60 (60%) hold Cert. 'A' 3-year Post Sec. 28 (26.7%) of the respondents in the urban schools and 18 (18%) of respondents in the rural schools hold Diploma in Education certificate. The respondents with First degree were more in the urban schools 20 (19%) than rural schools 2 (2%). One could infer from the table that the respondents were mainly professionally trained teachers.

The total years of teaching experience of respondents were also examined under the demographic data. This is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Respondents Teaching Experience

Length of Teaching	Urban		Rural	
	No	%	No	%
0-5years	26	24.8	46	46.0
6-10 years	49	46.7	28	28.0
11-15 years	7	6.7	7	7.0
16 years or more	23	21.8	19	19.0
Total	105	100.0	100	100.0

From Table 7, it is evident that a high percentage 49 (46.7%) of the respondents in the urban schools had between 6-10 years teaching experience and majority 46 (46%) of the respondents in the rural schools had between 0-5 years of teaching experience. This points to the fact that most of the respondents in the rural schools were young on the job and therefore had not yet accumulated enough teaching experience to determine the level of expectation for students.

With regard to the number of years respondents have taught in their present schools, results from Table 8 indicate that most of the respondents have taught less than 6 years, thus 82 (78%) in the urban schools and 82 (82%) in the rural schools. While only a minority of 3 (3%) in the urban schools and 4 (4%) in the rural schools have taught in their present schools for over 13 years. The low percentage of respondents who had over 13 years teaching experience in their present school could be attributed to the fact that most newly trained teachers

after having taught in their schools for a period of 3-5 years proceed on study leave and do not return to their former schools after graduation.

Table 8

Length of Respondents' Teaching Experience in Present school

	Urban		Rural	
Length of teaching	No	%	No	%
Less than 6 years	82	78.0	82	82.0
6-12 years	20	19.0	14	14.0
Over 13 years	3	3.0	4	4.0
Total	105	100.0	100	100.0

Another important aspect of the demographic data that was analysed is the status of the respondents in the Ghana Education Service.

Table 9

Status of Respondents in GES

	Urban		Rural	
Status	No	%	No	%
Non-Graduate Prof.	64	61.0	78	78.0
Graduate Prof.	27	25.7	2	2.0
Graduate Non-Prof.	6	5.7	2	2.0
Non-Graduate, Non-Prof.	8	7.6	18	18.0
Total	105	100.0	100	100.0

Results from Table 9 reveal that most of the respondents from urban schools 64 (61%) and rural schools 78 (78%) were non-graduates professional teachers who completed teacher training colleges. Twenty-seven (25.7%) of the urban teachers were graduate professional teachers and 2 (2%) of the teachers in the rural schools were graduate professional teachers. The results indicate that majority of the respondents though non-graduates were professionally trained teachers.

Table 10

Rank of Respondents in GES

	Urban		Rural	
Rank	No	%	No	%
Superintendent II	20	19.0	31	31.0
Superintendent I	17	16.2	8	8.0
Senior Supt. II	24	22.9	23	23.0
Senior Supt. I	8	7.6	7	7.0
Principal Supt.	17	16.2	7	7.0
Any other	19	18.1	24	24.0
Total	105	100.0	100	100.0

An examination of the results as presented in Table 10 reveal that majority 24(22.9%) of the respondents in urban schools and 23(23%) in rural schools were senior superintendent II teachers. Nineteen (18.1%) of urban teachers and 24 (24%) of the teachers in the rural schools have not yet attained any rank in the Ghana Education Service.

In conclusion, one could infer from the foregoing demographic data that the views expressed in this study were predominantly those of male teachers in their prime age in both urban and rural schools. A high percentage of the respondents were professionally trained teachers, most of who had taught for less than 6 years in their present school. It was, therefore, assumed that they would give quite a good assessment of their expectations of their students in their respective schools in terms of their achievement in the BECE.

Teachers' Expectations For Students

The expectations that teachers had toward their students were measured by responses to statements on the questionnaire. The frequency and percentage were calculated for each response, in addition to the mean and standard deviation. The 22 statements, beginning with statement 9, concerning teachers' expectations for their students in urban and rural schools, were designed to measure the degree of agreement with each statement, with a five point variation ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Table 11 illustrates the response frequency and percentage for teachers' expectation statement on the questionnaire.

Table 11

Teachers Response to statement 9-30 by Degree of Agreement

Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)
9	U	6 (5.7)	88 (83.8)	8 (7.6)	3 (2.9)	0 (0.0)
	R	8 (8.0)	67 (67.0)	15 (15.0)	9 (9.0)	1 (1.0)
10	U	9 (8.6)	79 (75.2)	16 (15.2)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)
	R	4 (4.0)	66 (66.0)	23 (23.0)	7 (7.0)	0 (0.0)
11	U	9 (8.6)	73 (69.5)	20 (19.0)	3 (2.9)	0 (0.0)
	R	5 (5.0)	49 (49.0)	36 (36.0)	9 (9.0)	1 (1.0)
12	U	3 (2.9)	74 (70.5)	16 (15.2)	12 (11.4)	0 (0.0)
	R	3 (3.0)	51 (51.0)	29 (29.0)	13 (13.0)	4 (4.0)
13	U	0 (0.0)	1 (1.0)	8 (7.6)	71 (67.8)	25 (23.8)
	R	2 (2.0)	5 (5.0)	9 (9.0)	57 (57.0)	27 (27.0)
14	U	17 (16.2)	66 (62.9)	12 (11.4)	9 (8.6)	1 (1.0)
	R	8 (8.0)	62 (62.0)	19 (19.0)	9 (9.0)	2 (2.0)
15	U	30 (28.6)	65 (61.9)	7 (6.7)	2 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
	R	19 (19.0)	69 (69.0)	9 (9.0)	3 (3.0)	0 (0.0)
16	U	34 (32.4)	64 (61.0)	6 (5.7)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)
	R	29 (29.0)	56 (56.0)	13 (13.0)	2 (2.0)	0 (0.0)
17	U	30 (28.6)	72 (68.6)	2 (1.9)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)
	R	25 (25.0)	62 (62.0)	12 (12.0)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)

Table 11 Cont.

Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18	U	20 (19.0)	75 (71.4)	8 (7.6)	2 (1.9)	0 (0.0)
	R	15 (15.0)	66 (66.0)	14 (14.0)	5 (5.0)	0 (0.0)
19	U	9 (8.6)	71 (67.6)	19 (18.1)	6 (5.7)	0 (0.0)
	R	3 (3.0)	49 (49.0)	33 (33.0)	14 (14.0)	1 (1.0)
20	U	1 (1.0)	3 (2.9)	8 (7.6)	70 (66.7)	23 (21.9)
	R	0 (0.0)	6 (6.0)	11 (11.0)	67 (67.0)	16 (16.0)
21	U	12 (11.4)	68 (64.8)	20 (19.0)	5 (4.8)	0 (0.0)
	R	15 (15.0)	52 (52.0)	18 (18.0)	13 (13.0)	2 (2.0)
22	U	28 (26.7)	64 (61.0)	10 (9.5)	2 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
	R	21(21.0)	64 (64.0)	12 (12.0)	3 (3.0)	0 (0.0)
23	U	4 (3.8)	60 (57.1)	35 (33.5)	6 (5.7)	0 (0.0)
	R	6 (6.0)	47 (47.0)	35 (35.0)	11 (11.0)	1 (1.0)
24	U	0 (0.0)	2 (1.9)	6 (5.7)	69 (65.7)	28 (26.7)
	R	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.0)	72 (72.0)	25 (25.0)
25	U	2 (1.9)	63 (60.0)	32 (30.5)	8 (7.6)	0 (0.0)
	R	0 (0.0)	51 (51.0)	32 (32.0)	16 (16.0)	1 (1.0)
26	U	0 (0.0)	4 (3.8)	12 (11.4)	68 (64.8)	21 (20.0)
	R	1 (1.0)	2 (2.0)	15 (15.0)	61 (61.0)	21 (21.0)
27	U	7 (6.7)	74 (70.5)	19 (18.1)	5 (4.8)	0 (0.0)
	R	8 (8.0)	65 (65.0)	21 (21.0)	6 (6.0)	0 (0.0)

Table 11 Cont.

Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28	U	16 (15.2)	83 (79.0)	5 (4.8)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)
	R	16 (16.0)	72 (72.0)	12 (12.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
29	U	8 (7.6)	53 (50.5)	36 (34.3)	8 (7.6)	0 (0.0)
	R	5 (5.0)	44 (44.0)	41 (41.0)	10 (10.0)	0 (0.0)
30	U	0 (0.0)	3 (2.9)	7 (6.7)	63 (60.0)	32 (30.5)
	R	0 (0.0)	3 (3.0)	8 (8.0)	71 (71.0)	18 (18.0)

Key: U- Urban   R- Rural

9 .   Most students in my school are capable of attaining grade level academic

objectives. A strong majority of respondents 94(89.5%) of urban teachers

agreed or strongly agreed with this statement while a slight majority of

respondents 75(75.0%) of the rural teachers agreed or strongly agreed with

this statement. This indicates that teachers in urban schools have high

expectations for their students to attain grade level academic objectives

than teachers in rural schools.

10.   Most students in my school will perform at about the national average in

academic achievement. Almost 88(84.0%) of the respondents in the urban

schools and 70(70.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with

this statement, although 23 (23.0%) in the rural schools were undecided.

This implies that teachers in urban schools expect students to perform at

about the national average in academic achievement than the teachers in the rural schools.

11.   I expect that most students in my school will perform above the national average in academic achievement. A majority of the respondents 82(78.1%) in the urban schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement while a slight majority of the respondents 54(54.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed, although 36(36.0%) were undecided. This indicates that teachers in urban schools expect most students to perform above the national average in academic achievement while teachers in rural schools are ambiguous in terms of this statement.

12   Nearly all of my students will be at or above grade level by the end of this year. Seventy-seven (73.4%) of the respondents in urban schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement while 54(54.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, although 29(29.0%) and 13(13.0%) were undecided and disagreed respectively. This implies that teachers in urban schools believe that nearly all students will be at or above grade level by the end of this year but teachers in rural schools are ambiguous in terms of this statement.

13.   I expect most students in my school will perform below the national average in academic achievement. Almost 96(91.6%) of the respondents in urban schools and 84(84.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies that

teachers in both urban and rural schools do not expect most students to perform below the national average in academic achievement.

14.   Teachers in my school generally believe most students are able to master basic read/maths skills. Eighty-three (79.1%) of the respondents in the urban schools and seventy (70.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers in both urban and rural schools expect most students to master basic reading/mathematics skills.

15.   Teachers in my school set high standards for learning and let students know they are all expected to meet them. A strong majority of respondents 95(90.5%) in urban schools and 88(88.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers in both urban and rural schools set high standards for learning and let students know they are all expected to meet them.

16.   Teachers expect all students to perform at a level needed to be successful at the next level of learning. Almost 98(93.4%) of the respondents in the urban schools and 85(85.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers in both urban and rural schools expect all students to perform at a level needed to be successful at the next level of learning.

17.   Teachers in my school provide the time, instruction and encouragement necessary to help lower achievers perform at acceptable levels which will improve performance. A strong majority of the respondents 102 (97.2%)

in the urban schools and 87(87.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers in both urban and rural schools provide the necessary help to lower achievers to perform at acceptable levels which will improve performance.

18. Teachers in my school monitor their own beliefs and behaviour to make certain that high expectations are communicated to all students, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other personal characteristics and this will lead to higher student achievement. Ninety-five (90.4%) of the respondents in the urban schools and 87(87.0%) of the respondents in the rural school agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers in both urban and rural schools monitor their own beliefs and behaviour to make certain that high expectations are communicated to all students irrespective of personal characteristics of students resulting into higher student achievement.

19. Most boys in my school will score above the national average in academic achievement. Eighty (76.2%) of the respondents in the urban schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. While a slight majority of the respondents 52(52.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, although 33(33.0%) and 14(14.0%) were undecided or disagreed respectively. This indicates that teachers in urban schools expect most of their boys to score above the national average in academic achievement but teachers in rural schools are ambiguous in terms of the statement.

20.   I expect most boys in my school to perform below the national average in academic achievement. Almost 93(88.6%) of the respondents in the urban schools and 83(83.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This indicates that majority of the teachers in both urban and rural schools do not expect most of their boys to perform below the national average in academic achievement.

21.   Teachers set high standards for boys in my school. Majority of respondents 80 (76.2%) in the urban schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. While 18 (18.0%) and 13(13.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools were undecided and disagreed with this statement respectively, although 67(67.0%) agreed or strongly agreed. This implies that majority of teachers in urban schools set high standards for boys in their schools than those in the rural schools.

22.   I make my expectations clear to all the boys in my school about their behaviour. A strong majority of respondents 92 (87.7%) in the urban schools and 85 (85.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers in both urban and rural schools make their expectations clear to all the boys about their behaviour.

23.   Teachers in my school emphasize that the boys are good and reinforce this by having them view each other's performance. Thirty-five (33.3%) of the respondents in the urban schools were undecided with this statement, although 64 (60.9%) agreed or strongly agreed. While 35(35.0%) and 11(11.0%) of the respondents in the rural schools were undecided and

disagreed with this statement respectively, although a slight majority of respondents 53(53.0%) agreed or strongly agreed. This indicates that though some of the teachers in both urban and rural schools were undecided, more than half of them emphasize that boys are good and reinforce this by having them view each other's performance.

24.   Teachers have lower expectations for boys in my school. A strong majority of the respondents 97(92.4%) in the urban schools and 97(97.0%) in the rural schools disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies that teachers in both urban and rural schools do not have lower expectations for boys in their schools.

25.   Most girls in my school will score above the national average in academic achievement. Sixty-five (61.9%) of the respondents in urban schools and 51(51.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, although 32(30.5%) and 32(32.0%) were undecided. While 8(7.6%) and 16(16.0%) disagreed respectively. This implies that a majority of teachers in the urban schools expect most girls to score above the national average in academic achievement but teachers in the rural schools are ambiguous in terms of this statement.

26.   I expect girls in my school to perform below the national average in academic achievement. Eighty-nine (84.8%) of the respondents in urban schools and 82(82.0%) in the rural schools disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers in both urban and rural

schools do not expect girls to perform below the national average in academic achievement.

27. <u>Teachers set high standards for girls in my school</u>. A majority of the respondents 81(77.2%) in the urban schools and 73(73.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers in both urban and rural schools set high standards for girls in their schools.

28. <u>I make my expectations clear to all the girls in my school about their behaviour</u>. A strong majority of the respondents 99(94.2%) in the urban schools and 88(88.0%) in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers in both urban and rural schools make their expectations clear to all students about their behaviour.

29. <u>Teachers in my school emphasize that girls are good and reinforce these by having them view each other's performance.</u> A slight majority of the respondents 61(58.1%) in the urban schools agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, although 36(34.3%) were undecided. While 49(49%) of the respondents in the rural schools agreed or strongly agreed, 41(41.0%) were undecided. The remaining respondents 10(10.0%) disagreed. This implies that teachers in urban schools emphasize that girls are good and reinforce these by having them view each other's performance but the teachers in the rural schools are ambiguous in terms of the statement.

30   <u>Teachers have lower expectations for girls in my school</u>. A strong majority of the respondents 95(90.5%) in the urban schools and 89(89.0%) in the rural schools disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers in both urban and rural schools do not have lower expectations for girls in their schools.

From the above discussions, it appears most of the teachers in both urban and rural schools have high expectations for students. Brophy (1986) and Good and Brophy (1997) noted that high expectations and commitment for increasing student achievement are a part of the beliefs, attitudes, and behavioural patterns that exist in successful school. According to Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbacker (1979) teachers in effective schools set goals that were minimally acceptable, which allowed them to act on their expectations for students. These teachers were challenged by student failures, which meant that they required students to redo work that was not acceptable, instead of overlooking the assignment or sending the students out for remediation elsewhere. They responded in class to mistakes and failures with appropriate feedback and reinstruction instead of lowering standards or using inappropriate praise. Cotton (1995) substantiated these characteristics and others in her research synthesis on effective schooling practices. She noted that teachers indicate high expectations for student learning in effective schools. Expectations that are accurate can lead to normal achievement levels that students would have reached based on their prior progress. However, Good (1987) noted that if expectations are not appropriate, the learning level of such students can be significantly hindered.

Table 12 contains the means and standard deviations to statements 9-30. Based on a scale of one to five, with five representing strongly agree and one representing strongly disagree for teachers expectations for students. The mean scores are reflected for each statement.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations to Statement 9-30

Statement	Urban		Rural	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nine	3.92	0.49	3.72	0.77
Ten	3.91	0.52	3.67	0.66
Eleven	3.83	0.60	3.48	0.77
Twelve	3.64	0.72	3.36	0.89
Thirteen	1.85	0.57	1.98	0.86
Fourteen	3.84	0.82	3.65	0.83
Fifteen	4.15	0.70	4.04	0.63
Sixteen	4.24	0.60	4.12	0.70
Seventeen	4.24	0.53	4.11	0.63
Eighteen	4.07	0.58	3.91	0.69
Nineteen	3.79	0.67	3.39	0.80
Twenty	1.94	0.70	2.07	0.71
Twenty-one	3.82	0.68	3.65	0.95
Twenty-two	4.10	0.71	4.03	0.67
Twenty-three	3.59	0.66	3.46	0.80

Table 12 Cont.

Statement	Urban		Rural	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Twenty-four	1.82	0.61	1.80	0.56
Twenty-five	3.56	0.66	3.33	0.77
Twenty-six	1.99	0.68	2.01	0.73
Twenty-seven	3.79	0.63	3.75	0.68
Twenty-eight	4.08	0.48	4.04	0.53
Twenty-nine	3.58	0.74	3.44	0.74
Thirty	1.81	0.67	1.96	0.61
Total	75.56	14.02	72.97	15.98

Analysis of Data for First Hypothesis

The first purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' expectations for students in urban schools and students in rural schools. This problem was stated in a null form for analysis. The null hypothesis was expressed as follows: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations of students in urban schools and students in rural schools.

The data regarding the teachers' expectations of their students in both urban and rural schools were collected by means of a Likert scale. The respondents' score of expectations could range from a low of 22.00 to a high of 110.0, with the higher score indicating a high level of expectations. The mean and

standard deviation for the data of average teacher expectations score for students in urban schools and students in rural school were calculated. A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for teachers' expectations score for students in both urban and rural schools. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient r was used to measure the strength of the relationship between the variables. A .05 level of significance was used as a determination of a significant relationship between teacher expectations score for students in both urban and rural schools.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for any significant relationship between teachers' expectation scores of both urban and rural schools. Table 13 illustrates the information concerning the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between teachers' expectation of urban and rural schools.

Table 13

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between

Teachers' Expectation of Urban and Rural Schools

Variable	N	r	p
Teachers' Expectations			
Between Urban and Rural Schools	18	.08	.73

Result from table 13 did not show any significant relationship (r = .08, $p>.05$) between the two variables, indicating that there is a weak linear relationship between teachers' expectations in urban and rural schools. The null

hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between teachers' expectation of urban and rural schools cannot be rejected.

In a related study by Sweatt (2000), no relationship exists among teachers' expectations for students in their schools. It is obvious that most of the schools had high expectations and commitment for increasing students' achievement. These are part of the beliefs, attitudes and behavioural patterns that exist in successful schools (Brophy, 1986). Omotani and Omotani (1996) characterized highly effective teachers as those who believe that every student has the potential to learn. No matter what the race, life experiences, interests, family wealth or stability, they do not waiver in their belief. It is therefore obvious that children become what significant others, such as parents and teachers, expect them to become (Jussim, 1991).

The mean and standard deviation of the average teachers' expectations scores for urban and rural school are contained in Table 14.

Table 14

Mean and Standard Deviation of Teachers' Expectation in

Urban and Rural School

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Urban Teachers' Expectation	18	75.40	2.58
Rural Teachers' Expectation	18	72.17	3.30

Analysis of Data for Second Hypothesis

The second purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of urban pupils and rural pupils. This problem was stated in a null form for analysis. The null hypothesis was expressed as follows: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of urban pupils and rural pupils.

The data regarding the teachers' expectations of urban pupils and rural pupils were collected by means of a Likert scale. The respondents' score of expectations could range from a low of 22.00 to a high of 110.0, with the higher score indicating a high level of expectations. The mean and standard deviation for the data of average teacher expectations score for urban pupil and rural pupils and their performance gain as expressed by the BECE were calculated. The achievement was obtained for pupils in the 2007/08 BECE result. A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for teachers' expectations score and academic achievement score for urban pupils and rural pupils. The Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient r was used to measure the strength of the relationship between the variables. A .05 level of significant was used as a determination of a significant relationship between teacher expectations score academic achievement score for urban and rural pupils.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between teacher expectation scores and the means of student achievement scores in both urban and rural school. Table 15 illustrates the

information concerning the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the expectation of teachers and academic achievement of urban and rural pupils.

Table 15

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Teachers'

Expectation Scores and Students' Achievement Scores of Urban and

Rural Pupils

Variable	N	r	P
Teachers' Expectation score for Urban and			
Rural Pupils	18	.08	.73
Academic Achievement Score for Urban and			
Rural Pupils	18	.21	.39

Results from table 15 did not indicate any significant relationship between teachers' expectations for students ($r =.08$, $p >.05$) and academic achievement of rural and urban pupils ($r = .21$, $p > .05$). The positive correlation suggests that an increase/decrease in one variable is associated with an increase/decrease in the other. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of urban and rural pupils is not rejected. This finding is consistent with a similar study carried out on teacher expectations and students' achievement (Sweatt, 2000). In a correlational study, Sweatt (2000) found out that teacher expectations and student achievement have no relationship among them. She therefore concluded that while teacher

101

expectation levels are not the same for all students, most teachers feel responsible for ensuring that students learn while they are in the teachers' classrooms, and communicate via word or action, the expectation that their students can learn at or above grade level.

In another research conducted in the State of New York, Monk and Haller (1986) found that students from smaller (often rural) schools achieved as well as students from larger schools. In relation to the perceptual bias hypothesis, teachers' expectations predicts their own judgements of students' achievement (i.e. grade) more than independent assessments of achievement (i.e. standardised test score) (Jussim, 1991). Thus, teachers' expectations may predict grades even when controlling for students' achievement because these lead to biased evaluations of students' achievement, and not because they have influenced students' achievement. Indeed, teachers' expectations have to "change" students' behaviour if we want to interpret the expectations behaviour association as evidence of the existence of self-fulfilling prophecy (Jussim, 1991).

The mean and standard deviation of the average teachers' expectation scores and academic achievement scores of both urban and rural pupils are contained in Table 16.

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers' Expectation Score

 and Student Achievement Score

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Urban Teachers' Expectation	18	75.40	2.58
Rural Teachers' Expectation	18	72.17	3.30
Urban Schools Achievement	18	54.52	30.22
Rural Schools Achievement	18	46.57	38.19

Analysis of Data for Third Hypothesis

The third purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' expectation and academic achievement of boys in both urban and rural schools. This problem was expressed in the null form for analysis. The null hypothesis was stated as follows: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectation and academic achievement of boys in the urban schools and boys in the rural schools.

The data regarding the teachers' expectation for boys in both urban and rural schools were collected by means of a Likert scale. The schools scores of teachers' expectations could range from a low of 6.00 to a high of 30.00, with the high score indicating a high expectation for boys. The means and standard deviations from the data of average teachers' expectation and average boys' achievement gains were calculated. These achievements were obtained for

students in the schools of the respondents from 2007/08 BECE results. A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for the teachers' expectations score and the academic achievement of boys score. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient r was used to measure the strength of the relationship between the variables. A .05 level of significance was used as a determination of a significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of boys.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between teachers' expectation score and the academic achievement of boys' score for both urban and rural schools. Table 17 illustrates the information concerning the Pearson product-moment correlation between teachers' expectation and academic achievement of boys in urban and rural schools.

Table 17

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Teachers' Expectation and Academic Achievement of Boys in Urban and Rural Schools

Variable	N	r	p
Teachers' Expectation for Boys in Rural and Urban Schools	18	.25	.310
Academic Achievement of Boys in Urban and Rural Schools	18	.07	.77

Result from table 17 indicates that there was a small positive correlation between the teachers' expectation for boys' variables in both urban and rural schools (r = .25, p > .05) and a very weak correlation between boys' achievement score of urban and rural schools (r = .07, p > .05). Thus, the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of boys in the urban schools and the rural schools cannot be rejected.

The reasons for the lack of relationship can be attributed to the similarities in teachers' characteristics rather than the school's managerial practices. This could also be due to the fact that teachers in both urban and rural schools had a uniform expectation levels for boys in their schools. Although there was no significant relationship between the variables, Ferguson (1998) noted that teachers have different perceptions and expectations for rural students than urban students. These differing expectations lead to different teacher behaviours that, in turn, reinforce lower rural students' performance. In a related study by Strayhorn (2008) in the U.S.A., he found out that teachers have lower expectations for Black men in rural schools when compared to White male counterparts. Weinstein, et al (1995) indicated that preventive action for increasing teachers' expectations must move beyond teacher-student interactions so that the understanding of the context in which expectations for students, teachers and schooling are embedded can occur. Jussim (1991) noted that expectancy confirmation does not arise in the student actual behaviour but only in the teacher's mind.

The mean and standard deviation of the average teachers' expectation scores and academic achievement scores of boys in urban and rural schools are contained in Table 18.

Table 18

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectations and

Academic Achievement of Boys in Urban and Rural Schools

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Urban Boys' Expectation	18	18.97	.70
Rural Boys' Expectation	18	18.10	1.19
Urban Boys' Achievement	18	60.33	28.14
Rural Boys' Achievement	18	54.32	38.44

Analysis of Data for Fourth Hypothesis

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between teachers' expectation score and the academic achievement score of girls in both urban and rural schools. Table 19 illustrates information concerning the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between teachers' expectation and academic achievement of girls in urban and rural schools.

Table 19

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Teachers'

Expectations and Academic Achievement of Girls in Urban and Rural

Schools

Variable	N	r	p
Teachers' Expectation of Girls			
in Urban and Rural School	18	.19	.43
Academic Achievement of Girls			
in Urban and Rural Schools	18	.34	.16

Table 19 reveals that there was a small positive correlation between teachers' expectations variable for urban girls and rural girls (r = .19, p > .05) and a medium positive correction between academic achievement of girls in both urban and rural schools (r = .34, p > .05). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of girls in urban schools and rural schools cannot be rejected. The results bring evidence concerning the similarities in teachers' characteristics. Though there was no significant relationship between the variables, Good (1987) noted students from rural schools are sometimes presumed to be less capable than students in urban schools. Moreover, girls from urban schools also perform better than their counterparts in rural schools.

The mean and standard deviation of the average teachers' expectation scores and academic achievement score of girls in urban and rural schools are contained in Table 20.

Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectations and

Academic Achievement of Girls in Urban and Rural Schools

Variable	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Urban Girls Expectation	18	18.67	.96
Rural Girls Expectation	18	18.20	.97
Urban Girls Achievement	18	46.42	34.46
Rural Girls Achievement	18	40.55	40 42

Additional Analysis of Data

Because no significant differences were found among the variables, additional ways to treat and analyse the data were designed in order to obtain as much information as possible from the data. The teachers' expectation scores for the schools were measured on a Likert scale, based on responses to statements about their agreement. These responses were assigned a value of one through five as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. These scores were summed up and their means were determined.

The schools answers reflected a high or low expectation regarding the BECE. In order to determine whether an individual school had a high or low

expectation for students towards the BECE, the median score for the schools were determined, and in ascending order those with score above the median were considered to exhibit high expectation for students, and those with scores below the median were considered to have low expectations for their students.

A median score of 73.78 from the expectation questionnaire established the divide between high and low expectations for students. The individual school scores ranged from 79.60 to 66.00, on a 100 point scale. The same procedure was used to determine low and high achievement of the individual school. The median score from the BECE 2007/08 result for the schools was 52.59. Table 21 illustrates the information regarding the mean and standard deviation of the scores of the schools.

Table 21

Means and Standard Deviations of the Scores

Variables	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low Expectation	14	70.54	2.59
High Expectation	22	75.84	1.77
Low Achievement	18	23.48	14.60
High Achievement	18	81.50	17.22

The schools' summed scores and ratings for level of expectation and achievement for urban schools and rural schools have been listed in Appendix D. Twelve of the rural schools and three urban schools had low expectations for their students and six rural schools and fifteen urban schools had high expectation for their schools. This supports Cooney & Bottoms (2002) assertion that students in urban schools have high standards in achievement than those in rural schools and their teachers expected much from them as they have the ability to learn. They stated further that educators expected much from students they thought had the ability to learn. Also, more students in urban schools than rural schools have teachers who expected them to achieve at a higher level. Schmoker (2001) noted that schools with exceptional levels of academic achievement consistently demonstrate high expectations and goals supported by data-driven collaboration and ongoing assessment.

Another approach to analyzing the data used demographic information as a dependent variable to be correlated with teachers' expectations for students and students' achievement in urban and rural schools.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between the means of respondents' sex scores and the means of teachers' expectations for student and the means of students' achievement. Table 22 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation and the two tailed probability test between sex and teachers' expectations and students' achievement.

Table 22

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Sex

and Teachers' Expectations for Students and Students' Achievement

Sex and	$\underline{N}$	$\underline{r}$	$\underline{p}$
Rural Teachers' Expectations	18	-.119	.637
Urban Teachers' Expectations	18	.147	.560
Urban Students' Achievement	18	-.192	.440
Rural Students' Achievement	18	-.223	.375

Result from table 22 did not show any significant relationships ($p > .05$) between sex and the two variables. The values of $\underline{r}$ = -.119, $\underline{r}$ = .147, $\underline{r}$ = -.192, $\underline{r}$ = -.223, respectively, indicated that there is a small negative relationship between sex and teachers' expectations and between students' achievement.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between the means of respondent age group and the means of teachers' expectation for students in urban and rural schools and means of students' achievement score. Table 23 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation between age group and teachers' expectations for students, and students' achievement.

Table 23

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Age

Group and Teachers' Expectations for Students and Students' Achievement

Age group and	N	$\underline{R}$	$\underline{p}$
Rural Teachers Expectation	18	-.199	.637
Urban Teachers Expectation	18	.147	.560
Urban Students Achievement	18	-.192	.445
Rural Students Achievement	18	-.223	.375

Result from table 23 did not show any significant relationship ($p > .05$) between age group and the two variables. The values of $\underline{r} = -.119$, $\underline{r} = .147$, $\underline{r} = -.192$, $r = -. 223$, respectively, indicated that there is a weak linear relationship between age group and teachers' expectation for students, and between age group and academic achievement of students.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between the means of respondents' highest academic qualification and the means of the teachers' expectation for students, and means of schools' achievement score. Table 24 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation between highest academic qualification and teachers' expectations for students, and students' achievement.

Table 24

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Between Highest Academic Qualification and Teachers' Expectation for Students, and Students' Achievement

Highest Academic Qualification and	N	R	p
Rural Teachers' Expectation	18	-.356	.148
Urban Teachers' Expectation	18	-.164	.515
Urban Students Achievement	18	-.056	.827
Rural Students Achievement	18	-.600	.062

Table 24 reveals that there was no significant relationship ($\underline{r}$ = -.600, p> .05) between highest academic qualification and rural schools' achievement and between the other variables. The values of $\underline{r}$ = -.356, $\underline{r}$ =-.164, $\underline{r}$ = -.056, respectively, indicated that there is a weak linear relationship between highest academic qualification and urban teachers' expectation, and urban schools' achievement, and a medium relationship between highest academic qualification and rural teachers' expectation.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between the means of respondents' highest professional qualification and the means of the teachers' expectations for students, and the means of students achievement score. Table 25 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation and the two-tailed probability

test between highest professional qualification and teachers' expectations for students, and student achievement.

Table 25

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Highest Professional Qualification and teachers' Expectations Student and Students' Achievement

Highest Professional Qualification and	N	r	p
Rural Teachers' Expectation	18	-.111	.662
Urban Teachers' Expectation	18	.252	.314
Urban Students Achievement	18	.170	.500
Rural Students Achievement	18	-.072	.778

Result from table 25 did not show any significant relationship (p > .05) between highest professional qualification and the two variables. The values of r =.111, r = .252, r = .170, r = -.072, respectively, indicated that there is a weak linear relationship between highest professional qualification and teachers' expectation for students, and between highest professional qualification and student achievement.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between the means of respondents' total teaching experience and the means of teachers' expectations for students and the means of students' achievement. Table 26 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson

product-moment correlation between total teaching experience and teachers'

expectations for students, and students' achievement.

Table 26

Pearson product-moment correlation Coefficient Between Total Teaching

Experience and Teachers' Expectations for Students and Students'

Achievement

Total Teaching Experience and	N	r	P
Rural Teachers' Expectation	18	.144	.568
Urban Teachers' Expectation	18	.190	.450
Urban Students' Achievement	18	.025	.923
Rural Students' Achievement	18	.224	.372

Result from table 26 indicates that there was no significant relationship

$(p > .05)$ between total teaching experience and teachers' expectation for students

and the two variables. The values of $r = .144$, $r = .190$, $r = .025$, and $r = .224$,

respectively, indicated that there is a weak linear relationship between total

teaching experience and teachers' expectations for students and students'

achievement.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for

significant relation between the means of respondents' years of teaching in

present school and the means of teachers' expectations for students and the means

of students' achievement score. Table 27 illustrates the information regarding the

Pearson product-moment correlation between years of teaching experience and teachers' expectations for students and students' achievement.

Table 27

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Years of Teachers of Teaching in Present School and Teachers' Expectations for Students and Students' Achievement

Years of Teaching Experience and	N	r	P
Rural Teachers Expectations	18	-.208	.408
Urban Teachers Expectations	18	-.351	.153
Urban Students Achievement	18	-.193	.443
Rural Students Achievement	18	-.356	.147

From table 27, there was no significant relationships (p>.05) between years of teaching in present school and the two variables. The values of r = -.208, r = -.351, r = -.193, r = -.356, respectively, indicated that there is a weak negative relationship and a medium negative relationship between years of teaching in present school and teachers' expectations and between years of teaching in present school and students' achievement.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between the means of respondents' status in GES and the means of teachers' expectations for students and the means of students' achievement. Table 28 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-

116

moment correlation between status in GES and teachers' expectations and students' achievement.

Table 28

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Status in GES and Teachers' Expectations for Students and Students' Achievement

Status in GES and	N	r	P
Rural Teachers' Expectations	18	-.135	.594
Urban Teachers' Expectations	18	.013	.960
Urban Students Achievement	18	.143	.555
Rural Students Achievement	18	-.288	.247

Result from table 28 did not show any significant relationships (p>.05) between status in GES and the two variables. The values of r = -.135, r = .013, r = .143, r = -.288, respectively, indicated a weak linear relationship between status in GES and teachers' expectations and between status in GES and students' achievement.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test for significant relationship between the means of respondents' rank in GES and the means of teachers' expectations for students and the means of students' achievement. Table 29 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation and the two tailed probability test between rank in GES and teachers' expectations and students' achievement.

Table 29

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Rank in GES

and Teachers' Expectations for Students and Students' Achievement

Rank in GES and	N	r	P
Rural Teachers' Expectations	18	.008	.974
Urban Teachers' Expectations	18	.166	.512
Urban Students' Achievement	18	.049	.846
Rural Students' Achievement	18	.046	.857

Result from table 29 did not show any significant relationships (p>.05) between rank in GES and the two variables. The values of r = .008, r = .166, r = .049, r = .046, respectively, indicated that there is a weak linear relationship between rank in GES and teachers' expectations and between rank in GES and students' achievement.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by age range. Table 30 contains information regarding this analysis.

Table 30

Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Expectations for Students when

Grouped Age Range

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	67.51	3	22.50	2.67	.049
Within Groups	1696.08	201	8.44		
Total	1763.59	204			

From the above table, no significant differences (p = .049) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis could not, therefore, be rejected.

The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students when grouped by age range of respondents are contained in Table 31.

Table 31

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectation for Students when Grouped by Age Range

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Under 30	78	36.34	2.49
30-40	73	37.63	3.13
41-50	35	36.74	2.96
Above 50	19	36.53	3.32
Total	205	36.92	2.94

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by highest academic qualification of respondents. Table 32 contains information regarding this analysis.

Table 32

Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Expectations for Students when Grouped by Highest Academic Qualification

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	42.45	3	14.15	1.65	.179
Within Groups	1721.14	201	8.556		
Total	1763.59	204			

Table 32 indicates that no significant differences (p>.05) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected.

The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students when grouped by highest academic qualification of respondents are contained in Table 33.

Table 33

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectation for

Students when Grouped by Highest Academic Qualification

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Bachelor Degree	21	37.95	2.58
Diploma (without edu.)	18	37.72	2.11
SSCE/O/A Level	153	36.71	2.99
Any other	13	36.54	3.57
Total	205	36.92	2.94

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by highest professional qualification of respondents. Table 34 contains information regarding this analysis.

Table 34

Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Expectations for Students when

Grouped by Highest Professional Qualification

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	63.08	5	12.62	1.48	.199
Within Groups	1700.51	199	8.54		
Total	1763.59	204			

Table 34 indicates that no significant differences ($p > .05$) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected.

The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students when grouped by highest professional qualification of respondents are contained in Table 35.

Table 35

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectation for Students

when Grouped by Highest Professional Qualification

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
PGDE	2	38.00	2.82
Bachelor (Edu.)	22	37.36	2.40
Diploma (Edu.)	46	37.19	3.34
Cert. A 3-year	100	36.38	2.91
Cert. A 4-year	1	38.00	-
Any other	34	37.74	2.66
Total	205	36.92	2.94

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by total years of teaching experience of respondents. Table 36 contains information regarding this analysis.

Table 36

Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Expectations for Students when

Grouped by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	37.57	3	12.52	1.46	.227
Within Groups	1726.02	201	8.59		
Total	1763.59	204			

Result from table 36 reveals that no significant differences (p>.05) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected.

The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students when grouped by total years of teaching experience of respondents are contained in Table 37.

Table 37

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectation for Students

when Grouped by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
0-5	72	36.57	2.47
6-10	77	37.35	3.12
11-15	14	35.93	2.89
16 and Above	42	37.05	3.28
Total	205	36.92	2.94

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by years of teaching in present school of respondents. Table 38 contains information regarding this analysis.

Table 38

Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Expectations for Students when

Grouped by Years of Teaching in Present School

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	$\underline{p}$
Between Groups	34.62	2	17.31	2.02	.135
Within Groups	1728.97	202	8.56		
Total	1763.59	204			

Table 38 indicates that no significant differences ($p > .05$) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected.

The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students when grouped by years of teaching in present school of respondents are contained in Table 39.

Table 39

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectation for Students when Grouped by Years of Teaching in Present School

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Less than 6yrs	164	36.71	2.96
6-12yrs	34	37.68	2.74
Over 13yrs	7	38.00	2.89
Total	205	36.91	2.94

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by status in GES of respondents. Table 40 contains information regarding this analysis.

Table 40

Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Expectations for Students

when Grouped by Status in GES

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	14.42	3	4.805	.55	.647
Within Groups	1749.17	201	8.70		
Total	1763.59	204			

Table 41 indicates that no significant differences ($p>.05$) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected. The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students when grouped by status in GES of respondents are contained in Table 41.

Table 41

Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Expectation for Students

when Grouped by Status in GES

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Non-Graduate Prof.	142	36.75	3.01
Graduate Prof.	29	37.24	2.64
Graduate Non-Prof.	8	37.63	2.13
Non-Graduate, Non-Prof.	26	37.26	3.14
Total	205	36.92	2.94

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by rank in GES of respondents. Table 42 contains information regarding this analysis.

Table 42

Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Expectations for Students when

Grouped by Rank in GES

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	$\underline{p}$
Between Groups	11.31	5	2.263	.26	.94
Within Groups	1752.28	199	8.805		
Total	1763.59	204			

Result from table 42 shows that no significant differences ($\underline{p}$>.05) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected.

The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students when grouped by rank in GES of respondents are contained in Table 43.

Table 43

Means and Standard Deviation of Teachers' Expectation for Students when Grouped by Rank in GES

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Supt. 2	51	36.78	2.77
Supt.1	25	37.16	3.53
Senior Supt. 2	47	37.02	3.05
Senior Supt. 1	15	36.27	3.97
Principal Supt.	24	37.21	1.98
Any other	43	36.88	2.81
Total	205	36.92	2.94

The relationship between teachers' expectations for students and their sex was investigated using Point biserial correlation coefficient. Table 44 illustrates the information concerning the Point biserial correlation coefficient between teachers' expectation for students and their sex.

Table 44

Point Biserial Correlation Coefficient Between Teachers Expectations for Students and their Sex

Variable	N	r	p
Teachers Expectations and their sex	205	0.004	0.95

Table 44 reveals that there was no significant relationship ($\underline{r}$ = .004, p>.05) between the two variables, indicating that there is a weak linear relationship between teachers' expectations for students and their sex in urban and rural schools.

The means and standard deviations of the scores of teachers' expectations for students and their sex are contained in Table 45.

Table 45

Means and Standard Deviations Between Teachers' Expectations for Students and their Sex

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Teachers Expectations	205	36.91	2.94
Sex	205	0.28	0.45

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter gives an overview of the study. It also presents the summary of the major findings, conclusions, recommendations and areas for further studies.

Overview of the Study

The study was designed to find out if there was any significant relationship between teachers' expectations and students' achievement in junior high schools in the Mfantseman Municipality. Four hypotheses were developed as follows:

1   There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations of students in urban schools and students in rural schools.

2   There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of urban pupils and rural pupils.

3   There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of boys in the urban schools and boys in the rural schools.

4   There will be no significant relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of girls in the urban schools and girls in the rural schools.

As part of the search for relationships, demographic information was analysed to determine if any of the categories were significant in the relationship between the two variables of teachers' expectations and student achievement.

The instrument for this study was obtained after a comprehensive review of literature on teachers' expectations and students' achievement. It was pre-tested in three urban and three rural schools in the Komenda, Edina, Eguafo, Abirem District and had a reliability of .731. It comprised 4 sections.

Section A consisted of eight items that probed the demographic data of the respondents. This section was deemed necessary because independent variables like sex, age, educational experience, etc could cause variations in teachers' expectation for students. The section consisted of a number of alternatives from which respondents were to select applicable ones. Responses were aggregated and their percentages calculated.

Section B had ten items structured to find out teachers' and headteachers' expectations of students in their respective schools. Section C and D consisted of six items each, structured to find out teachers' and headteachers' expectations for boys and girls in their respective schools. All the items were simple descriptive statements. Teachers and headteachers were to indicate the extent to which each statement best described their responses on the occurrence of each of them on a 5-point Likert-type scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The data were aggregated to the school level by averaging teachers' responses and the achievement score of students within each school. This is because the unit of analysis was the school. Data on students' achievement was obtained from the

Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) result of 2007/08 academic year.

A total of 169 teachers and 36 headteachers from both urban and rural schools participated in this correlational study. Five teachers were randomly selected from a school where the teachers were more than five but where the teachers were not up to five, all of them were sampled to respond to the questionnaire. In all, 205 questionnaires were administered and about 95% were returned.

The frequency, percent, mean and standard deviation were used to analyse the responses on the questionnaire for teachers' expectations for students. A median score was identified in order to distinguish high expectations from low expectations for students and high achievement from low achievement in both urban and rural schools. While comparing the two variables, the correlation coefficients were determined. Levels of significance were determined at the .05 level.

A further analysis was conducted to determine whether teachers' expectations and students' achievement were independent of the sex, age, highest academic qualification, highest professional qualification, total teaching experience, total years of teaching in present school, status in GES and rank in GES of the respondents. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the point biserial correlation coefficient were used in these analyses. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (version 16) was used for the statistical treatment of the data.

The review of literature focused on teachers' expectations and students' achievement. Extensive research was found regarding teachers' expectations, but no similar study was found in comparing urban and rural schools.

Most of the research on expectations was conducted in the mid 1970s and 1980s and the findings have tended to be repetitions. The interactions between student and teacher are influenced by the expectations which the teacher develops towards the student. Expectations are formed by teachers in a variety of ways, as are the ways that teachers communicate these expectations to students. The research has found that students react to ways that teachers communicate their expectations, and can either rise to the expectation, whether it is high or low, while developing an internal acceptance of the perceived ability. This perception can become a self-fulfilling prophecy or a sustaining expectation. Teachers' expectations can impact individual students, groups, classes, and schools.

Summary of Findings

The respondents were mainly male teachers in their prime age in both urban and rural schools. Most of them possessed SSSCE/'O'/'A' level certificate as their highest academic qualification and were professionally trained teachers and had taught for 6-10 years in urban schools and 0-5 years in rural schools. Hence, it was assumed that they would give quite a good assessment of their expectations for students in their respective schools.

The study revealed that a majority of the respondents in this study had high expectations for students to attain grade level academic objectives which would enable them to perform at or above the national average in academic

achievement and teachers' felt nearly all of their students would be at or above grade level by the end of the year. They believed students could master basic reading/mathematics skills. Most of the teachers believed they set high standard for learning and provided the necessary time, instruction and encouragement necessary to help lower achievers perform at acceptable levels which would improve performance.

The teachers also believed they monitored their own beliefs and behaviour to make certain that high expectations were communicated to all students, regardless of gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity, or other personal characteristics and this would lead to higher student achievement. However, teachers in this study did not have the same level of expectations for all students. They were ambivalent about boys' and girls' achievement score in terms of the national average in academic achievement but strongly agreed that both boys and girls will not perform below the national average in academic achievement and do not show any lower expectations for boys and girls in their respective schools.

Hypothesis 1

Teachers' expectations for students in urban schools and rural schools had no relationship. The null hypothesis was not rejected. When the data for all teachers or respondents in both urban and rural schools were disaggregated based on demographics, no significant relationships ($p>.05$) were found between teachers' expectations for students based on sex, age group, highest academic qualification, highest professional qualification, total teaching experience

teaching in present school, years of teaching in present school status in GES and rank in GES.

Hypothesis 2

Teachers' expectations and academic achievement of pupils in both urban and rural schools had no relationship. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Demographically, there were no significant relationships ($p > .05$) between teachers' expectations for students and the demographic categories, although, some weak correlations were found between students' achievement and demographic categories.

Hypothesis 3

Teachers' expectations and academic achievement of boys in both urban and rural schools had no relationship ($p > .05$) between the two variables. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 4

Teachers' expectations and academic achievement of girls in urban schools and rural schools had no significant relationship ($p > .05$) between the two variables. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

In addition to the preceding findings, the ratings of teachers' expectations were examined to expectation level, for the respective schools. Twelve of the rural schools and three urban schools had low expectations for their students and six rural schools and fifteen urban schools had high expectation for their schools.

137

Conclusions

The following conclusions are offered concerning the analysis of the data and compilation of information collected in the review of literature.

1 No significant relationship exists between teachers' expectations for students in urban schools and students in rural schools, between teachers' expectations and academic achievement of urban and rural pupils, between teachers' expectation for boys and boys' academic achievement in urban and rural schools, and between teachers' expectation for girls and girls' academic achievement in urban and rural schools. These could have been due to similarities in teachers characteristics.

2 Most teachers believe students can perform at or above the national average in academic achievement in both urban and rural schools.

3 Teachers appeared to communicate, via word or action, the expectation that their students can learn at or above grade level in academic achievement in urban and rural schools.

4 Teachers appeared to have high standards for students in their schools and provide the time, instruction and encouragement to help lower achievers perform at acceptable level in both urban and rural schools.

5 Teachers seemed to expect all students to master basic reading/mathematics skills and perform at a level needed to be successful at the next level of learning in both urban and schools.

Recommendations

In the light of the above research findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are made although weak correlations were found between the variables:

1 In-service training should be organized for heads and teachers of Junior High Schools to sensitize them on the possible unconscious biases and heighten their awareness of the detrimental effects of holding differential expectations for students and help them to make positive changes in their thinking and behaviour.

2 District Directorates of Education should task school administrators (heads and teachers) to set goals (for individuals, groups, classrooms, and whole school) in terms of floors (minimally acceptable standards) and communicate to all students that they have the ability to meet those statements.

Recommendations for Further Studies

1 A more comprehensive study should be conducted to increase the sample size. The same could also be expanded to involve more than one district.

2 A related study should be initiated that measures students' perceptions of their teachers' expectation for students. This could then be compared to student achievement.

3 A related study should be conducted to determine the learning expectations of parents and students' achievement.

REFERENCES

Adentwi, K. I. (2002). *Principles, practices and issues in teacher education,* Kumasi: Skies printing works.

Agyeman, D. K. (1993). *Sociology of education for African students*. Accra: Black Mask Ltd.

Agyeman, D. K., Baku, J. J. K., & Gbadamosi, R. (2000). *Review of education sector analysis in Ghana*, 1987-1998. France: UNESCO

Allington, R. (1983). The reading instruction provided readers of differing reading ability. *Elementary School Journal*, 83, 548-559.

Anamuah-Mensah, J. (2002). *Meeting the challenges of education in the twenty-first century*. *President committee on the review of new educational reform.* Tema: Ghana Publishing Corporation

Anastasi, A. (1984). *Psychological testing* (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishers Company.

Ankomah, Y. A. (2002). The success story of three selected private schools in the Cape Coast Municipality. *Journal of Educational Management,* 4 (1), 1-14

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Razavieh, A. (1985). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ashton, P. (1985). Motivation and the teacher's sense of efficacy. In Ames, C. & Ames, R. (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education, Vol. II: The classroom milieu*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Babad, E. A. (1985). Some correlates of teacher expectancy bias. *American Educational Research Journal*, 22, 175-183.

Baird, C., Pavelsky, N., Savage, B. & Valburg, K. (n.d). *Identifying and removing barriers to student achievement*. Retrieved on 26-05-08 from http://faculty.fullerton.edu/lorozco/stlec-barriers.html

Bamburg, J. D (1994). *Raising expectations to improve student learning*. Oak Brook, Illinois: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, ED 378 290

Bamburg, J. D. (2000). *NCREL Monograph: Raising expectations to improve student learning*. Pathways Home Page, Hyperlink. Retrieved on

26-05-08 from
http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrshp/le0bam.htm

Beckerman, T. & Good, T. (1981). The classroom ration of high and low aptitude
students and its effect on achievement. *America Educational Research
Journal*, 18, 317-327.

Beez, W. V. (1968). Influence of biased psychological reports on teacher behavior
and pupil performance. *Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the
American Psychological Association*, *3*, 605-606.

Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (1998). *Research in education*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Brattesani, K. A., Weinstein, R. S., & Marshall, H. H (1984). Student perceptions
of differential teacher treatment as moderators of teacher expectation
effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 236-247.

Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbacker, J. (1979).
*school social systems and student achievement: schools can make a
difference.* New York: Bergin

Brophy, J. E. (1986). *On motivating students*. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute
for Research on Teaching.

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher
expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 631-661.

Brophy, J. & Emerson, C. M. (1976). *Learning from teaching: a developmental
perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon,

Brophy, J. & Good, T. L. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential
expectations for children's classroom performance: some behavioral data.
Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 365-374.

Brylinsky, J. A., & Moore, J. C. (1984). The identification of body build
stereotypes in young children. *Journal of Research in Personality*,
170-181.

Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.).
Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1995). *Research methods in education* (3rd ed.) London:
Routledge.

Coleman, J. J. (1966). *Quality of education opportunities*. Washington DC:
Merrill Publishing Company.

Collins, J. K., & Plahn, M. R. (1988). Recognition, accuracy, stereotypic preference, aversion, and subjective judgment of body appearance in adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 17(4), 317-334

Commission on Reading (1984). *Becoming a nation of readers.* Sponsored by the National Academy of Education, Washington, DC: National Institute of Education

Cooney, S. & Bottoms, G. (2002). *What works to improve student achievement in the middle grades: A making middle grades work research report*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board

Cooper, H. (1979). Pygmalion grows up: A model for teacher expectation communication and performance influence. *Review of Education Research*, 49, 389-410.

Cooper, H. (1985). Models for teacher expectation communication. In Dusk, J.B., Hall, V.C. & Meyer, W. J. (Eds.). *Teacher expectancies* (p.317 334). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Cooper, H. & Good, T. (1993). *Pygmalion grows up: Studies in the expectation communication process*. New York: Longman

Cooper, H. & Tom, D. Y. H. (1984). Teacher expectation research: A review with implications for classroom instruction. *Elementary School Journal*, 85, 77-89.

Cotton, K. (1989). *Expectations and student outcomes*. School Improvement Research Series. Close-up No.7, Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved on 26-05-08 from http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/4/Cu7.html

Cotton, K. (1989). *Classroom questioning*. School Improvement Research Series, Close- up #5, Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Cotton, K. (1995). *Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis update*, Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved on 04- 08-08 from http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/esp/esp95-2.html.

Crowther, J. (Ed.1995). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary* (5th ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Dusek, J. (1985). *Teacher expectancies*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Dweck, C. & Elliott, E. (1983). Achievement motivation. In Mussen, P. & Hetherington, E. (Eds.) *Handbook of child psychology, IV: Socialization, personality, & social development*, New York: Wiley.

Dzobo, N. K. (1972). *Report of the education advisory committee on the proposed new structure and content of education for Ghana*. Accra: Government printer.

Eccles, J. & Wigfield, A. (1985). Teacher expectations and student motivation. In Dusek, J. (Ed.), *Teacher expectancies*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Edmonds, R. R., Fredericksen, J. R. (1978). *Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children*. Harvard University Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, MA.

Ferguson, R. F. C. (1998). Teachers' perceptions and expectations and the black-white test score gap. In Jencks, C and Philips, M. (Eds.) *The black-white test score gap* (pp. 273-317). Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Phillips, N. (1994). The relation between teachers 'beliefs about the importance of good student work habits, teacher planning, and student achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 94, 331 - 345.

Gay, L. R. (1987). *Educational research* (3rd ed.) London: Merrill Publishing Company.

Ghana Education Service (2008). *Mfantseman directors' 1st quarterly report*. Saltpond: Unpublished

Goldenberg, C. (1992). The limits of expectations: A case for case knowledge about teacher expectancy effects. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 517 - 544.

Good, T. L. (1987). Two decades of research on teacher expectations: findings and future directions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35, 32 - 47.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1986). School effects. In Wittrock, M. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1987). *Looking in classrooms* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1997). *Looking in classrooms* (7th ed.). New York: Longman.

Good, T. & Weinstein, R. (1986). Teacher expectations: A framework for exploring classrooms. In Zumwalt, K. (Ed.), *Improving Teaching. The 1986 ASCD Yearbook* (pp. 63 - 85). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.12

Gottfredson, D., Marciniak, E., Birdseye, A., & Gottfredson, G. (1995). Increasing teacher expectations for student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 88, 155 - 163.

Graham, S. (1984). Teacher feelings and student thoughts: An attributional approach to affect in the classroom. *Elementary School Journal*, 85, 91 - 104.

Grant, L. & Rothenberg, J. (1986). The social enhancement of ability differences: Teacher-student interactions in first- and second-grade reading groups. *Elementary School Journal*, 87, 29 - 49.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1995). Increasing teacher expectations for student achievement. *Journal of Education Research*, 88(3), 155-163.

Hall, J. L. (1993). What can we expect from minority students*? Contemporary Education*, 64(3), 180-182.

Heubert, J. P., & Hauser, R. M. (Eds.). (1999). *High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation*. Washington, D.C. : National Academy Press.

Hilliard, A. (1991). Do we have the will to educate all children? *Educational Leadership*, 49, 131-136.

International Development Research Centre-Manuscript Reports (1981). *Teacher effectiveness: Research in West Africa*. Ottawa: Educational Research Review and Advisory Group.

Jussim, L. (1986). Self-fulfilling prophecies: A theoretical and integrative review. *Psychological Review*, 93, 429-445.

Jussim, L. (1991). Social perception and social reality: A reflective-construction model. *Psychological Review*, 98, 54-73.

Lumsden, L. (1997). *Expectations for students*. ERIC document ED 409 609. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene,

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (2004). *White paper on the report of the education reform review committee*. Unpublished

Mittler, S. & Mittler, R. (1982). *Parents as educators*. London: Grown Helm.

MOE (2000). *Performance monitoring test and school performance appraisal meeting in public basic schools (Draft Report)* Accra: Author

Monk, D. H., & Haller, E. J. (1986). *Organisational alternatives for small rural schools.* Cornell: New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University.

Morine-Dershimer, G. (1982). Pupil perceptions of teacher praise. *Elementary School Journal*, 82, 421 - 434.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Omotani, B. J., & Omotani, L. (1996). Expect the best. *The Executive Educator*, 27, 31.

Oppenheim, A. N. (1973). *Questionaire design and attitude measurement*, London: Heineman Publishers.

Ozturk, M. A., & Debelak, C. (2005). Setting realistically high academic standards and expectations. *Essays in Education*, Vol. 15. Retrieved on 25-05-08 from http:// www.usca.edu/essays/vol152005/ozturkrev.pdf

Pascal, R. A., Weinstein, T. & Walberg, H. J. (1984). The effects of homework on learning: A quantitative synthesis. *Journal of Educational Research*. No.15570-GH.

Peterson, P. & Barger, S. (1984). Attribution theory and teacher expectancy. In Dusek, J. (Ed.), *Teacher expectancies* (pp. 159 - 184). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Raudenbush, S. W. (1984). Magnitude of teacher expectancy effects on pupil IQ as a function of the credibility of expectancy induction: A synthesis of findings from eighteen experiments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 85 - 97.

Rosenshine, B. (1980). Synthesis of research on explicit teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 4: 60-69.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968) *Pygmalion in the classroom: teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development*. New York: Holt,

Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ross, J. A. (1995). Strategies for enhancing teachers' beliefs in their effectiveness: Research on a school improvement hypothesis. *Teachers College Record*, 97, 227 - 251.

Saks, J. B. (1995). Building a rainbow. *American School Board Journal*, 182, 18 -22.

Sadker, M. P. & Sadker, D. M. (1984). *Teachers, schools and society*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Saracho, O. N. (1991). Teacher expectations of students' performance: a review of the research. *Early Child Development and Care*, 76, 27-41.

Sarantakos, S. (1988). *Social research* (2nd ed.) New York: Palgrave publishers Ltd.

Shupe, J. (1997). Converting theory into practice for academic success. *Bulletin*, 32 - 38.

Spinthal, N. A. & Spinthal, E. C. (1990). *Educational psychology: Developments approach* (4th ed.) New York, Wiley Publishing Company.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2008) Teacher expectations and urban black males' success in school: Implication for academic leaders. *The Online Journal*, Volume 6(2), 1-6.

Sweatt, S. S. (2000) *The relationship among teachers expectations, teacher attitudes towards the TAAS, and student achievement*. Denton, Texas: University of North Texas.

Tauber, R. T. (1998). *Good or bad, what teachers expect from students they generally get*! ERIC document ED 426 985.

Thorndike, R. S. (1968). Review of Pygmalion in the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal,* 5, 708-711.

Trouilloud, D. O, Sarrazin, P. G, Martinek, T. G, & Guillet, E. (2001). The influence of teacher expectations on students' achievement in physical education classes: Pygmalion Revisited. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32: 591-607

Weber, B. J. & Omotani, L. M. (1994). The power of believing. *The Executive Educator*, 16, 35 – 38.

Weinstein, R. S. (1976). Reading group membership in first grade: Teacher behaviours and pupil experience over time. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 103 –116.

Weinstein, R. S. (1983). Student perceptions of schooling. *Elementary School Journal*, 83, 287- 312.

Weinstein, R. S. (1985). Student mediation of classroom expectancy effects. In Dusek, J. (Ed.), *Teacher expectancies*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weinstein, R. S., & Marshall, H. H. (1984). *Ecology of students' achievement expectation,* Executive Summary. Berkeley, CA: California University; Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, (ED 257805).

Weinstein, R., Madison, S., & Kuklinski, M. (1995). Raising expectations in schooling: Obstacles and opportunities for change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 121 - 159.

Weinstein, R., Marshall, H., Brattesani, K., & Middlestadt, S. (1982). Student perceptions of differential teacher treatment in open and traditional classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 678 - 692

White, V. (1959). *Studying the individual pupil*, New York: Harper Ltd

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION (IEPA)

TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AND STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The aim of this questionnaire is to solicit information with regard to teachers' expectations and students' achievement in junior high schools (JHS) in the Mfantseman District. The research is for the purpose of writing a thesis as part of the requirement for the award of a Master of Philosophy Degree in Educational Administration in the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration. Your candid and objective responses will constitute a strong empirical basis for determining the teachers' expectations and students' achievement. You are kindly requested to respond as objective as possible to the items in the questionnaire. Confidentiality in respect of whatever information you may give is fully assured. Thank you.

PART A (To be filled by the researcher)

 SCHOOL CODE:…………………………………………………

CIRCUIT CODE:……………………………………………………………

SCHOOL LOCATION: (URBAN/RURAL)

DATE:………………………………………………………………….

PART B (To be filled by respondent)

TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

Demographic Data

The following are statements about you. Please circle the number that best describes your response to each statement.

1.   Sex

    1.   Male   2.   Female

2.   Age

    1.   Under 30   2.   30-40

    3.   41-50   4.   Over 50

3.   Highest Academic Qualification

    1. Master's degree   2. Bachelor's degree

    3. Diploma (without education)   4. SSCE/ 'O'/ 'A' Level

    5. Any other (specify)…………………

4.   Highest Professional Qualification

    1. PGDE   2. Bachelor (Education)

    3. Diploma (Education)   4.Cert. A '3' Year

    5. Cert. A '4' Year   6. Any other (specify) -------------------------

5.   Total teaching experience

    1. 0- 5 years   2. 6-10 years

    3. 11-15 years   4. 16 years or more

6.   Total years of teaching in your present school.

    1. Less than 6 years   2. 6-12 years

    3. Over 13 years

7.   Your status in the Ghana Education Service (GES)

      1. Non-Graduate Professional

      2. Graduate Professional

      3. Graduate Non-Professional

      4. Non-Graduate, Non-Professional

8.   Present Rank in the Ghana Education Service (GES)

1. Superintendent 2	2. Superintendent 1
3. Senior Superintendent 2	4. Senior Superintendent 1
5. Principal Superintendent	6. Any other (specify)…………..

SECTION B

Teachers' Expectations for Students

The following are statements about your expectations for students in your school. Please circle the number that best describes your response on the occurrence of each of them.

KEY

5. Indicates 'Strongly Agree'

4. Indicates 'Agree'

3. Indicates 'Undecided'

2. Indicates 'Disagree'

1. Indicates 'Strongly Disagree'

9.   Most students in my school are capable of attaining grade

       level academic objectives.   5   4   3   2   1

10.   Most students in my school will perform at about the

       national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

11.   I expect that most students in my school will perform above

       the national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

12.   Nearly all of my students will be at or above grade level by

       the end of this year.   5   4   3   2   1

13.   I expect most students in my school will perform below

       the national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

14.   Teachers in my school generally believe most students

       are able to master the basic read/maths skills.   5   4   3   2   1

15.   Teachers in my school set high standards for learning and let

       students know they are all expected to meet them.   5   4   3   2   1

16.   Teachers expect all students to perform at a level needed

       to be successful at the next level of learning.   5   4   3   2   1

17.   Teachers in my school provide the time, instruction and

       encouragement necessary to help lower achievers perform

       at acceptable levels which will improve performance.   5   4   3   2   1

18.   Teachers in my school monitor their own beliefs and behaviour

       to make certain that high expectations are communicated to all students,

       regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other personal

characteristics and this will lead to higher student

achievement. 5 4 3 2 1

SECTION C

Teachers' Expectations for Boys

Use the same instructions above to answer the following expectations for boys in your school.

19. Most boys in my school will score above the national

average in academic achievement. 5 4 3 2 1

20. I expect most boys in my school to perform below the

national average in academic achievement. 5 4 3 2 1

21. Teachers set high standards for boys in my school. 5 4 3 2 1

22. I make my expectations clear to all the boys in my

school about their behaviour. 5 4 3 2 1

23. Teachers in my school emphasize that the boys are good and reinforce

this by having them view each others performance. 5 4 3 2 1

24. Teachers have lower expectations for boys in my school. 5 4 3 2 1

SECTION D

Teachers' Expectations for Girls

Use the same instructions above to answer the following expectations for girls in your school.

25. Most girls in my school will score above the national average

    in academic achievement.   5 4 3 2 1

26. I expect girls in my school to perform below the

    national average in academic achievement.   5 4 3 2 1

27. Teachers set high standards for girls in my school.   5 4 3 2 1

28. I make my expectations clear to all the girls in my school

    about their behaviour.   5 4 3 2 1

29. Teachers in my school emphasize that girls are good and reinforce

    these by having them view each others performance.   5 4 3 2 1

30. Teachers have lower expectations for girls in my school.   5 4 3 2 1

PART B (To be filled by respondent)

HEADTEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

Demographic Data

The following are statements about you. Please circle the number that best describes your response to each statement.

1. Sex

   1. Male   2.   Female

2. Age

    1.   Under 30   2.   30-40

    3.   41-50   4.   Over 50

3. Highest Academic Qualification

    1. Master's degree   2. Bachelor's degree

    3. Diploma (without education)   4. SSCE/ 'O'/ 'A' Level

    5. Any other (specify)…………………

4. Highest Professional Qualification

    1. PGDE   2. Bachelor (Education)

    3. Diploma (Education)   4.Cert. A '3' Year

    5. Cert. A '4' Year   6. Any other (specify) ----------------

5. Total teaching experience

    1. 0- 5 years   2. 6-10 years

    3. 11-15 years   4. 16 years or more

6.   Total years of headship in your present school.

       1. Less than 6 years   2. 6-12 years

       3. Over 13 years

7.   Your status in the Ghana Education Service (GES)

       1. Non-Graduate Professional

       2. Graduate Professional

       3. Graduate Non-Professional

       4. Non-Graduate, Non-Professional

8. Present Rank in the Ghana Education Service (GES)

       1. Superintendent 2   2. Superintendent 1

       3. Senior Superintendent 2   4. Senior Superintendent 1

       5. Principal Superintendent   6. Any other (specify)…………..

SECTION B

Headteachers' Expectations for Students

The following are statements about your expectations for students in your school. Please circle the number that best describes your response on the occurrence of each of them.

KEY

5. Indicates 'Strongly Agree'

4. Indicates 'Agree'

3. Indicates 'Undecided'

2. Indicates 'Disagree'

1. Indicates 'Strongly Disagree'

9. Most students in my school are capable of attaining grade

    level academic objectives.   5   4   3   2   1

10. Most students in my school will perform at about the

    national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

1. I expect that most students in my school will perform above

    the national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

12. Nearly all of my students will be at or above grade level by

    the end of this year.   5   4   3   2   1

13. I expect most students in my school will perform below

    the national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

14. Teachers in my school generally believe most students

     are able to master the basic read/maths skills.   5   4   3   2   1

15. Teachers in my school set high standards for learning and

     let students know they are all expected to meet them.   5   4   3   2   1

16. Teachers expect all students to perform at a level needed

     to be successful at the next level of learning.   5   4   3   2   1

17. Teachers in my school provide the time, instruction and

     encouragement necessary to help lower achievers perform at

     acceptable levels which will improve performance.   5   4   3   2   1

18. Teachers in my school monitor their own beliefs and behaviour

     to make certain that high expectations are communicated to all

     students, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity,

     or other personal characteristics and this will lead to higher student

achievement.   5 4 3 2 1

SECTION C

Headteachers' Expectations for Boy

Use the same instructions above to answer the following expectations for boys in your school.

19.   Most boys in my school will score above the national average in academic

achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

20.   I expect most boys in my school to perform below the

national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

21.   Teachers set high standards for boys in my school.   5   4   3   2   1

22.   Teachers make their expectations clear to all the boys in

my school about their behaviour.   5   4   3   2   1

23.   Teachers in my school emphasize that the boys are good and reinforce

this by having them view each others performance.   5   4   3   2   1

24.   Teachers have lower expectations for boys in my school. 5   4   3   2   1

SECTION D

Headteachers' Expectations for Girls

Use the same instructions above to answer the following expectations for girls in your   school.

25.   Most girls in my school will score above the national average

in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

26. I expect girls in my school to perform below the

national average in academic achievement.   5   4   3   2   1

27. Teachers set high standards for girls in my school.   5   4   3   2   1

28. Teachers make their expectations clear to all the girls in my

school about their behaviour.   5   4   3   2   1

29. Teachers in my school emphasize that girls are good and reinforce

these by having them view each others performance.   5   4   3   2   1

30. Teachers have lower expectations for girls in my school. 5   4   3   2   1

B.E.C.E 2007/08: SCHOOL RESULT

School Code	Name of School	Percentage Passed for Boys	Percentage Passed for Girls	Total School Score (%)
R1	Mampong D/A	00.00	18.18	15.38
R2	Asafora Cath	90.00	100.00	92.31
R3	Akraman Cath	83.33	50.00	66.67
R4	Buranomoa	00.00	00.00	00.00
R5	Dadaagua D/A	86.66	42.85	72.73
R6	Obuadze D/A	11.11	00.00	8.33
R7	Amisakrom Ekroful	100.00	75.00	92.31
R8	Gyinankoma Cath	33.33	00.00	20.00
R9	A/Buadukwaa	20.00	00.00	12.50
R10	Egyankwa Owuyaa	100.00	100.00	100.00
R11	Twa Dunkwa	40.00	00.00	30.77
R12	Suprudo D/A	18.18	20.00	18.75
R13	Kwesil Ansah D/A	100.00	66.66	85.71
R14	Ebiram D/A	9.09	11.11	10.00

R15	Srafa-Immuna			
	D/A	44.44	00.00	34.78
R16	Srafa-Wesley	100.00	100.00	100.00
R17	Kuntu D/A	75.00	46.15	57.14
R18	Eshiro D/A	66.66	100.00	90.91
U1	Anomabo Meth.	48.93	19.28	38.36
U2	Anomabo Cath.	22.22	00.00	12.24
U3	Biriwa Meth.	86.66	60.00	74.12
U4	Yamoransa			
	Cath.	100.00	100.00	100.00
U5	Essarkyir D/A	38.46	54.54	45.83
U6	Essuekyir D/A	73.07	48.00	60.78
U7	Saltpond Meth.	57.69	56.52	57.14
U8	Saltpond Ahm.	50.00	20.00	43.48
U9	Kormantse D/A	38.46	26.31	31.25
U10	Abanze Meth.	72.72	66.66	71.43
U11	Nanaben D/A	62.96	40.00	53.19
U12	Eyisam D/A	60.00	35.71	45.83
U13	Dominase Ang.	33.33	5.55	18.18
U14	Narkwa D/A	37.50	14.28	32.26
U15	Ekumpoano			
	Cath.	9.09	00.00	4.76
U16	Mankessim			
	Meth.B	100.00	100.00	100.00

| U17 | Mankessim D/A 'A' | 95.00 | 88.88 | 92.68 |
| U18 | Baifikrom D/A | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

APPENDIX D

School Rating for Teachers' Expectations for Students and

Students' Achievement

School	Summed Score for Expectation Level for Students	Rating for Expectation Level for Students	Average student Achievement for the year (%)	Rating for Achievement Level for School
R1	73.00	Low	15.38	Low
R2	69.80	Low	92.31	High
R3	75.25	High	66.67	High
R4	68.24	Low	00.00	Low
R5	70.50	Low	72.73	High
R6	72.92	Low	8.33	Low
R7	77.24	High	92.31	High
R8	72.50	Low	20.00	Low
R9	70.59	Low	12.50	Low
R10	76.25	High	100.00	High
R11	73.93	High	30.77	Low
R12	70.59	Low	18.75	Low
R13	73.36	Low	85.71	High
R14	66.00	Low	10.00	Low
R15	65.60	Low	34.78	Low

R16	74.82	High	100.00	High
R17	75.40	High	57.14	High
R18	73.09	Low	90.91	High
U1	76.62	High	38.36	Low
U2	68.90	Low	12.24	Low
U3	77.08	High	74.12	High
U4	73.94	High	100.00	High
U5	74.25	High	45.83	Low
U6	74.20	High	60.78	High
U7	72.60	Low	57.14	High
U8	74.07	High	43.48	Low
U9	76.93	High	31.25	Low
U10	78.91	High	71.43	High
U11	74.60	High	53.19	High
U12	76.90	High	45.83	Low
U13	75.99	High	18.18	Low
U14	75.79	High	32.26	Low
U15	72.60	High	4.76	Low
U16	75.91	High	100.00	High
U17	78.37	High	92.68	High
U18	79.60	High	100.00	High

APPENDIX E

Cronbach's Alpha Internal Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	Number of Items
.731	.737	30