THE IMPACT OF TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS, PARENTS' EXPECTATIONS, AND ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

A Dissertation

by

VIVINA YUKARI RIVERA

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2012

Major Subject: School Psychology

The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners

THE IMPACT OF TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS, PARENTS' EXPECTATIONS, AND ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

A Dissertation

by

VIVINA YUKARI RIVERA

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Cynthia A. Riccio
Committee Members,	Anita S. McCormick
	Fuhui Tong
	Victor Arizpe
Head of Department,	Victor L. Willson

August 2012

Major Subject: School Psychology

ABSTRACT

The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners. (August 2012)

Vivina Yukari Rivera, B.A., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Cynthia A. Riccio

Given the projected increase of Hispanic Spanish-speaking English language learners (ELLs), researchers have begun examining issues related to their high levels of school dropout, largely stemming from academic underachievement. The focus of this study is to examine the impact of teacher expectations, parent expectations, and academic self-efficacy on the achievement of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs. Participants in this study were from a medium-size school district in southwest Texas and included 99 2nd, 5th, and 8th grade students identified as limited English proficient, their parent, and their teacher. Norm-referenced achievement measures and researcher developed measures were utilized in this study.

Findings from this study indicate that teacher expectations was a significant predictor of all measures of achievement, while parent expectations was a significant predictor of English reading and students' academic self-efficacy was a significant predictor of Spanish reading. Second, this study determined the best predictor for reading and math achievement was teacher expectations in 2nd grade, but there were no significant predictors in 5th and 8th grade. Third, this study addressed the possibility of

academic self-efficacy functioning as a mediator, but the analysis was not conducted because academic self-efficacy did not serve as a significant predictor of all measures of achievement.

Findings from additional analyses indicate that students' English language proficiency was determined to be a significant predictor of English reading achievement and parent expectations. Furthermore, students' Spanish proficiency was positively associated with their grade levels, and Spanish proficiency was negatively related to English proficiency. Academic self-efficacy was separated by domains (i.e., math self-efficacy and reading self-efficacy). In the overall sample math self-efficacy was not a significant predictor of math achievement. Math self-efficacy served as a significant predictor for 5th and 8th grade math achievement. In the overall sample, reading self-efficacy did not significantly predict English or Spanish reading. Reading self-efficacy served as a significant predictor in 8th grade English reading. Parents' employment desires for their children demonstrated a mismatch with parents' desire for their child's highest level of education. Teachers believed that family concerns were the greatest obstacle participants faced and many did not desire to speculate about students' future employment.

DEDICATION

Para mis padres… mi inspiración.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my academic advisor and chair, Dr. Riccio, for her guidance, her words of encouragement, and for believing in me. You are a great chair and I am privileged to be your student! Thank you to the rest of my committee, especially Dr. McCormick for all her help and support throughout my graduate career, including editing the Spanish translations of my dissertation measures.

I am forever grateful for the administrators who gave me permission to go into their school district/schools, and especially for the teachers, parents, and students who participated in my study. Without you none of this would have been possible. I would also like to thank the Texas A&M Association of Former Students, the Texas A&M Office of Admissions and Records, and Peter Piper Pizza for their donations.

Finally, thank you to my family who give my life so much meaning. It is because of your love and support that I am able to fulfill this dream.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the United States (U.S.), Hispanics, also referred to as Latinos, is the largest minority group within the country and are projected to continue increasing at exponential rates in the coming decades (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008b, 2011c). With this projected increase, it is likely that the number of Spanish-speaking English language learners (ELLs; individuals learning to speak English) will increase in different domains of society. One area which this increase is noted is in the school environment (Goldenberg, 2008; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2011a, 2011b). With this in mind, it becomes obvious that much focus should be placed on the academic achievement and dropout rate of Spanish-speaking ELLs.

Dropping out of school leads to many adverse long-term effects (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007, 2011; Cassel, 2003; U.S. Department of Justice, 1993, 2006). Consistently Hispanic students have evidenced the highest dropout rate for over 30 years in this country. Even in more recent times, though the dropout rate has declined, Hispanic students comprise the group with the largest percentage of school dropout (NCES, 2011b; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012), especially Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs (August & Shanahan, 2006; Gingras, & Careaga, 1989; NCES, 2000, 2007; Steinberg, Blinde, & Chan, 1984; Thomas & Collier, 2002). Thus, given the increase of Hispanics and ELLs in the U.S., one can deduce that the dropout rate will likely become an even

---

This dissertation follows the style of *School Psychology Review*.

greater problem in the future, particularly with regard to Spanish-speaking ELLs.

Students drop out of school for many reasons, some of which come from differing domains in students' lives, involving, school, family, peer, and individual characteristics. One factor that is malleable and has received great attention in the literature is the impact that poor school performance and achievement has on the dropout problem (Bertrand, 1962; Lloyd, 1976; Rumberger, 2011; Simner & Barnes, 1991; Strom & Boster, 2007). As such, it is necessary to focus on predictors of academic achievement as a method of alleviating the school dropout problem. Similar to the dropout problem, predictors of academic achievement involve school, family, peer, and individual characteristics. Of these characteristics it is important to focus on ones that can be altered, such as teacher expectations (Hinnant, O'Brien, & Ghazarian, 2009).

Upon consideration of expectations and their impact on achievement, given the predictors of dropout and academic achievement, it becomes obvious that in order to alleviate these problems research must take an ecological/systems approach (Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008) and hone in on the school (i.e., teacher), family (i.e., parents), and student. Thus, research needs to consider expectations from differing domains. By approaching the study of these variables from a systemic manner, this will improve the likelihood of uncovering a different method to better the rate of dropout and academic underachievement of these students.

Teachers' expectations are defined as a teacher's estimate of a student's likely academic performance at present or in the future (Saracho, 1991). Though teachers' expectations have been suggested to predict student academic achievement (e.g., Gill &

Reynolds, 1999; Hinnant et al., 2009; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001), there is paucity in the research with regard to students' in older grades and teachers' expectations on Spanish-speaking ELLs' achievement. In addition, parents' expectations are defined as parent's future academic aspirations or their present level of expectations for their child's academic performance (Christenson, Rounds, & Gorney, 1992). Similar to the research regarding teachers' expectations, parents' expectations has also been suggested to predict student achievement (Dimmler, 2008; Flowers & Flowers, 2008; Galindo & Sheldon, 2012; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Jacobs, 1991; Patrikakou; 1997; Reynolds & Gill; 1994; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005; Wu & Qi, 2006; Zhan, 2006). Still, few studies have investigated younger and older students in the same sample to determine the effect of parents' expectations on differing grade levels. Moreover, there is limited research investigating parents' expectations on Spanish-speaking ELLs' academic achievement.

The expectancy literature has considered the student themselves as playing a vital role in studies. One area of interest with regard to the student has been in student academic self-efficacy. Academic self-efficacy is the students' "perceived capability to fulfill academic demands" (Bandura, Pastorelli, Babaranelli, & Caprara, 1999, p. 259). It has been widely suggested that academic self-efficacy predicts academic achievement (Britner & Pajares, 2006; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Coutinho & Neuman, 2008; Ghosh, 2007; Pajares, 2003; Pajares & Miller, 1994; Pajares & Valiante, 1997; Phan, 2012; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Wood & Locke, 1987). However, few studies have

considered the impact of academic self-efficacy on students in early elementary grades and ELLs.

Some studies have addressed combinations of the variables under consideration. However, when looked at in tandem, no literature to date to the author's knowledge has investigated the impact of teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and academic self-efficacy on Spanish-speaking ELLs' academic achievement. Considering the documented and projected rise of this population within the country, this area of research is necessary in order to alleviate the school dropout problem that will likely continue with the increase of this population.

Statement of the Problem

Hispanic students, particularly those who are ELLs, have a higher than expected rate of drop out, with associated negative long term effects financially and socially. The historic problems of Hispanics in the U.S. educational system is not likely to change, and the growth of the Hispanic population in the U.S. would suggest that dropping out will continue to occur with this population if there is not a better understanding of the malleable factors that contribute to academic outcomes for these students. Factors identified for other groups are teacher and parent expectations. Because the school dropout and achievement problem involve predictors related to the differing systems of students' lives, it is necessary to address not only teachers and parents but also the student themselves. As such, one other factor identified to assist in alleviating these social problems is academic self-efficacy. No published research to date has examined

these factors with regard to their effect on the academic outcomes of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs.

Purpose of the Study

As such, it is the purpose of this study to address the impact that teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and student academic self-efficacy have on the academic success of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs. This study will provide evidence for the potential relationship between these variables. If a relationship should exist between these domains, it could provide very useful information to assist in improving student outcomes. In addition, if this relationship is found, it will provide information regarding the best time and method to intervene in order to reduce the likelihood of poor academic performance and dropout, both of which are problems that plague this population. It is in this context that the following research questions will be addressed by this study:

Research Question 1

Do teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, or students' academic self-efficacy predict Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELL students' math and reading academic achievement? If so, which is the better predictor? It is hypothesized that teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy will each predict Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs' math and reading academic achievement. Of these variables, it is hypothesized that teachers' expectations will be the better predictor.

Research Question 2

Which is a better predictor of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELL students' math and reading achievement at differing grade levels: teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, or students' academic self-efficacy? It is hypothesized that at earlier grade levels (i.e., 2nd and 5th grade) teachers' expectations will be better predictors' of math and reading achievement, while students' academic self-efficacy will be the better predictor of academic achievement for Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs in later grade levels (i.e., 8th grade).

Research Question 3

Does academic self-efficacy mediate effects of teacher expectations and parent expectations overall and/or at differing grade levels? It is hypothesized that academic self-efficacy will mediate effects of teacher expectations and parent expectations on academic achievement. It is believed that upon controlling for academic self-efficacy, teachers' and parents' expectations will not as strongly predict math and reading achievement. It is hypothesized that this mediation will be demonstrated with most significance in later grade levels (i.e., 8th grade).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

English Language Learners (ELLs)

Immigration into the United States (U.S.) has continuously increased throughout time (U.S. Census Bureau, 1996, 2002, 2003, 2011a, 2011c). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2002), throughout the decade of 1990 and 2000 the U.S. witnessed a 57% increase in immigration by the foreign-born population. Comparing the years of 2000 and 2010, the total amount of foreign-born individuals increased as well. During 2000, 11% (31.1 million people) of the total U.S. population were foreign-born individuals, while in 2010 13% (40 million individuals) of the total population was made up of foreign-born people (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a). A large number of the U.S. foreign-born population lives on the U.S.-Mexico border, and so states on the southwestern border of the country, from California to Texas, have high concentrations of new immigrants (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). As such, the majority of the U.S. foreign-born population is from Latin American countries, primarily Mexico (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a, 2011b).

The U.S. and Spanish-speakers

At present, Hispanics are the largest minority group in the U.S. Throughout the decade of 2000 and 2010, over half of the increase in the U.S. total population was from the growth of the Hispanic population by 15.3 million individuals (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011c). Hispanics are projected to continue growing at an exponential rate over the next

40 years (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008b). For example, in 2050, the U.S. Census Bureau projects that Hispanics will comprise 24.4% of the total U.S. population. This percentage far outnumbers any other minority group, including African Americans and Asians who are projected to comprise 14.6% and 8% of the population, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006; 2008a).

This increase in immigration and of Hispanics in the country has introduced more households who speak non-English languages, such as Spanish, into the nation (Siegel, Martin, & Bruno, 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010); however, speaking a non-English language does not equate an inability to speak English. Of these individuals who speak non-English languages the majority do not report having difficulty with English, while some indicate not being able to speak the language or having difficulty with speaking English. Though it seems that the rate of proficiency in English has improved across time, it is possible that this trend may be an overestimate of proficiency level given that individuals self-report their level of proficiency and those who have trouble with English do not always complete census forms (Siegel et al.). Thus, with the increase of foreign-born immigrants to the nation and the continuous upward trend of Hispanics in the country, we are likely to see an increase in English language learners (ELLs; i.e., individuals learning to speak English) in differing arenas of society (e.g., medical facilities, employment, and schools).

School-age ELLs

One domain in which ELLs have been vastly noted is in U.S. schools. Similar to the trend of immigration and the upward trend of the Hispanic population in the country,

ELLs comprise an ever growing population of school-age individuals in the U.S. (Goldenberg, 2008; NCES, 2011a, 2011b). When comparing the years 1994 and 2000, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2004) reported that the rate of school-age ELLs enrolled in U.S. public schools increased by approximately one million students, leading to a two percent increase of ELLs. Furthermore, the NCES (2009) reported an increase in three to six percent of students who spoke a non-English language and who spoke English with difficulty between the decades of 1980 and 2000. Though it was noted that this trend did not continue to a significant degree between 2000 and 2007, given that the percentage of students who were ELLs in this time frame was between five and six percent, there still appears to have been growth in this population.

Of the school-age ELLs in the country, large percentages reside primarily in the Western region of the U.S (e.g., California). However, the U.S. witnessed a slight shift in 2000, as the percentage of these ELLs declined in the Northeastern region (e.g., Maine and Massachusetts) and increased in the South (e.g., Texas), Midwest (e.g., Illinois), and Western regions (NCES, 2004). In 2007, the geographic concentration of school-age ELLs shifted once again. Particularly, the NCES (2009) reported that the number of school-age children who spoke a non-English language and had difficulty speaking English was highest in California, Texas, and Arizona, as they comprised 11%, 10%, and 9% of school enrollment, respectively. Given that a high concentration of the U.S. foreign-born population lives on the U.S.-Mexico border (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003), the aforementioned findings by the NCES (2009) is logical. Thus, these areas are

more likely to house a high concentration of Spanish-speaking school-age ELLs, which have been increasing in number since at least 1979 (NCES, 2009).

ELLs in Texas

When looking closely at the information provided by the NCES (2009), though it seems that California is leading all states with the highest percentage of school-age ELLs, when it comes to Spanish, the dominant language of most ELLs in the country (Espinosa, 2007; NCES, 2009, 2011b), Texas leaves California behind. Specifically, California has a large percentage of ELLs who speak differing languages (e.g., Spanish or an Asian language). Of the total school-age population in California, 44.3% spoke a non-English language in the home, 10.9% spoke English with difficulty, and 80.5% of those who spoke English with difficulty spoke Spanish. In contrast, in Texas, only 34.2% of the total Texas school-age population spoke a non-English language in their home. Of that percentage, 10.1% spoke English with difficulty, and 92.5% of those students spoke Spanish (NCES, 2009). As such, in comparison to all states in the U.S., Texas has by far the greatest percentage of Spanish-speaking school-age ELLs.

State of ELLs Achievement

Considering that Hispanic students comprise the majority of school-age ELLs in the U.S., it is necessary to look at the state of Hispanic achievement in the country. At present, the NCES provides the public with information regarding the current state of achievement in U.S. schools by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) program. This program has investigated the reading and mathematics performance of U.S. students since the beginning of the 1990s. From this information a

better sense of the current condition of education is able to be obtained (NCES 2011a, 2011b).

When looking at the state of Hispanic achievement reports from the NCES (2011a, 2011b) about both math and reading suggests that Hispanic students score below White students. This trend is often referred to as the achievement gap between White and Hispanic students. From the year 2005 to 2009, the 4th and 8th grade mathematics achievement gap between these two ethnicities has remained relatively stable (NCES, 2011a). When comparing the gap between students in 1990 and 2009, the achievement gap from one year is not significantly different from the other year (NCES, 2011b). Between the years of 1990 to 2009, White and Hispanic students' performances have both increased; however, White students continue to outperform Hispanic students in mathematics and an ethnic gap persists. With regard to Hispanics reading performance, a similar trend found in the 4th and 8th grade mathematics achievement gap emerged. Specifically, in both 4th and 8th grade, the 2009 reading gap was not significantly different from the gap noted in either 1992 or 2007 (NCES, 2011a, 2011b). Still, White students continue to outperform Hispanic students in reading, as in math, even if scores in the 4th and 8th grade have begun to improve (NCES, 2011a, 2011b).

When considering ELLs, the NCES (2011b) does not disaggregate the state of ELLs' achievement by language. Still, the NCES does compare the achievement gap between ELLs and their non-ELL counterparts. Reports from the NCES indicate that non-ELL students outperform ELL students in both reading and mathematics in 4th, 8th, and 12th grade, though the gaps noted were not always statistically significant when

compared to the gap in 2009. Particularly, in the realm of reading, the gap between ELLs and their non-ELL counterparts from 2000 to 2007 is not statistically significant from the gap noted in 2009 in the 4th and 8th grade. In the 12th grade, the years of 2002 and 2005 appear statistically significant from 2009. Furthermore, in mathematics, in the 4th grade, the gap in 2000 to 2007 was not statistically significant from that noted in 2009, but in 8th grade a statically significant change was noted in the years of 2003, 2005, and 2007 in comparison to the year of 2009. In addition, in the 12th grade the gap between ELLs and their non-ELL counterparts was statistically significant in 2003 as compared to the gap noted in 2009. In sum, non-ELLs continue to academically outperform ELLs.

Because Texas houses the greatest number of Spanish-speaking ELLs (NCES, 2009), it is important to look at their performance on mathematics and reading tasks in this state as reported by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). It is necessary to note that though the TEA does not disaggregate ELLs by language, considering that Texas does house a great number of Spanish-speaking ELLs, it seems that these rates may be more representative of Spanish-speaking ELLs than those noted in the NCES (2011b). According to the TEA's Academic Excellence Indicator System (2011), in 2011 the performance of ELLs in the state dropped greatly at the 5th grade. Particularly, prior to the 5th grade, the range of students meeting the 2011 standard was between 74 and 86 percent. However, in the 5th grade ELLs meeting the mathematics and reading standard ranged from 49 to 77 percent, respectively. In the 6th grade, the range of ELLs meeting the 2011 standard in reading and mathematics narrowed between content areas, from 60

to 69 percent, respectively. Interestingly, when comparing 5th and 6th grade ELLs, the percentage of students in 6th grade meeting 2011 standards increased in the domain of mathematics, but decreased in reading. It is necessary to keep in mind that the 6th grade testing was solely done in English, while in earlier grades students were either tested in English or Spanish. Thus, the decline in the percentage of ELLs who did not meet the 2011 standards in reading may be an artifact of limited English proficiency. Still, a great decline in the amount of ELLs who met 2011 standards was noted in secondary school. Particularly, in 7th and 8th grade 57 to 63 percent of ELLs met the 2011 standard in reading and mathematics. In high school, scores continued to decline as ELLs meeting the 2011 standard ranged from 44 to 66 percent. As such, it seems that as ELLs go further in their education fewer are performing up to par with the standards set forth indicating the underachievement of this population. It is further necessary to make note that this drop in achievement through-out the different school grades is often accompanied with school dropout. Thus, these ranges may not be representative of all school-age ELLs in the U.S. and may in fact be an overestimate of performance given that some leave school early.

ELLs and Dropout

Though education through high school is provided to all children and is mandated by law, some students, for differing reasons, leave school early and dropout. Overall, the trend for dropping out of school slowly declined since the 1970s and throughout the 1990s continued at a steady rate, but has begun to decrease once again in the 2000s (NCES, 2009, 2011c). Though it seems that this issue is gradually being

alleviated, the dropout problem continues to plague more than 3 million students every year (NCES, 2000).

This social ailment adversely impacts many areas of individuals' lives. Research has documented the consequences of dropout and has indicated that some of its effects include teenage pregnancy (Bickel, Weaver, Williams, & Lange, 1997; Manlove, 1998), delinquent behavior (Chavez, Oetting, & Swaim, 1994; U.S. Department of Justice, 2006), entering the justice system (Cassel, 2003; NCES, 2007; U.S. Department of Justice, 1993), and unemployment (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007, 2011). Moreover, dropping out of high school affects occupational opportunities, income, quality of life, and can lead to a dependence on public assistance (Bernal, Saenz, & Knight, 1991; NCES, 2000; Swaim, Beauvais, Chavez, & Oetting, 1997). As such, the consequences for not completing high school can be severe and take its toll throughout individuals' lifetime. Thus, the U.S. government and educational system is severely affected by this social problem given that this problem puts many of students at risk for dropping out, primarily students who are ethnic minorities (NCES, 2000).

The U.S. dropout rate has been a well documented phenomenon throughout the literature (e.g., Bernal et al., 1991; Fernandez, Paulsen, & Hirano-Nakanishi, 1989; NCES, 2000, 2007, 2011c). This social problem does not discriminate in its impact on different races and ethnicities considering that all children can be at risk for this problem (NCES, 2000). Still, when compared to White students, Hispanic and African American students are at a greater risk for dropping out (NCES, 2011c; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). For example, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2007), in

2005 6% of all White students, 10.4% of African American students, and 22.4% of all Hispanic students dropped out of high school.

Though the dropout rate has declined, consistently Hispanics have been at the forefront of this social malady for over 30 years, likely more-so today given the exponential increase in Hispanic youth (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; U.S. Department of Justice, 2006). Even in more recent times, Hispanic students comprise 17.6% of individuals who dropout, while 5.2% and 9.3% of students who dropout are made up of White and African American individuals (NCES, 2011c). Of the 17.6% of Hispanic students who dropout, an overwhelming majority of these students were not born in the U.S. (NCES, 2011b, 2011c). From these statistics it becomes apparent that although greater numbers of African Americans and Hispanics dropout of school, this problem seems to target Hispanics at full force, primarily foreign-born Hispanics.

Thus, Hispanics are the fastest growing minority group, as previously mentioned; they also account for the largest percentage of youth who drop out of high school (NCES, 2011b; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Given the consequences of the dropout problem, it is important to note that though high school dropouts encompass a large portion of imprisoned individuals, in actuality, Hispanics comprise a large proportion of the imprisoned population. Particularly, Hispanics with literacy difficulties make-up a large amount of those Hispanics that are imprisoned (Cassel, 2003), which in turn could be related to issues regarding the English language. When disaggregating the dropout population in the U.S., a large part of those who drop out of high school tend to be Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs (August & Shanahan, 2006; Gingras, & Careaga,

1989; NCES, 2000, 2007; Steinberg et al., 1984; Thomas & Collier, 2002). Thus, given the increase of Hispanics and ELLs in the U.S., one can deduce that the dropout rate will likely become an even greater problem in the future, particularly with regard to Spanish-speaking ELLs.

Reasons for Drop Out

Students drop out of school for many different reasons. For instance, school, family, peer, and individual characteristics all contribute toward school dropout (Rumberger, 2011). Due to the adverse effects and impact on society, researchers have well documented the predictors and risk factors involved in school dropout. From the dropout literature, risk factors include factors that are not easily malleable such as, socioeconomic-status (SES; Bertrand, 1962; Campbell & Duffy, 1998; Flisher, Townsend, Chikobvu, Lombard, & King, 2010; Henry, Cavanagh, & Oetting, 2011; Hyman, Aubry, & Klodawsky, 2011; Rumberger, 1983), student mobility (Goksen & Cemalcilar, 2010; Rumberger & Larson, 1998; Stroup & Robins, 1972), and lack of school resources (Rumberger, 1983, 2011; Rumberger & Thomas, 2000). Moreover, there are a great deal of risk factors that reside in the individual student as well, such as school disengagement and lack of connectedness (Bertrand, 1962; Davalos, Chavez, & Guardiola, 1999; Hunt, Meyers, Davies, Meyers, Grogg, & Neel, 2002; Ream & Rumberger, 2008; Schulz & Rubel, 2011; Thomas, 1954), student expectations (Campbell & Duffy, 1998; Rumberger, 2011), and teenage pregnancy (Rumberger, 1983, 2011). Still, the students' home environment continues to play a large role in the dropout problem. For instance, lack of parental involvement in school (Barnard, 2004;

Bertrand, 1962; Englund, Egeland, & Collins, 2008; Rumberger, Ghatak, Poulos, Ritter, & Dornbusch, 1990), poor parent-child relationship (Englund et al., 2008; Strom & Boster, 2007; Tenenbaum, Porche, Snow, Tabors, & Ross, 2007), low parental expectations (Rumberger, 1995; Strom & Boster, 2007), and coming from a non-English speaking family (Rumberger, 1995, 2011) adversely impact students' completion of high school. One factor that has received great attention in the literature is the impact that being retained in school (Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2007; Rumberger, 1995) and poor school performance and achievement (Battin-Pearson, Newcomb, Abbott, Hill, Catalano, & Hawkins, 2000; Christle et al., 2007; Bertrand, 1962; Lloyd, 1976; Matthews, 2009; Rumberger, 2011; Simner & Barnes, 1991; Strom & Boster, 2007) has on the dropout problem.

Though there has been a considerable amount of research with regard to school dropout, most researchers have studied dropping out of school at the high school level (Davalos et al., 1999; Lee, Cornell, Gregory, & Fan, 2011; Rumberger, 1983; Rumberger et al., 1990; Rumberger & Thomas, 2000; Strom & Boster, 2007, Thomas, 1954). Rumberger (1995) investigated this phenomenon from the middle school level. Rumberger found that similar factors plagued middle school students who would drop out of school, such as SES, lack of parental involvement, being retained, school mobility, low student and parent educational aspirations, and poor academic performance. Thus, it seems that even with a differing and younger population, very similar risk factors need to be addressed in order to alleviate the school dropout problem.

Though investigators have noted these reasons for school dropout across all youth, it is necessary to focus attention on factors that can be changed or are malleable (e.g., school performance). Due to the rate of ethnic minority student dropout, primarily Hispanic students (NCES, 2009), some researchers have teased out the impacts these factors have on differing races and ethnicities (e.g., Hirano-Nakanishi, 1986; Jordan, Lara, & McPartland, 1996; Ream & Rumberger, 2008). Of particular interest, given their leading rate in dropout, Ream and Rumberger (2008) looked closely at school dropout with regard to Mexican American students. Findings suggest that in comparison to non-Latino White students, Mexican American students are less engaged in school, are of lower SES, have lower educational aspirations, and perform more poorly in the realm of academic achievement. These factors all contribute to the school dropout problem; however, it is important to focus our attention on areas that are malleable. Given that level of school achievement is a strong predictor of school dropout (Battin-Pearson et al., 2000; Englund et al., 2008; Strom & Boster, 2007), attention should be placed in this area in order to assist in the betterment of this social problem.

Factors Contributing to Academic Achievement

With the adverse impact school dropout has on individuals and the relationship between academic performance and dropout (Ream & Rumberger, 2008; Rumberger, 1995, 2011; Strom & Boster, 2007), academic achievement among school-age youth has been an area that research has devoted great interest (e.g., Accordino, Accordino, & Slaney, 2000; Altschul, Oyserman, & Bybee, 2006; Anderson & Keith, 1997; Bang, Suarez-Orozco, Pakes, & O'Connor, 2009; Barbaranelli, Caprara, Rabasca, & Pastorelli,

2003; Boveja, 1998; Singer & Weinstein, 2000; Jeynes, 2005; Jimerson, Egeland, & Teo, 1999; LeCroy & Krysik, 2008; Malecki & Elliott, 2002; Nichols & White; 2001; Ruus et al., 2007). Because poor academic achievement functions as a predictor of school dropout one can deduce that predictors of academic performance are similar to those of dropout. For instance, much like school dropout, the academic achievement literature has demonstrated that this domain is also impacted by differing systems, or domains, of an individual's life, such as the school, family, peers, and the individual themselves.

With regard to individual characteristics, personality traits (Accordino et al., 2000; Barbaranelli et al., 2003; Caprara, Vecchione, Alessandri, Gerbino, & Barbaranelli, 2011; Laidra, Pullman, & Allik, 2007), attention (Grimm, Steele, Mashburn, Burchinal, & Pianta, 2010; Mayes, Calhoun, Bixler, & Zimmerman, 2009; Steinmayr, Ziegler, Trauble, 2010; Sarver et al., 2012), behavior (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli, Bandura, & Zimbardo, 2000; Jennings & DiPrete, 2010; Jimerson et al., 1999; Malecki & Elliott, 2002), self-efficacy (Britner & Pajares, 2006; Caprara et al., 2011; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Coutinho & Neuman, 2008; Weiser & Riggio, 2010), and academic thoughts, motivation, and effort (Adelabu, 2008; Anderson & Keith, 1997; Dotterer & Lowe, 2011; Erkman, Caner, Sat, Borkan, & Sahan, 2010; Lyon, 1993; Park, 2011; Stewart, 2007; Stewart, 2008) function as predictors of academic achievement. Still, in the midst of these predictors, much research has documented that intelligence is one of the strongest single predictors of academic success (Anderson & Keith; 1997; Buckner, Bassuk, & Weinreb, 2001; Duncan et al., 2007; Geary, 2011; Goran & Gage,

2011; Laidra et al., 2007; Mayes et al., 2009; Steinmayr et al., 2010); however, intelligence, or ability, is not a malleable domain; similarly other individual characteristics are not easily malleable (e.g., personality and attention). As such, focus throughout the literature should be placed on areas that can be changed with regard to school-age students in order to enhance academic performance.

In the area regarding peers, it seems that the group with which the individual affiliates predicts school performance (LeCroy & Krysik, 2008; Nichols & White, 2001; Ryabov, 2011; Stewart, 2007; Stewart, 2008). The literature has focused attention on the home environment and family as it provides significant predictors of academic performance. For instance, single parent homes (Burchinal et al., 2011; Jeynes, 2005; Ryabov, 2011; Schlee, Mullis, & Shriner, 2009; Stewart, 2008), SES (DuPaul, Volpe, Jitendra, Lutz, Lorah, & Gruber, 2004; Jimerson et al., 1999; Langberg et al., 2011), parent-child interaction (LeCroy & Krysik, 2008; Stewart, 2007; Stewart, 2008), parent involvement (Jeynes, 2005; Ruiz, 2009), and parental expectations (Reynolds & Gill, 1994; Ryabov, 2011) are all noted throughout the literature as predictors of academic performance, similar to the dropout literature.

Moreover, school factors predicting academic achievement have also been investigated. From the literature, it has been suggested that teacher expectations (Buckner et al., 2001; Hinnant et al., 2009; Hornstra, Denessen, Baker, van den Bergh, & Voeten, 2010), teacher perceptions (DuPaul et al., 2004; Peet, Powell, & O'Donnel, 1997), school climate (Dotterer & Lowe, 2011; Ruus et al., 2007; Stewart, 2007), and school cohesion (LeCroy & Krysik, 2008; Ruiz, 2009; Stewart, 2007) all function as

predictors of academic achievement. Such predictors appear to be very similar to those noted in the dropout literature, with the exception and addition of the variable, teacher expectations.

Academic Achievement and Hispanic Students

Furthermore, researchers have looked closely at predictors of academic achievement in groups of racial and ethnic minority students and have obtained similar findings (e.g., Altschul, Oyserman, & Bybee, 2006; Alvarez, 2003; Christian, 2009; LeCroy & Kysik, 2008; Ragland, 2009; Ruiz, 2009; Williams & Dawson, 2011). For example, given the status in dropout and academic achievement among Hispanic students, investigators have focused attention on predictors of achievement for these students. These predictors include student's level of connection and identification to the school (Alvarez, 2003; Ruiz, 2009), acculturation (e.g., home language, limited English proficiency, and culture; Alvarez, 2003; Ruiz, 2009; Sandoval, 1997; Williams & Dawson, 2011; Zarate, Bhimji, & Reese, 2005), association with peers who are in favor of academic success, parental support (LeCroy & Kysik, 2008), as well as SES and education of the parent (Williams & Dawson, 2011). Though these differing predictors appear to be malleable, research should consider moving toward a different direction in order to find other less researched alternatives to alleviate these social ailments experienced by Hispanic students. Of particular interest is the limited research regarding the impact of expectations on this group, especially with regard to Spanish-speaking ELLs, given that expectations has been suggested to be a predictor of both dropout and

achievement in other populations (e.g., Buckner et al., 2001; Hinnant et al., 2009; Rumberger, 1995; Strom & Boster, 2007).

Ecological/Systems Perspective

When looking closely at the predictors of dropout and academic achievement, it becomes apparent that the differing systems in students' lives (e.g., the individual, family, and school) interact and influence both social problems (Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008). Given this interaction, it is then necessary to take an ecological or systems perspective in reducing the rate of dropout and improving academic achievement. Particularly, the ecological or systems perspective allows researchers to consider the relationships and dynamics between differing systems. It assists with the awareness to look beyond the individual and consider that they are the product of the interaction between themselves and the environments that they participate in (Conoley & Haynes, 1992; Felner, 2000; Germain, 2002; Germain & Gitterman, 1996; Odom, Brown, Schwartz, Zercher, & Sandall, 2002; Rhodes, 1970; Syverson, 2008). As such, given the limited research regarding Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs and expectations, research needs to address this gap and consider it from an ecological or systems perspective by honing in on the school (i.e., teachers), home (i.e., parents), and individual. By approaching the study of these variables from a systemic manner, this will improve the likelihood of uncovering a different method to reduce the rate of dropout and improve academic achievement of these students.

Expectations

For decades researchers have attempted to understand the impact that others' expectations have on individuals' behavior (e.g., Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Good, 1981; Good & Nichols, 2001; Harris, Rosenthal, & Snodgrass, 1986; Kenealy, Frude, & Shaw, 1991; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Sciarra & Ambrosino, 2011). Primarily, efforts began with studies demonstrating support for the influence of experimenters' personality and behavior on their subjects and further moved to the impact others' expectations have on individuals. Research in this area was founded on the self-fulfilling prophecy, which declared that false expectations guide the behaviors that cause the expectation to become reality (Merton, 1948). Specifically, in the 1960s, early expectancy research began with the documentation of experimenter bias (Rosenthal & Fode, 1963b). In their study, Rosenthal and Fode (1963b) found support for their hypothesis that others' expectations predicted an individual's behavior. Findings from their research indicated that experimenters who expected for participants to rate photographs highly achieved a great amount of these high ratings, while those anticipating low ratings found a substantial amount of this outcome. Thus, it seemed that an experimenter's expectations would predict participants' responses and behavior which would likely lead to biased findings.

These positive results from this preliminary line of research encouraged Rosenthal and Fode to continue investigating the effects of expectations, in turn moving toward investigating the impact of expectations with animal subjects. Similar to their study regarding human participants, findings from their study involving animals suggested that experimenters who were told that their rats were bred for good maze

performance expected better outcomes; as such, these rats performed better relative to rats whose experimenters expected poor performance (Rosenthal & Fode, 1963a). Given the impact that experimenter expectations had on their participants, Rosenthal (1994) pioneered the next movement of expectancy research toward its impact within the real world.

Considering that experimenters' expectations predicted rats' performance in the laboratory (Rosenthal & Fode, 1963a), researchers designed investigations to expand the generalization of this finding (e.g., Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1966). In their seminal research, Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) began work to determine if findings would be similar with school children. Particularly, the researchers investigated the effect of teachers' expectations on their students' performance. Findings from their study suggested that when teachers expected their students to cognitively "bloom," students were more likely to demonstrate significant cognitive gains; a phenomenon coined the *Pygmalion effect* (Rosenthal & Jacobson). Much controversy ensued after the publication of Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) work (i.e., Pygmalion). For instance, researchers indicated that the work of Pygmalion was a statistical artifact caused by erred methodology and interpretation of data analysis (e.g., Snow, 1995; Thorndike, 1968). Still, with these critiques in mind, proponents of Pygmalion continued to refute these criticisms (Rosenthal, 1987, 1995). Though the results of Pygmalion were contested, this study spawned research within the field; as such, expectancy research within the schools was born.

Teacher Expectations

Researchers have investigated others' expectations on individual behavior in differing domains, such as in the workforce, therapy sessions, and gymnasium (King, 1980; Rosenthal & Babad, 1985). Still, given the grave impact of poor academic achievement, much expectancy research has focused on ways of improving performance thereby honing in on teachers expectations (e.g., Benner & Mistry, 2007; Brown & Medway, 2007; Cagle, 1998; Ferguson, 2005; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Good, 1981; Good & Nichols, 2001; Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, & Gottfredson, 1995; Ma, 2001; McKown & Weinstein, 2008; Rubie-Davies, 2007; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007; Tournaki, 2003; Trouilloud, Sarrazin, Bressoux, & Bois, 2006; Washington, 2001). Particularly, teacher expectations are defined as a teachers' estimate of a student's likely academic performance at present or in the future (Saracho, 1991).

Influencing Agents of Teacher Expectations. Researchers have investigated differing domains that influence teachers' expectations of their students' academic performance (e.g., Clark & Artiles, 2000; Flores, 2007; Hinnant et al., 2009; Hornstra et al., 2010; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Reyes, 2003; Ross & Jackson, 1991; Saracho, 1991; Stevens & van Houtte, 2011; Thompson, 2004; Tournaki & Podell, 2005). Often times, students arrive to their classrooms early in the school year and teachers' expectations of these students have begun to be formed (Good, 1987). For instance, student attributes that are difficult to change are key influencing agents of teachers' expectations, including gender (Hinnant et al., 2009; Ross & Jackson, 1991; Van Matre, Valentine, & Cooper, 2000; Wood, Kaplan, & McLoyd, 2007), socio-economic status (Hinnant et al.,

2009; Thompson, 2004; Van Matre et al., 2000), and racial/ethnic minority status (García-Nevarez, Stafford, & Arias, 2005; Thompson, 2004; Tyler, Boykin, &Walton, 2006; Washington, 2001). In addition, more malleable student characteristics also shape teachers' expectations, such as student behavior (Hinnant et al., 2009; Tournaki, 2003; Tournaki & Podell, 2005), engagement in extracurricular activities (Van Matre et al., 2000), and effort/motivation (Clark & Artiles, 2000; Flores, 2007; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998). One influencing agent of teachers' expectations often referred to throughout the literature is students' level of capability and skill, or achievement (Flores, 2007; Gingras & Careaga, 1989; Hauser-Cram, Sirin, & Stipek, 2003; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Mistry, White, Benner, & Huynh, 2009; Ouzts, 1986; Tournaki, 2003; Tournaki & Podell, 2005). In particular, researchers suggest that teachers' expectations are often accurate representations of students' level of achievement (Begeny, Eckert, Montarello, & Storie, 2008) because this factor largely influences teachers' level of student expectations. Still, other factors regarding the teacher him/herself, as well as the student's family, also influence teachers' expectations. For example, teachers' level of preparation (Kennedy, 2010; Walker, Shafer, & Iiams, 2004), self-efficacy (Tournaki & Podell, 2005; Warren, 2002), as well as teacher perceived value differences between themselves and the parent (Hauser-Cram et al., 2003), contribute to these expectations. Thus, it appears that many differing factors contribute and influence the development of teachers' expectations (Saracho, 1991).

Teachers' Expectations Communicated. As teachers develop their expectations of student performance, they begin to communicate these expectations

through differing behaviors (Alpert, 1974; Babad & Taylor, 1992; Brophy, 1983; Hall, Rosenthal, Archer, DiMattero, & Rogers, 1977; Lopez, 2011; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Thompson, Warren, & Carter, 2004). Particularly, teachers will at times treat students differently based on their level of expectations for each student (Flores, 2007; Kelly, 2010; McKown & Weinstein, 2008; Ouzts, 1986; Rubie-Davies, 2007). For example, depending on their level of expectations, teachers will provide some students with the opportunity to answer more questions and more time to answer questions (Good, 1981; Snodgrass & Rosenthal, 1982; Rubie-Davies, 2007; Weinstein, Gregory, & Strambler, 2004). In addition, keeping in mind expectancy levels, teachers provide students with different types of feedback and interactions (e.g., praise and warmth; Brophy & Good, 1970; Flores, 2007; Good, 1981; Hall et al., 1977; Harris et al., 1986; Rubie-Davies, 2010; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007; Thompson et al., 2004; Walker-Dalhouse & Risko, 2008). These trends do not seem to hold only in North America but in differing regions of the world. For instance, Rubie-Davies (2007) explored the differing practices of teachers with high and low expectations in New Zealand and found significant differences between high and low expectancy groups. Primarily, when compared to teachers with low expectation, high expectation teachers gave their students a greater amount of instructions and explanations over concepts being taught in the classroom. High expectation teachers also provided students with feedback more often, asked their students more open ended questions, as well as more questions in general relative to low expectation teachers. It appears that teachers with high expectations utilize more effective teaching strategies, which likely fosters increased academic

performance by their students. This is likely the case given that students are prone to internalizing these expectations (Flores, 2007; Saracho, 1991; Thompson et al., 2004; Weinstein, 2002; Wentzel, Battle, Russell, & Looney, 2010); however, this is dependent on the age and grade level of the student. It is important to note that this internalizing effect in younger students has received mixed results, given that some indicate that teachers' expectations most influences young elementary students (Good, 1981), while others report that this not the case (Baker, Wood, & Flynt, 1993) as they may developmentally lack the insight to comprehend the differential treatment taking place in their classrooms. Thus, through interactions with their students, teachers are able to communicate their expectations (Thompson et al., 2004).

Teacher Expectations and Achievement. When considering methods of bettering student achievement, one domain to be considered is the relationship between teachers' expectations and academic achievement (Bae, Holloway, Li, & Bempechat, 2008; Good, 1981; Jacobs & Harvey, 2010; Valverde & Scribner, 2001; Washington, 2001). For several years, researchers have conducted studies suggesting a positive relationship between the expectations teachers have of individual students on their students' academic performance (Benner & Mistry, 2007; Blatchford, Burke, Farquhar, Plewis, & Tizard, 1989; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Good, 1981; Gyanani & Agarwal, 1998; Hinnant et al., 2009; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Jussim & Harber, 2005; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001; Ma, 2001; McKown & Weinstein, 2002, 2008; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Washington, 2001). In addition, investigators have also found evidence supporting the belief that teachers' expectations do function as predictors of student

academic success (Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Hinnant et al., 2009; Hornstra et al., 2010; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001; Wigfield, Galper, Denton, & Seefeldt, 1999). Yet, it is necessary to state that some researchers insist that teachers' expectations predict achievement because those expectations are accurate representations of achievement and do not cause academic performance (i.e., self-fulfilling prophecy; Begeny et al., 2008; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Jussim & Harber, 2005; Vondra, 1999).

Though much research points positively to the impact of high teacher expectations on enhanced achievement, there are a few studies that indicate this relationship is not the case (Goldenberg, 1992; Harris et al., 1986) leaving this area of research open to some controversy (Good, 1981). For example, Harris and colleagues (1986) investigated teachers' expectations as a predictor of students' achievement, indicated that teachers' high expectations had no significant impact on students' performance. It is necessary to point out that the "teachers" in this case were peer tutors, which likely impacted the researchers findings given that most studies in this domain obtain information from students' actual school teachers.

Grade Levels Addressed in Research. Moreover, as noted by Thompson and colleagues (2004), most research in this domain has largely been conducted with elementary school age students, ranging from preschool to sixth grade (e.g., Blatchford et al., 1989; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Hauser-Cram et al., 2003; Hornstra et al., 2010; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001; McKown & Weinstein, 2002, 2008; Tyler et al., 2006; Wigfield et al., 1999). Some investigators have attempted to

address this gap found in the literature (Bae et al., 2008; Benner & Mistry, 2007; Ma, 2001) and have found similar results. Still, teachers' expectations appear to play a stronger role early in children's academic career (Good & Nichols, 2001), though this may be a result of limited research pertaining to students in later grade levels.

Racial/Ethnic Minority Students. Research has demonstrated that teacher expectations of their students vary across ethnicities and culture (e.g., Reyes, 2003; Tyler et al., 2006; van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, & Holland, 2010). Specifically, research suggests that teachers hold more negative expectations and attitudes towards these minority individuals (Flores, 2007; Monsivais, 1990; Reyes, 2003; Ross & Jackson, 1991; Shapiro, 2008; Sirota & Bailey, 2009; Tyler et al., 2006; Wiggan, 2007; Xu & Drame, 2008). Though most studies in this area pertain mainly to White students (e.g., Hinnant et al., 2009; Peet et al., 1997), of studies regarding racial/ethnic minority students the crux of this literature base has included African American students over other minority groups (e.g., Benner & Mistry, 2007; Blatchford et al., 1989; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001; McKown & Weinstein, 2002; Tyler et al., 2006; Wigfield et al., 1999). Given the current state of Hispanic students' academic achievement and dropout status, studies have also investigated teachers' expectations and academic performance with this group (e.g., Kukliski & Weinstein, 2001; McKown & Weinstein, 2008; Peet et al., 1997; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007); however, few studies have included greater attention to this population in comparison to other groups (i.e., few study samples are primarily made up of Hispanic students; Cagle, 1998; Wigfield et al., 1999).

ELLs. Though the number of ELLs, primarily Hispanic, Spanish-speaking ELLs, are growing at an exponential rate in the United States (Goldenberg, 2008), at present researchers have not considered this population with regard to the impact of teachers' expectations on achievement. This lack of research is in actuality a grave limitation given that teacher expectations have been found to be more related to the achievement of individuals of racial/ethnic minority groups (Hinnant et al., 2009; Jussim Eccles, & Madon, 1996). Even with this lack of research, studies have investigated teachers' attitudes of ELLs; findings suggest that feelings and attitudes teachers have of ELLs native language are mixed (Walker et al., 2004) and is based on prior experience and teacher-training (García-Nevarez et al., 2005). That is, some teachers feel positively while others feel negatively towards ELLs native language, which is affected by the more years that a teacher has taught (i.e., the greater number of years the more negative attitudes). As such, it is likely that teachers' attitudes and experience will impact their expectations of this group of students which will in turn affect their academic performance; however, research with regard to this population is needed to determine if this is the case.

Parent Expectations

When considering methods of bettering the academic achievement of students, researchers have devoted a great deal of effort investigating the impact of teachers' expectations on achievement (e.g., Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Hinnant et al., 2009). Though teachers' expectations have been extensively investigated (e.g., Benner & Mistry, 2007; Brown & Medway, 2007; Cagle, 1998; Ferguson, 2005) , it is important to

keep in mind that an ecological/systems perspective must be taken in order to alleviate difficulties with academic achievement, and so other realms of a student's life must be considered. Primarily, one such area is the consideration of parents given that they influence children's development and are often considered children's first teachers (Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002; Stewart, 2007; Wu & Qi, 2006). As such, some studies have examined the impact of parents' expectations on students' achievement (e.g., Dimmler, 2008; Fan & Williams, 2010; Patrikakou, 1997; Reynolds & Gill, 1994; Seyfried & Chung, 2002), of which, these studies are fewer in number when compared to the literature on teacher expectations. Particularly, parent expectations is often studied under the umbrella of parent involvement (e.g., Draper, 1997; Englund, Luckner, Whaley, & Egeland, 2004; Fan, 2001; Fan & Williams, 2010; Jeyens, 2010; Xu, Benson, Mudrey-Camino, Steiner, 2010) and is defined as parent's future academic aspirations or their present level of expectations for their child's academic performance (Christenson et al., 1992).

Shaping Parents' Expectations. Researchers have investigated differing factors that influence parents' expectations. From these studies, it becomes apparent that these factors are greatly similar to the agents shaping teachers' expectations (e.g., gender, behavior, and achievement). Some of these influencing agents are difficult to alter, such as student gender (Bleeker & Jacobs, 2004; Christenson et al., 1992; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Jacobs, 1991; Wood, Kurtz-Costes, Rowley, & Okeke-Adeyanju, 2010; Youn, 1994), family SES (Davis-Kean, 2005; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Rutchick, Smyth, Lopoo, & Dusek, 2009; Wood et al., 2010; Zhan, 2006; Zhang, Hsu, Kwok, Benz, & Bowman-

Perrott, 2011), and the household composition (i.e., number of siblings and adults in the home; Thompson, Alexander, & Entwisle, 1988). Similar to teachers' expectations, behavior (Krohn, Schmidt, Lizotte, & Baldwin, 2011; Rutchick et al., 2009; Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002) and previous student academic progress (Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Jacobs, 1991; Wood et al., 2010; Yamamoto & Holloway, 2010) also influences parents' expectations. Though throughout the teacher expectation literature it appears that academic achievement is often referred to as a factor influencing teachers, it seems that this finding does not have similar levels of support throughout the parent expectations literature. Moreover, one influencing factor of parents' expectation often referred to in the literature is the level of parent's education (Brown & Iyengar, 2008; Davis-Kean, 2005; Englund et al., 2004; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005; Wood et al., 2010; Zhan, 2006), as it appears that parents who hold higher levels of education expect more academically from their children.

Communicating Parent Expectations. Much like teachers, parents communicate their academic expectations to their children by differing mechanisms and behaviors (Christenson et al., 1992; Davis-Kean, 2005; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005). Primarily, these expectations are transmitted through parent-child interactions (Davis-Kean, 2005; Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002), parental home involvement (e.g., television rules and literacy involvement; Davis-Kean, 2005; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005), and parental involvement in school work and activities (Christenson et al., 1992; Rutchick et al., 2009; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005; Stewart, 2007). Thus, considering the methods involved

in communicating parent expectations, it is likely that these behaviors promote a home learning environment of academic success. Still, when considering the literature regarding the transmittance of parent expectations, it is necessary to note that some parents, primarily those in poverty, may not have the ability to participate in school activities largely due to a lack of transportation or financial difficulty. As such, though these parents are not able to participate fully in their children's school lives, these parents may in fact have high expectations for their children (Gill & Reynolds, 1999). It is necessary to keep in mind that even with a lack of opportunity to participate in school functions parents have even greater opportunities to communicate their expectations to their children in the home environment.

Parent Expectations and Achievement. Given that achievement has been associated with negative effects (e.g., school dropout; Battin-Pearson et al., 2000; Bertrand, 1962; Christle et al., 2007; Lloyd, 1976; Simner & Barnes, 1991; Strom & Boster, 2007), it is important to address methods of enhancing academic performance by accounting for the home environment (Englund et al., 2004; Zhan, 2006). One such method has been through the investigation of parent expectations. Particularly, as noted throughout the literature, researchers have found a positive association between parent expectations and academic performance (Christenson et al., 1992; Davis-Kean, 2005; Englund et al., 2004; Ensminger & Slusarcick, 1992; Galindo & Sheldon, 2012; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Youn, 1994). In addition to this positive relationship, investigators have also documented a trend in their studies of parental expectations predicting academic achievement (Aunola, Nurmi, Lerkkanen, & Rasku-Puttonen, 2003; Dimmler,

2008; Flowers & Flowers, 2008; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Jacobs, 1991; Patrikakou; 1997; Reynolds & Gill; 1994; Rutchick et al., 2009; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005; Thompson et al., 1988; Wu & Qi, 2006; Xu et al., 2010; Zhan, 2006; Zhang et al., 2011). Thus, it seems that high parental academic expectations are related to better student academic performance. Moreover, parental expectations further serve as a predictor of college completion (Zhan & Sherraden, 2011). Considering these effects, parents are recommended to communicate high expectations to their children (Leach & Williams, 2007). In turn, this will likely promote student's graduation status (Ensminger & Slusarcick, 1992) by impacting student achievement levels.

On a similar note, Bleeker and Jacobs (2004) conducted a longitudinal study in which they followed up with sixth grade students twelve years later at the age of 24 and 25. Results from this study suggested that parental beliefs were related to later career choices by students. For example, mother's expectations for success in a math related field was related to entering a physical science-computing career. As such, it appears that parental expectations transcend the classroom and affect children as they become working adults.

Mother and Father Raters. It is interesting to note that most studies did not disaggregate the ratings of mothers and fathers (Davis-Kean, 2005; Flowers & Flowers, 2008; Galindo & Sheldon, 2012; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Patrikakou, 1997; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Wu & Qi, 2006), to determine if a difference exists between raters. Of those that do indicate the rater researchers have largely accounted for mothers' expectations and not those of fathers' (Bleeker & Jacobs, 2004; Ensminger & Slusarcick,

1992; Reynolds & Gill, 1994; Rutchick et al., 2009; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005; Zhan, 2006; Zhan & Sherraden, 2011). So, these trends linking expectations and achievement may be an artifact of the parent rater. However, it is likely that this is not the case given that investigators have captured similar trends with father raters as well (Aunola et al., 2003; Jacobs, 1991). For example, Aunola and colleagues (2003) investigated the impact of parents' beliefs on math achievement in six and seven year old children. Their findings suggest that mothers and fathers beliefs both predicted their children's achievement. As such, it seems that both parents' expectations have similar effects on student achievement.

Grade Levels Addressed. As noted by Seyfried and Chung (2002) as well as Christenson and colleagues (1992), the research addressing the relationship between parental expectations and achievement is primarily dominated by samples that include elementary school students ranging from kindergarten to sixth grade (Aunola et al., 2003; Davis-Kean, 2005; Dimmler, 2008; Englund et al., 2004; Galindo & Sheldon, 2012; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Reynolds & Gill, 1994; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005; Thompson et al., 1988; Wu & Qi, 2006). However, given this limitation found throughout the literature, investigators have tried to account for older students as well, ranging from the ages of seventh to twelfth grade (Carpenter, 2008; Ensminger & Slusarcick, 1992; Flowers & Flowers, 2008; Jacobs, 1991; Patrikakou, 1997; Seyfried & Chung, 2002). Though studies have begun to account for similar relationships between parental expectations and student achievement for adolescents, like the literature has done for elementary aged children, very few have investigated both age groups in the

same study (e.g., Ensminger & Slusarcick, 1992; Zhan, 2006; Zhang et al., 2011). As such, given this lack of research it is difficult to determine what age group parental expectations impacts at a greater level. However, it is likely that adolescents are more impacted by their parents' expectations when compared to younger students given that adolescents are more able to internalize and perceive expectations, which then shapes their own academic expectations (Ensminger & Slusarcick, 1992).

Racial/Ethnic Minority Students. Like the research regarding teacher expectations, according to Christenson and colleagues (1992) and Carpenter (2008), most studies with regard to parental expectations and achievement largely encompass White students (e.g., Davis-Kean, 2005; Englund et al., 2004; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Sy & Schuldenberg, 2005). Still, when looking closely at racial/ethnic minority samples, it becomes clear that most research attention has gone to African American students in comparison to all other groups (Carpenter, 2008; Davis-Kean, 2005; Englund et al., 2004; Ensminger & Slusarcick, 1992; Flowers & Flowers, 2008; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Patrikakou, 1997; Reynolds & Gill, 1994; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Rutchick et al., 2009; Wu & Qi, 2006). Though, as previously noted, Hispanic students make up the largest growing minority group in the country and are experiencing massive difficulties with drop out and achievement, few studies have accounted for this group in their studies with regard to parent expectations (Carpenter, 2008; Dimmler, 2008; Galindo & Sheldon, 2012; Patrikakou, 1997; Zhang et al., 2011). Even with this limited research, it appears that the relationship between parent expectations and achievement is similar to that noted in other populations as well (Trusty, Plata, & Salazar, 2003).

ELLs. With the rise of the Hispanic population in the United States has come a wave of Spanish-speaking ELLs. Despite the fact that these numbers are projected to exponentially increase, few studies with regard to achievement and parental expectations have been conducted with this group. Though it would be expected that the relationship between parental expectations and student achievement would be similar to that noted in other populations, some researchers have not found support for this relationship among Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs in kindergarten to sixth grade (Goldenberg, Gallimore, Reese, & Garnier, 2001) and Hispanic high school students of immigrant parents (Carpenter, 2008). So, some research suggests that high parental expectations do not translate into enhanced student achievement as has been noted in other groups. Still, the lack of research in this area with regard to Spanish-speaking ELLs is so limited that more research is needed in order to determine the existence of a relationship between parent expectations and student achievement. In addition, researchers indicate that taking note of students' generational status as well as the language spoken in the home is necessary in order to fully account for the impact of these differences between ELLs with regard to parental expectations and achievement (Okagaki & Frensch, 1994).

Self-Efficacy

Looking closely at the expectancy research with regard to achievement, it becomes clear that researchers consider the student themselves as playing a role in this relationship (Bae et al., 2008; Baker et al., 1993; Bleeker & Jacobs, 2004; Cagle, 1998; Caprara et al., 2011; Carpenter, 2008; Jacobs, 1991; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001; Ma, 2001; Museus, Harper, & Nichols, 2010; Patrikakou, 1997; Rutchick et al., 2009;

Trouilloud, Sarrazin, Bressoux, & Bois, 2006; Washington, 2001). One area of interest with regard to the student has been in student self-efficacy (e.g., Chen & Pajares, 2010; Klassen & Lynch, 2007; Klassen & Welton, 2009; Lackaye & Margalit, 2006; Moore, 2010; Phan, 2012). Self-efficacy is an individual's perceived beliefs about their own capability to accomplish a task or engage in an activity (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996). Particularly, a student with a higher level of self-efficacy believes that they are more able to perform a task in comparison to a student with lower levels of self-efficacy (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002). As such, it is highly unlikely that an individual believe they are capable of all tasks and activities in life, and so self-efficacy is largely domain specific (Carroll et al., 2009; Jonson-Reid, Davis, Saunders, Williams, Williams, 2005; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Schweinle & Mims, 2009). For example, students have varying levels of self-efficacy related to football, tennis, biology, and algebra.

Sources of Self-Efficacy

A student's level of self-efficacy can be attributed to different aspects in their lives. Particularly, student self-efficacy is not only influenced by the individual themselves, but also their environment (Bandura, 2006; Lackaye & Margalit, 2006; Tyler, Boelter, & Boykin, 2009; Schweinle & Mims, 2009). Bandura (1977, 1997) suggested that student self-efficacy stemmed from the interpretation of four differing sources: mastery experience, vicarious experience, emotional and physiological states, as well as social persuasion. With regard to mastery experience, self-efficacy beliefs are formed from the student's previous experience and performance on tasks that are related to the new task at hand. In the realm of vicarious experience, this source relates to

students' observations of others' actions and performance on similar activities (modeling). The emotional and physiological reactions refer to the students' own sense of arousal or anxiety which influences their level of self-efficacy. Finally, the social persuasion domain refers to information that students' receive from important others' feedback and appraisals (i.e., feedback from their parents and teachers). Thus, the student interprets the information provided by these four sources and develops their level of self-efficacy. These self-efficacy beliefs then influence the amount of effort and persistence that students give particular tasks (Bandura, 1982, 2007; Klassen & Lynch, 2007; Linnenbenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Britner & Pajares, 2006).

When looking closely at the sources of self-efficacy, research indicates that all sources serve as predictors of self-efficacy (Usher & Pajares, 2006, 2009). Of the four sources, mastery experience has been documented as the most influential (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977; Barling & Snipelisky, 1983; Britner, 2008; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Usher & Pajares, 2006; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009; Zeldin, Britner, & Pajares, 2008). Still, it has been suggested that both mastery experience and social persuasion are highly correlated (Usher & Pajares, 2009). That is, if a student performs poorly he will obtain or perceive feedback from teachers' and parents' in line with his performance. Some studies provide support for the function of social persuasion on the development of self-efficacy (Phan, 2012; Usher & Pajares, 2006; Woodgate & Brawley, 2008). For example, in Usher and Pajares' (2006) study with sixth grade students, results suggested that social persuasion was one of two sources, including mastery experience, that was predictive of the self-efficacy of African

American students. In addition, the researchers found that social persuasion was the most influential source for the self-efficacy of girls. Interestingly, this gender effect has also been documented by other researchers as well (Anderson & Betz, 2001; Britner, 2008; Lent, Lopez, & Bieschke, 1991; Zeldin et al., 2008; Zeldin & Pajares, 2000). Keeping in mind teachers' and parents' expectations, social persuasion appears particularly related to expectations. Thus, it seems that through social persuasion, self-efficacy is aligned with the constructs of parents' and teachers' expectations.

Academic Self-Efficacy

Because self-efficacy is domain specific (Carroll et al., 2009; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Schweinle & Mims, 2009), there are differing types of self-efficacy (e.g., social and academic self-efficacy; Anderson & Betz, 2001; Jonson-Reid et al., 2005; Usher & Pajares, 2006). Given the adverse consequences of poor academic performance, one area that has been addressed throughout the literature is academic self-efficacy (Baird, Scott, Dearing, & Hamill, 2009; Bandura, Babaranelli, Caprara, Pastorelli, 2001; Bandura et al., 1999; Usher & Pajares, 2006). Academic self-efficacy is the students' "perceived capability to fulfill academic demands" (Bandura et al., 1999, p. 259).

Academic Self-Efficacy and Achievement. Many studies have addressed methods of improving academic achievement (e.g., Accordino et al., 2000; Altschul et al., 2006; Anderson & Keith, 1997; Barbaranelli et al., 2003; Boveja, 1998; Jeynes, 2005; Jimerson et al., 1999; LeCroy & Krysik, 2008; Malecki & Elliott, 2002; Nichols & White; 2001; Ruus et al., 2007; Singer & Weinstein, 2000). When looking closely at the

domain of the student, research has documented a positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic achievement (Caprara et al., 2011; Carroll et al., 2009; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Ferla, Valcke, & Cai, 2009; Liew, McTigue, Barrois, & Hughes, 2008; Pajares, 2003; Pajares & Valiante, 2001; Phan, 2012; Ryan & Shin, 2011; Shultz, 1993; Tella, 2011). Particularly, perceived self-efficacy has been addressed in many academic domains, including writing, science, reading, and mathematics (Britner, 2008; Britner & Pajares, 2006; McMahon, Wernsman, & Rose, 2009; Pajares & Valiante, 1997; Walker, 2003; Zeldin et al., 2008). From these studies, investigators have found support for the predictive nature of academic self-efficacy on academic achievement (Bandura et al., 2001; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Coutinho & Neuman, 2008; Ferla et al., 2009; Ghosh, 2007; Joo, Bong, & Choi, 2000; Kitsantas, Cheema, & Ware, 2011; Kitsantas, Ware, & Cheema, 2010; Lucio, Rapp-Paglicci, & Rowe, 2011; Pajares, 2003; Pajares & Miller, 1994; Pajares, Miller, & Johnson, 1999; Pajares & Valiante, 1997; Phan, 2012; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Roeser, Midgley, & Urdan, 1996; Saunders, Davis, Williams, & Williams, 2004; Weiser & Riggio, 2010; Wood & Locke, 1987). Moreover, self-efficacy not only appears to impact academic progress, but also influences career choices and pursuits (Bandura, 2007; Bandura et al., 2001; Zeldin & Pajares, 2000). As such, it appears that self-efficacy plays an important role not only in academic performance but also in pursuits taking place later in life.

Grade Levels. Researchers have largely addressed self-efficacy beliefs with regard to young college age adults (e.g., Adeyemo, 2007; Coutinho & Neuman, 2008;

Elias & Loomis, 2002; Finn & Frone, 2004; Pajares & Miller, 1994; Phan, 2011; Tuckman & Sexton, 1991; Weiser & Riggio, 2010; Wood & Locke, 1987; Zeldin & Pajares, 2000). However, within the realm of school age children and the impact that these beliefs have on achievement, differing grade levels spanning primary and secondary school have been studied. For example, studies with high school (Acoach & Webb, 2004; Bong, 2004; Carroll et al., 2009; Joo et al., 2000; Kitsantas et al., 2011; Lucio et al., 2011; Saunders et al., 2004), junior high school (Acoach & Webb, 2004; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Lackaye, Margalit, Ziv, & Ziman, 2006; Pajares & Valiante, 1999, 2001; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Roeser et al., 1996), and elementary school students, from first to sixth grade, have been conducted (Britner & Pajares, 2006; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Phan, 2012; Liew et al., 2008; Pajares & Valiante, 1997). Still, it seems that fewer studies with regard to elementary age students have been conducted. Particularly, it seems that studies regarding students in later grades of elementary school (i.e., fifth and sixth grade; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Pajares & Valiante, 1997) are greater than those of students in early elementary grades (e.g., Liew et al., 2008). This trend is likely the case considering that self-efficacy involves interpretation and perception which children develop with age. That is, younger children have difficulty interpreting information, and so in effect self-efficacy declines with age as students develop (Schweinle & Mims, 2009; Smith, Smith, Gilmore, & Jameson, 2012).

Racial/Ethnic Minority Students. Some research with regard to self-efficacy has been conducted with students from varying countries (e.g., Bandura et al., 2001;

Bong, 2004; Caprara et al., 2011; Ghosh, 2007; Phan, 2012; Smith et al., 2012; Tella, 2011). Of those studies involving United States school-age students' academic self-efficacy and achievement, most have been conducted primarily with White participants (Britner & Pajares, 2006; Kitsantas et al., 2010; Pajares & Valiante, 2001; Roeser et al., 1996). Those investigators that have considered racial/ethnic minority students in their samples have largely included African American students over all other groups (Roeser et al., 1996; Saunders et al., 2004; Scheweinle & Mims, 2009; Shultz, 1993). Still, given their grave position in dropout and achievement, investigators have also included Hispanic students as part of samples in their studies (Schultz, 1993). Though few studies have considered Hispanic participants, limited evidence does suggest that academic self-efficacy predicts the academic achievement of Hispanic students (Kitsantas et al., 2011).

ELLs. One group that has largely been underrepresented throughout the academic self-efficacy literature is ELLs (LeClair, Doll, Osborn, & Jones, 2009). Though few studies have investigated ELLs academic self-efficacy (Acoach & Webb, 2004; LeClair et al., 2009; Rodriguez, Ringler, O'Nearl, & Bunn, 2009; Wu, West, & Hughes, 2010), much fewer have investigated the relationship between academic self-efficacy and achievement with this population (Acoach & Webb, 2004). In their study with junior high and high school Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs, Acoach and Webb (2004) found a positive relationship between academic self-efficacy and achievement. Though school-age Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs are projected to increase at a dramatic rate the literature is not addressing this issue. As such, more research with this population with regard to academic self-efficacy and academic performance is

necessary. Given Acoach and Webb's findings, it is likely that this relationship will also be found across more varying age groups which includes younger students. However, more research is needed to determine if this is the case.

Academic Self-Efficacy, Expectations, and Achievement. Throughout the expectancy literature, studies have considered the student. Specifically studies have investigated student expectations (Rutchick et al., 2009; Tavani & Losh, 2003), self-perceptions (Jacobs, 1991), self-concept (You & Nguyen, 2011), locus of control (You & Nguyen, 2011), perceptions of others' expectations (Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Tyler & Boelter, 2008), and behavior (Aunola et al., 2003), often as mediators. Though adults have been noted to influence student self-efficacy (Bleeker & Jacobs, 2004; Doll, Kurien, LeClair, Spies, Champion, & Osborn, 2009; Fan & Williams, 2010; Tyler & Boelter, 2008), few studies have investigated the impact of adults' expectations and student academic self-efficacy on achievement (Bandura et al, 2001). For example, in their study with sixth and seventh graders from Italy, Bandura and colleagues (2001) found that in comparison to students' academic self-efficacy, parents' aspirations better impacted academic performance.

Investigators often do not incorporate more than one adult's expectations in their studies when considering these three variables. Primarily studies relating to academic self-efficacy, achievement, and expectations pertain to parents' expectations and not teachers'. The Gill and Reynolds (1999) study is but one of few studies that consider all three systems (i.e., child, parent, and teacher). Their study of sixth grade African American students suggests with regard to academic achievement, teachers' expectations

is a better predictor compared to parents' expectations. Still, it does appear that the effect of teacher expectations declines as students get older (Kuklinski & Weinsten, 2001). As such, it is possible that students begin to internalize adults' expectations which affect their level of self-efficacy. Thus, with age academic self-efficacy often begins to decline because students have more experience and are able to evaluate their abilities more realistically (Jacobs, Lanza, Osgood, Eccles, & Wigfield, 2002).

Though the Gill & Reynolds (1999) study considered parents' and teachers' expectations and the Bandura and colleagues (2001) study accounted for parents' expectations and student academic self-efficacy, both studies are missing necessary systems and variables. Specifically the Gill & Reynolds study did not account for student academic self-efficacy, while the Bandura and colleagues study did not address teachers' expectations. Thus more research is needed in order to obtain a more ecological approach to better understand the phenomena of teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy on achievement.

Gap in the Literature

The population of Hispanic individuals is continuously growing throughout the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008b, 2011c), as more individuals immigrate to this country from Latin America (Siegel et al., 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a, 2011b). As such, many Hispanic students are coming to this country with little, if any, English skills (i.e., ELLs; Goldenberg, 2008, NCES 2009). Given the projected exponential increase of these students, researchers have begun to closely examine issues related to their great levels of high school dropout (August & Shanahan, 2006; NCES, 2000,

2007). Upon further investigation it becomes clear that these Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs are also struggling with academic performance (TEA, 2011), which has been demonstrated to be a powerful predictor of dropout (Battin-Pearson et al., 2000; Englund et al., 2008). One method to alleviate these social problems has been through investigations of expectations (Buckner et al., 2001; Hinnant et al., 2009) and self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 2001; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Chen & Pajares, 2010).

Though expectancy and self-efficacy studies have demonstrated an impact on achievement (e.g., Bandura et al., 2001; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Coutinho & Neuman, 2008; Dimmler, 2008; Ferla et al., 2009; Flowers & Flowers, 2008; Galindo & Sheldon, 2012; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Ghosh, 2007; Hinnant et al., 2009; Jacobs, 1991; Joo et al., 2000; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001; Patrikakou; 1997; Phan, 2012; Reynolds & Gill; 1994; Rutchick et al., 2009; Ryabov, 2011; Seyfried & Chung, 2002; Sy & Schulenberg, 2005; Thompson et al., 1988; Wigfield et al., 1999; Wu & Qi, 2006; Zhan, 2006), there is still a gap in the literature. Particularly, studies regarding teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and student academic self-efficacy have limited studies pertaining to Spanish-speaking ELLs (e.g., Acoach & Webb, 2004; Carpenter, 2008; Goldenberg et al., 2001). It is necessary to investigate these variables with regard to the academic achievement of this population given the state of high school dropout and poor academic performance of Hispanic students, particularly ELLs (NCES, 2000). In addition, studies in these domains have not addressed varying grade levels, so it becomes difficult to determine the impact of each variable on achievement at different points of development. Finally,

upon examination of the predictors of high school dropout and academic achievement, it becomes clear that taking an ecological/systems perspective to these social problems is needed in order to lessen the effect of these problems (Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008); however, few studies consider the domains of the student, parent, and teacher (e.g., Gill & Reynolds, 1999). As such, more research is needed to help alleviate these problems from an ecological approach that focuses on malleable factors (i.e., expectations).

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Though existing research appears to indicate that expectations and academic self-efficacy predict student level of academic success (Bandura et al., 2001; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Chen & Pajares, 2010; Coutinho & Neuman, 2008; Dimmler, 2008; Ferla et al., 2009; Flowers & Flowers, 2008; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Ghosh, 2007; Hinnant et al., 2009; Jacobs, 1991; Joo et al., 2000; Jussim & Eccles, 1992; Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001), the state of expectancy research with regard to the academic achievement of Hispanic English language learners (ELLs) is at present limited. As such, it was the purpose of this study to fill this gap noted in the literature and determine, as well as to explain the degree to which others' expectations and students' academic self-efficacy impacts the achievement of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs.

This is a cross-sectional study that was conducted with teachers, parents, and Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs. Student participants were divided into three cohorts with each cohort being representative of the students' current grade level. This investigation involved questionnaires and a standardized achievement measure presented in English and/or Spanish in order to capture teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, student academic self-efficacy, and student academic achievement. Participation in this study was completely voluntary and did not involve any experimental conditions or manipulation of variables.

Participants

Participants consisted of students, as well as their teachers and parents, who were recruited from a medium sized school district in a community located in the lower southwestern region of Texas. This school district was selected based on its population of Hispanic students enrolled at each school. Particularly, as indicated from the Texas Education Agency (2011), in the 2010-2011 school year this school district had a total of 23 schools with a student enrollment of 14,731. Of the total number of students an overwhelming amount were Hispanic (97.1%). With regard to ELLs, the district was made up of 34.9% of students who were limited English proficient (LEP), while 32.9% were in bilingual education or English as a second language. In addition, a vast amount of students (86%) were economically disadvantaged. With regard to teachers, the majority of teachers (93.2%) were Hispanic, while 5.9% were White. From this school district, three groups of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELL students in grades 2, 5, and 8, as well as the students' parent and teacher, were recruited to participate in this study. These particular grade levels were selected by the researcher in order to account for differences noted at differing time points to determine if certain variables are of greater impact at particular grade levels given that the literature has not investigated this.

For this study, student participants were excluded if they meet any of the following criteria: 1) students were not identified as Hispanic; 2) students were not identified as Spanish speaking; 3) they were not classified as LEP in the district; 4) they had been previously identified as intellectually disabled; 5) they were placed in a life skills setting; and/or 6) if relevant information needed to answer research questions was

not obtained from both teacher and parent. Students were included in the study, provided their parent/guardian gave consent, if the student did not meet any exclusionary criteria.

Participants included a total of 121 students; however, 22 students were excluded from the data-set because all portions of the necessary data were not completed or because they were enrolled in a life skills classroom. As such, only 99 students were considered valid cases and included in this study for analysis.

Student Participants

Of the sample size of 99 students, 45.5% were 2nd graders, 28.3% were 5th graders, and 26.3% were 8th graders. Overall, 57.6% were males and 42.4% were females across all target grade levels. Specifically, there were 45 (28 males, 17 females) 2nd graders, 28 (16 males, 12 females) 5th graders, and 26 (13 males, 13 females) 8th graders that participated in this study. Of the total participants 88.9% were born in the United States (U.S.), while 11.1% were born in Mexico. Ages ranged from 7 to 15 years across grade levels, with a mean age of 10.37 and a standard deviation of 2.66. From the total student sample, 8.1% were identified as receiving Special Education services; specifically 1% of students were identified as having an emotional disturbance, 2% as having a specific learning disability, and 2% as having speech difficulties. From the sample of students, 22.2% had previously been retained and 23% had previously attended school in Mexico. All student participants were of Hispanic decent; however, 2% of participants were biracial (African American and Hispanic). Parents reported that

68.7% of students spoke both English and Spanish and 31.3% spoke solely Spanish. According to school records, all 99 study participants were identified as LEP.

Parent Participants

A total of 403 parent packets were distributed (196 in 2nd grade, 83 in 5th grade, and 124 in 8th grade) to parents/guardians of students identified as LEP and whose teachers consented to participate in this study. Only parents/guardians of students with complete data were considered in this study, as such there was a total of 99 parent/guardian participants. Guardians who completed study questionnaires ranged in age from 20 to 65 years, with a mean of 37.08 and a standard deviation of 7.55. Of the sample of 99 parents/guardians, 83.8% were female, while16.2% were male. Particularly, 72.7% described their relationship to the child as being the child's mother, 16.2% as being the child's father, and 11.1% as other (including grandmother, aunt, adult sibling, and legal guardian). Of the parent/guardian reporters, 99% indicated that they were Hispanic/Latino, while 1% reported being American Indian. From parent reports, 70.7% indicated that they were not born in the U.S., and more specifically 68.7% of parents/guardians were born in Mexico. In addition, 61.7% of parent/guardian participants have lived in the U.S. between 0 to 25 years, while 38.4% have lived in the U.S. for 26 plus years. Particularly, 18.2% have lived in the U.S. for 0 to 5 years, 7.1% for 6 to 10 years, 15.2% for 11 to 15 years, and 10.1% for 21 to 25 years. Furthermore, 3% have resided in the U.S. 26 to 30 years, 7.1% for 31 to 35 years, 6.1% for 36 to 40 years, 2% for 41 or more years, and 20.2% have always lived in the U.S. From parent/guardian reports, 39.4% of parents/guardians reportedly speak both English and

Spanish, 59.6% only speak Spanish, and 1% solely speaks English. With regard to their highest level of education received, 12.1% of parents/guardians completed 1st to 6th grade, 7.1% completed 7th to 8th grade, 36.4% completed 9th to 11th grade, 24.2% completed high school, 11.1% completed technical school, 2% are currently enrolled in a bachelor program, 6.1% completed their bachelor degree, and 1% have some schooling beyond their bachelor degree. Of their completed studies, 57.6% of parents/guardians obtained their highest level of education in Mexico, while 41.4% in the U.S. Of these parent/guardian participants, 69.7% reported that a member of their family had graduated from high school and 33.3% indicated that a family member had graduated from college. It is important to note that these percentages not only represent immediate family members but also extended family members.

Teacher Participants

The following selection criteria were utilized to recruit teachers for participation in this study: teachers had to instruct 2nd, 5th, or 8th grade ELLs and teachers had to be the reading/language arts instructor of these students. When looking at both the student and parent/guardian samples, there were 99 valid cases in each. However, because several ELLs were in a single reading/language arts teacher's class, it was unnecessary to obtain 99 completed teacher packets. Of the target schools, all reading/language arts teachers in 2nd, 5th, and 8th grade that had ELLs in their classes were given teacher packets. A total of 48 teacher packets were distributed (19 in 2nd grade, 17 in 5th grade, and 12 in 8th grade). Efforts were made for the researcher to obtain completed teacher packets. Particularly, the researcher would follow up with teachers via e-mail or during

visits to the school if teachers had previously approached the researcher and indicated that they planned on participating in the study. Thirty completed teacher packets were returned. Ten teachers who completed packets were then disregarded in this study because these teachers either did not teach reading/language arts or no student in their classroom had complete data in order to participate in this study. Of the 20 teachers that participated in this study, 85.9% were females and 14.1% were males. Teacher ages ranged from 28 to 67 years, with a mean of 42.27 and a standard deviation of 9.36. Reports indicated that 99% identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino and 1% identified him/herself as White (non-Hispanic). Of those teachers who identified themselves as Hispanic, 100% indicated that they are Mexican/Mexican American. In the domain of languages spoken, 97% of teachers reported speaking both English and Spanish, while 3% report solely speaking English. From their reports, 33.3% reported that they are general education teachers, 43.4% are bilingual education teachers, and 23.2% are English as a second language teachers. With regard to grade levels taught, 45.5% solely teach 2nd grade, 26.3% solely teach 5th grade, and 12.1% solely teach 8th grade; 2% teach grades 1 through 6, 11.1% teach 7th and 8th grade, and 3% teach 7th to 12th grade. Teaching experience ranged from 0 to 35 years. Specifically, 14.1% of teachers reported 0 to 5 years of experience, 38.4% 6 to 10 years, 24.2% 11 to 15 years, 11.1% 16 to 20 years, 3% 21 to 25 years, 2% 26 to 30 years, and 7.1% 31 to 35 years of teaching experience. With regard to their highest level of education obtained, 92.9% of teachers reported obtaining a bachelor degree and 6.1% a master degree. Furthermore, 99% of teachers reported obtaining traditional teaching certification.

Measures

Students, teachers, and parents completed specific respective measures. Specifically, students completed reading and mathematics academic achievement testing, as well as the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire (Wigfield et al., 1997). Teachers completed the Teacher Demographic Questionnaire and the Teacher Questionnaire, while parents completed the Parent Demographic Questionnaire and the Parent Questionnaire.

Teacher Demographic Questionnaire

The Teacher Demographic Questionnaire was created to obtain detailed demographic information about participants' teachers. Information gathered included: years of teaching experience, age, highest level of education, teacher certification status, race/ethnicity, Spanish language proficiency, and the amount of time that the teacher has known the student (see Appendix Q).

Parent Demographic Questionnaire

The Parent Demographic Questionnaire was created in English and Spanish to obtain detailed demographic information about students and their parents. For example, information about the student that was obtained included: child race/ethnicity, languages spoken, child level of Spanish/English proficiency, number of siblings, grade retention, and schooling outside of the U.S. Information about parents gathered included: highest level of education, level of Spanish/English proficiency, race/ethnicity, and number of years living in the U.S. (see Appendix Q and Appendix R).

Woodcock-Johnson III: Tests of Achievement

The Woodcock-Johnson III: Tests of Achievement (WJ-III; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001) is a norm-referenced measure of academic achievement administered to individuals from 2 to over 90 years of age. For the purposes of this study, only one subtest of the WJ-III was administered, *Letter Word Identification* (Subtest 1) as a measure of English reading ability. This subtest from the WJ-III was administered to students in order to take into account the differing levels of English language proficiency and reading abilities. On this subtest, individuals were asked to read words aloud fluently in English. It is possible for examinees to be administered 76 items; however, administration ceased once the examinee incorrectly read six consecutive words. Raw scores were converted to standard scores to allow for comparisons between other achievement measures. With regard to reliability, test-retest reliability correlations of this subtest range from .90 to .95 when individuals are retested less than one year apart. The split-half reliability coefficient for this subtest ranges from .88 to .99 (McGrew, Schrank, & Woodcock, 2007).

Batería Woodcock-Muñoz III: Pruebas de Aprovechamiento

The Batería Woodcock-Muñoz III: Pruebas de Aprovechamiento (Batería III; Muñoz-Sandoval, Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2005) is a Spanish measure of academic achievement for individuals' ages 2 to over 90 years and was adapted from the WJ-III. In this study, two subtests were used from the Batería III in order to obtain a Spanish measure of reading and mathematics. Specifically, *Identificación de Letras y Palabras* (Prueba 1), the Spanish version of Letter Word Identification in the WJ-III, and

Cálculo (Prueba 5) were administered to student participants. Prueba 1 functions exactly the same as Subtest 1 *Letter Word Identification* from the WJ-III, and Prueba 5 asks students to calculate mathematical problems. Individuals have the opportunity to complete 45 items on Prueba 5; however, after five incorrect responses administration of this subtest is discontinued.

For the purposes of this study, raw scores on both subtests were converted to standard scores to allow comparisons to be made between these two subtests and the subtest from the WJ-III. Furthermore, in this study mathematics achievement is only accounted for in Spanish and not in English given that all participants' are Spanish-speaking ELLs and considering that mathematical calculations is not largely language laden. As such, scores on these mathematics calculations should be the same as if this subtest was administered on the WJ-III. With regard to reliability, according to the *Batería III Woodcock-Muñoz: Overview and Technical Supplement* (Schrank, McGrew, Ruef, Alvarado, Muñoz-Sandival, & Woodcock, 2005), the internal consistency reliability coefficients of *Identificación de Letras y Palabras* range from .84 to .98, while the range was from .84 to .93 in *Cálculo.*

Teacher Questionnaire

Researcher developed questionnaires with regard to teacher and parent level of academic expectations for the student were completed. The Teacher Questionnaire was created as a measure of what teachers expect of students in the future (see Appendix S). The measure was developed by examining previous literature (e.g., Crano & Mellon, 1978; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Hauser-Cram et al., 2003; Wigfield et al., 1999; Wood et

al., 2007) and the method/wording used to obtain information about teacher expectations. In addition, a panel of experts was consulted to edit the measure and also add questions to further capture an in-depth understanding of teacher expectations. The measure was made up of twelve questions, two of which were open-ended. For instance, teachers were asked about expected performance in reading and math at the end of the school year. In addition, teachers were asked to note the highest level of education they expect the student to complete. The questionnaire is comprised of 12 items, two of which are open ended. Internal consistency reliability for the overall score of this measure was conducted using Cronbach's α and calculated as .78. In addition, Cronbach's α was calculated at .79 for 2nd grade, .78 for 5th grade, and .78 for 8th grade. Though measures with scores of higher reliability allow more confidence to be placed on scores that they are in turn measuring the variables they purport to measure, the reliability estimates of the overall score for the Teacher Questionnaire for the total sample and separated by grade levels are adequate.

Parent Questionnaire

The Parent Questionnaire was developed in English and Spanish to account for what parents anticipate their child will achieve academically (see Appendix T and U). This measure was developed in a similar manner to the Teacher Questionnaire. Specifically, it was developed by examining previous literature (e.g., Benner & Mistry, 2007; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Mistry et al., 2009; Reynolds, 1998; Reynolds & Gill, 1994; Reynolds & Lee, 1991; Wood et al., 2007) and the method/wording used to obtain information about parent expectations. A panel of experts was then consulted to edit the

measure and also add questions to further capture an in-depth understanding of parent expectations. For example, parents were asked to complete questions regarding the total amount of schooling they expect their child to achieve. Parents were also asked to rate their child's reading and mathematics performance. The questionnaire is made up of 10 items. Cronbach's α, as a measure of internal consistency reliability of overall scores, was conducted and calculated at .76 across scores of the entire sample. Cronbach's α was also calculated separately by grade levels and was .78 for 2nd grade, .74 for 5th grade, and .73 for 8th grade. As such, internal consistency reliability estimates across scores of the entire sample and separated by grade levels are adequate.

Competence Beliefs Questionnaire

The Competence Beliefs Questionnaire (Wigfield et al., 1997) is an instrument that was used to assess academic self-efficacy (see Appendix V and U). Specifically, this instrument was designed to measure how competent children believed they were in math, reading, and sports (Wigfield et al., 1997). This questionnaire is a self-report measure that encompasses fives questions for each domain addressed, totaling 15 when considering math, reading, and sports. For the purposes of this study, only math and reading competence beliefs (i.e., academic self-efficacy) will be addressed. Students were asked how good they are in each area of math and reading, how well they expect to perform in each domain, and how good they believe they would be at learning something new in the differing domains. In addition, they were asked to rate their performance in comparison to other students. Students were asked to answer most items using a six-point likert-type scale, with 1 being the lowest and 6 the highest. Cronbach's α was

calculated at .74 as a measure of overall score internal consistency reliability for data across all grade levels from this research study. Cronbach's α was also individually calculated by grade levels and results include .75 for 2nd grade, .71 for 5th grade, and .69 for 8th grade. Previous researchers have utilized this measure as part of their study and included ELLs in their sample. Specifically, Wu and colleagues (2010) conducted a study involving third and fourth grade ELLs. They administered the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire for reading and math and obtained a coefficient alpha reliability score of .82 (third grade) and .84 (fourth grade). Though reliability estimates from this study are lower than those previously found, it is necessary to note that the overall internal consistency reliability of scores is adequate.

Procedure

Prior to conducting the study, the researcher obtained permission to work with human participants from the Texas A&M Institutional Review Board. Once the study was approved, the researcher proceeded to obtain authorization from the target school district's superintendent. After approval from the superintendent was granted, the researcher was directed to work with the assistant superintendent to identify target schools. The assistant superintendent selected particular schools in which data was to be collected based on the number of students identified as LEP in each school. That is, schools with the highest numbers of students identified as LEP were selected as potential schools in which data could be attained. Of the 23 schools in the school district, 9 were targeted for this study. The researcher then met with principals of the target elementary and junior high schools to seek permission in order to recruit participants. Once

permission was granted by the principals, the investigator then provided teachers from target grade levels with packets that included a consent form (see Appendix A), information sheet, and a Teacher Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix Q), that teachers were to return if they were interested in participating in the study. Upon the completion and return of teacher packets, teachers were then given parent packets to distribute to students identified LEP in the classrooms. Parent packets included: parent consent forms (see Appendix B and C), parent permission slips (see Appendix D and E), Parent Demographic Questionnaires (see Appendix Q and R), and Parent Questionnaires (see Appendix T and U). After packets were returned and checked by the investigator to ensure all forms were completed, parents were sent back a note informing parents that their name was placed in a drawing to win a $50 gift certificate to HEB Grocery Store. At this point, teachers were then given Teacher Questionnaires (see Appendix S) to complete regarding students participating in the study. After teachers completed these forms, they were given a "thank you" mug which included candies, pens, and pencils. Students were then pulled for individualized achievement testing in English and Spanish and asked to complete the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire in either English (see Appendix V) or Spanish (see Appendix W). Of the total number of students, 55.6% chose to complete questionnaires in Spanish, while 44.4% chose to complete the form in English. All testing, which took approximately two months to complete for all students in the total sample, was completed solely by the investigator. Students were pulled only once from their classes to complete testing. They were then taken to empty classrooms or the library to be free from distractions. At this point, the researcher utilized the

respective Assent Forms (see Appendix F through K) and Information Sheets (see Appendix M through P), in either English or Spanish, depending on the student's grade level and language preference, and assent was either provided or denied by the student. Students that assented to participate in the study were then administered the two subtests from the Batería III, beginning with *Identificación de Palabras* then *Cálculo*, and were then presented the individual subtest from the WJ-III. After completing academic achievement testing, students were then asked to complete the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire in either English or Spanish. The Competence Beliefs Questionnaire was read aloud to each student individually. After completing the tasks, students were presented with a small goody bag including a coupon for a personal pizza, pencils, and stickers.

Power Analysis

A power analysis was conducted in order to determine the sample size needed to have statistical power to obtain a statistically significant result. G*Power 3 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) was used to run the power analysis and calculate the number of participants needed in this study. The required number of participants was determined given the significance level ($\alpha = 0.01$), required power level ($1-\beta = .80$), and population effect size to be detected with probability (.15) with linear multiple regression analysis. As such, the total number of students needed with four predictor variables is 119. Though many attempts were made to obtain 119 participants for power, this study was only able to recruit 99 valid cases of participants.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Before beginning data analysis, data was carefully examined to ensure no missing data. Cases with missing data on key items were excluded from this study. Statistical analyses for this study were conducted with the statistical software package program SPSS Statistics 17.0. After data was entered, it was inspected for the possibility of errors in data entry.

Descriptive analyses were conducted prior to answering research questions. Descriptive statistics of the measures used, including *n*, means, and standard deviations were calculated for all independent and dependent measures across the total sample and then by grade levels as noted in Table 1. Ranges in scores were wide; however, this is likely attributed to the differing levels of English and Spanish language proficiency of the students.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Measures across all Grade Levels and Separated by Grades

Measure	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
WJ-III	99	49	127	92.48	14.36
2nd grade	45	50	127	95.62	16.59
5th grade	28	64	110	92.57	11.03
8th grade	26	49	107	86.96	11.97
Batería Reading	99	22	154	96.48	22.92
2nd grade	45	47	133	91.89	24.12
5th grade	28	22	130	93.96	22.65
8th grade	26	74	154	107.15	17.80

Table 1 Continued

Measure	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Batería Math	99	31	125	91.84	15.69
2nd grade	45	31	120	91.71	16.82
5th grade	28	68	112	92.75	11.62
8th grade	26	44	125	91.08	17.88
Parent Expectations	99	21	62	46.07	7.92
2nd grade	45	21	62	45.82	9.46
5th grade	28	31	58	47.25	6.11
8th grade	26	29	58	45.23	6.75
Teacher Expectations	99	15	50	36.39	8.94
2nd grade	45	15	50	36.89	9.98
5th grade	28	16	47	34.25	8.33
8th grade	26	21	50	37.85	7.44
Academic Self-Efficacy	99	18	60	45.00	8.24
2nd grade	45	18	60	47.29	9.51
5th grade	28	33	55	46.07	5.99
8th grade	26	27	50	39.88	5.52

Assumptions of Multiple Regression

Data was scrutinized to determine if the assumptions of multiple regression had been met. These assumptions include a normal distribution of error scores, homoscedasticity (equal variances of error scores), linear relationship between predictors and outcome, and that predictors are not perfectly correlated. All assumptions for multiple regression were met, with the exception of homoscedasticity. Specifically, skewness and kurtosis of independent and dependent variable error scores were examined and residuals appear normally distributed (skewness error scores across independent and dependent variables was .24, kurtosis error scores across predictor and

outcome variables was .48). Scatter plots, as well as residual scatter plots, were created to visually check for linear relationships between predictors and outcomes and ensure that linearity best described variable interactions. A correlation matrix was generated to determine that independent variables were not perfectly correlated, as noted in Table 2 and Table 3. In addition, tolerance of all predictors and outcome variables was examined to ensure no problems of multicollinearity. With regard to homoscedasticity, equal variances of error scores were not found. In actuality, large discrepancies between variance scores were noted; however, this is attributed to the use of both standardized and unstandardized measures. As such, corrections were not conducted as the problem was an artifact of the different types of measures utilized in this study.

Table 2
Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Outcome Variables across Grade Levels

	WJ-III	Batería R	Batería M	PE	TE	SASE
WJ-III	1	.35**	.48**	.40**	.46**	.01
Batería R	.35**	1	.33**	.18	.30**	-.17
Batería M	.48**	.33**	1	.27**	.36**	-.04
PE	.40**	.18	.27**	1	.54**	.17
TE	.46**	.30**	.36**	.54**	1	.16
SASE	.01	-.17	-.04	.17	.16	1

Note. Batería R= Batería Reading; Batería M= Batería Math; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; SASE= student academic self-efficacy.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 3
Correlation Matrix between Predictors and Outcome Variables by Grade Levels

Grade	Measure	WJ-III	Batería R	Batería M	PE	TE	SASE
2nd	WJ-III	1	.61**	.69**	.54**	.71**	-.11
	Batería R	.61**	1	.52**	.36*	.54**	-.09
	Batería M	.69**	.52**	1	.38*	.51**	-.14
	PE	.54**	.36*	.38*	1	.64**	.07
	TE	.71**	.54**	.51**	.64**	1	.80
	SASE	-.11	-.09	-.14	.07	.08	1
5th	WJ-III	1	.45*	.06	.01	.13	-.16
	Batería R	.45*	1	.01	.07	-.22	-.19
	Batería M	.06	.01	1	.28	.20	.28
	PE	.01	.07	.28	1	.50**	.12
	TE	.13	-.22	.20	.50**	1	.43*
	SASE	-.16	-.19	.28	.12	.43*	1
8th	WJ-III	1	-.06	.32	.35	.21	.09
	Batería R	-.06	1	.30	-.10	.32	.21
	Batería M	.32	.30	1	.00	.21	-.06
	PE	.35	-.10	.00	1	.43*	.62**
	TE	.21	.32	.21	43*	1	.41*
	SASE	.09	.21	-.06	.62**	.41*	1

Note. Batería R= Batería Reading; Batería M= Batería Math; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; SASE= student academic self-efficacy.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Research Question One

Do teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, or students' academic self-efficacy predict Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELL students' math and reading academic achievement? If so, which is the better predictor? The study hypothesized that teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy will each significantly predict Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs' math, Spanish reading, and English reading academic achievement. Of these variables, it was hypothesized that teachers' expectations will be the better predictor and account for greater variance.

To analyze research question one, hierarchical linear multiple regression analysis was first utilized. Independent variables consisted of teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy, and dependent variables encompassed math (Batería Math), Spanish reading (Batería Reading), and English reading (WJ-III) academic achievement. Since there are three dependent variables, three analyses were conducted; socio-economic status (SES) was controlled for by entering it as the first step in the hierarchical regression. Specifically, parents' highest level of education was used as an approximation of SES.

In all three analyses, SES was not statistically significant and thus did not serve as a good predictor of academic achievement. Particularly, in the initial step of each multiple regression analysis, SES was entered first and the model was not statistically significant (WJ-III $F(1,97)=2.41$, $p=.12$, $R^2=.02$, adjusted $R^2= .01$; Batería Reading $F(1, 97)=1.71$, $p=.19$, $R^2=.02$, adjusted $R^2=.01$; Batería Math $F(1,97)=1.84$, $p=.18$, $R^2=.02$, adjusted$R^2=.01$). However, on the second step of all three analyses (i.e., Batería Math, Batería Reading, and WJ-III) in which the three primary predictor variables were entered (i.e., parent expectations, teacher expectations, and student academic self-efficacy), a statistically significant model then emerged (WJ-III model $F(4, 94)=8.25$, $p<.001$, $R^2=.26$, adjusted $R^2=.23$; Batería Reading model $F(4,94)=4.61$, $p<.005$, $R^2=.16$, adjusted $R^2=.13$; Batería Math model $F(4,94)=4.36$, $p<.005$, $R^2=.16$, adjusted $R^2=.12$). Furthermore, effects between parents' expectations and SES were also considered and tested, but there was no interaction effect between variables. As such, SES was an unnecessary addition to models as it did not assist in predicting or explaining academic

achievement. Table 4 summarizes results from all three multiple regression analyses through hierarchical regression analyses with SES entered first.

Table 4
Predictors of Academic Achievement across Grade Levels with SES entered first

Step	Predictor	B	SE B	β	P	R^2	Adj R^2
			WJ-III				
1	SES	1.44	.93	.16	.12	.02	.01
2	SES	.83	.84	.09	.32	.26	.23
	PE	.39	.19	.21	.05		
	TE	.56	.17	.35**	.001		
	SASE	-.15	.16	-.09	.34		
			Batería Reading				
1	SES	-1.94	1.48	-.13	.19	.02	.01
2	SES	-2.31	1.42	-.16	.11	.16	.13
	PE	.23	.33	.08	.49		
	TE	.79	.29	.31**	.007		
	SASE	-.59	.27	-.21	.03		
			Batería Math				
1	SES	1.38	1.02	.14	.18	.02	.01
2	SES	.98	.97	.10	.32	.16	.12
	PE	.20	.23	.10	.37		
	TE	.55	.20	.31**	.007		
	SASE	-.22	.18	-.11	.24		

Note. Adj R^2= adjusted R2; SES= socio-economic status; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; SASE= student academic self-efficacy.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

A linear multiple regression analysis was then conducted, with the removal of SES, to evaluate if parents' expectations, teachers' expectations, and students' academic

self-efficacy significantly predicted students' English reading, Spanish reading, and math academic achievement without the addition of SES. With the removal of SES and the three predictors entered at once all three regression models were statistically significant (WJ-III model $F(3,95)=10.66$, $p<.001$; Batería Reading model $F(3,95)=5.17$, $p<.005$; Batería Math model $F(3,95)=5.42$, $p<.001$). Because SES did not assist in explaining or predicting academic achievement, as noted in Table 4, effect sizes between hierarchical regression models with SES and regression models without SES are similar. In actuality, with the addition of SES, R^2 effect sizes as well as the majority of adjusted R^2 effect sizes are slightly larger than with the removal of SES. The results of the regression indicated that approximately 25% of the variance of English reading scores (WJ-III; $R^2 = .25$) was accounted for by the three independent variables of parents' expectations, teachers' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy. Furthermore, 14% of the variance of Spanish reading scores (Batería Reading; $R^2 = .14$) and approximately 15% of the variance of math academic achievement scores (Batería Math; $R^2 = .15$) was explained by the three predictor variables. Consistently across all dependent variables, the variable of teachers' expectations significantly predicted all three domains of academic achievement (WJ-III $\beta = .35$, $p<.01$; Batería Reading $\beta = .31$, $p<.01$; Batería Math $\beta = .31$, $p<.01$). In addition, parents' expectations appeared to significantly predict the WJ-III ($\beta = .23$; $p<.05$), while students' academic self-efficacy significantly predicted Batería Reading ($\beta = -.22$, $p<.05$). Structure coefficients (r_s) were also calculated to determine the amount each independent variable predicted and explained the total explained variance. Overall, r_s support the hypothesis that teacher

expectations serve as the greatest predictor of academic achievement (WJ-III r_s =.92; Batería Reading r_s=.81; Batería Math r_s=.93). Table 5 summarizes results from the three regression analyses with the removal of SES.

Table 5
Predictors of Academic Achievement across Grade Levels Entered at Once

Predictors	B	SE B	β	P	r_s	R^2	Adj R^2
			WJ-III				
PE	.41	.19	.23*	.03	.80	.25	.23
TE	.56	.17	.35**	.001	.92		
SASE	-.14	.16	-.08	.37	.02		
			Batería Reading				
PE	.16	.33	.06	.63	.49	.14	.11
TE	.79	.29	.31**	.008	.81		
SASE	-.62	.27	-.22*	.02	-.44		
			Batería Math				
PE	.23	.22	.12	.30	.70	.15	.12
TE	.55	.20	.31**	.007	.93		
SASE	-.20	.18	-.11	.27	-.10		

Note. Adj R^2= adjusted R2; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; SASE= student academic self-efficacy.
* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Research Question Two

Which is a better predictor of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELL students' math and reading achievement at differing grade levels: teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, or students' academic self-efficacy? It was hypothesized that at earlier grade levels (i.e., 2nd and 5th grade) teachers' expectations will be better predictors' of math and reading achievement, while students' academic self-efficacy will be the better

predictor of academic achievement for Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs in later grade levels (i.e., 8th grade).

Multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to determine the best predictor of academic achievement in each of the three grade levels. In order to account for the three different outcome variables, three separate regression analyses were conducted, in which the data file was split by grade level. Because SES did not account for any of the variance across the total sample, it was not included in the present analyses. The results of the regression analyses indicated that the grade point in which the three predictors (i.e., parents' expectations, teachers' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy) best explained the variance across all three dependent variables (WJ-III R^2=.54, F (3,41)=16.70, p<.001; Batería Reading R^2=.31, F(3,41)=6.08, p<.005; Batería Math R^2=.30, F (3,41)= 5.90, p<.005) was at 2nd grade. Similar to findings in the total sample, across all dependent variables, the variable of teachers' expectations served to significantly predict the three criterion variables. However, this was solely the case in 2nd grade (WJ-III β=.63, *p*<.001; Batería Reading β=.53, *p*<.005; Batería Math β=.47, *p*<.01), given that in all other grades significant predictors did not emerge. Additionally, structure coefficients were calculated and further support that teacher expectations explain the largest portion of the explained variance in the 2nd grade (WJ-III r_s=.96; Batería Reading r_s=.97; Batería Math r_s=.94). Table 6 summarizes results of the regression analyses.

Table 6
Predictors of Academic Achievement by Grade Levels

Grade	Predictors	B	SE B	β	p	r_s	R^2	Adj R^2
				WJ-III				
2nd	PE	.26	.24	.15	.28	.73	.54	.51
	TE	1.04	.23	.63**	.000	.96		
	SASE	-.30	.19	-.17	.12	-.15		
5th	PE	-.19	.41	-.11	.65	.03	.08	-.04
	TE	.39	.33	.30	.25	.45		
	SASE	-.50	.40	-.27	.23	-.56		
8th	PE	.76	.46	.43	.11	.88	.15	.04
	TE	.20	.36	.12	.59	.55		
	SASE	-.48	.55	-.22	.40	.24		
				Batería Reading				
2nd	PE	.08	.43	.03	.86	.65	.31	.26
	TE	1.28	.41	.53**	.003	.97		
	SASE	-.34	.33	-.14	.31	-.16		
5th	PE	.82	.83	.22	.33	.21	.10	-.02
	TE	-.79	.67	-.29	.25	-.71		
	SASE	-.36	.82	-.10	.66	-.62		
8th	PE	-1.28	.64	-.48	.06	-.21	.25	.15
	TE	.90	.50	.38	.08	.64		
	SASE	1.15	.77	.36	.15	.43		
				Batería Math				
2nd	PE	.17	.30	.10	.58	.69	.30	.25
	TE	.79	.29	.47**	.009	.94		
	SASE	-.32	.23	-.18	.17	-.25		
5th	PE	.52	.42	.27	.22	.75	.14	.03
	TE	-.07	.34	-.05	.83	.53		
	SASE	.52	.41	.27	.22	.74		
8th	PE	-.04	.71	-.02	.96	.02	.07	-.06
	TE	.69	.56	.29	.23	.80		
	SASE	-.54	.86	-.17	.54	-.22		

Note. Adj R^2= adjusted R^2; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; SASE= student academic self-efficacy.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Research Question Three

Does academic self-efficacy mediate effects of teacher expectations and parent expectations overall and/or at differing grade levels? It was hypothesized that academic self-efficacy will mediate effects of teacher expectations and parent expectations on academic achievement. Prior to beginning data analyses it was thought that academic self-efficacy would predict academic achievement; however, because student academic self-efficacy did not predict or explain differing models of academic achievement, it was unnecessary to conduct meditational analysis.

Exploratory Analyses

Language Proficiency

Further analyses were conducted in addition to the research questions. Four separate simple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine if students' English language proficiency (as rated by the parent) predicted English reading academic achievement, parents' expectations, teachers' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy. Statistically significant models emerged for English reading achievement ($F(1,96)=24.91$, $p<.001$, $R^2=.21$) and parents' expectations ($F(1,96)=8.18$, $p<.01$, $R^2=.08$). Parent rated student English language proficiency predicted English reading achievement ($\beta= .45$, $p<.001$) and parents' expectations ($\beta=.28$, $p<.01$). Results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7
Students' English Language Proficiency as a Predictor in Four Separate Regression Analyses

Outcome	B	SE B	B	p	R^2
WJ-III	4.07	.82	.45**	.000	.21
PE	1.39	.49	.28**	.005	.08
TE	1.06	.56	.19	.06	.04
SASE	-.23	.53	-.05	.66	.00

Note. PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; SASE= student academic self-efficacy.
* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Furthermore, correlation coefficients were computed between student grade level, student language proficiency in English (rated by the parent), and student language proficiency in Spanish (rated by the parent). The results of the correlational analyses as noted in Table 8 demonstrate that students' Spanish language proficiency ($r(96)=.28$, $p<.01$) was statistically significant and related to grade level, while students' English language proficiency was not. Thus, as student grade level increased, students' Spanish language proficiency increased. Furthermore, the data suggests that students' Spanish proficiency is negatively related to their English proficiency ($r(96)= -.26$, $p<.05$). So, as Spanish proficiency increases English proficiency decreases.

Table 8
Correlation Coefficients between Grade Level and Student Language Proficiency

	Grade	English Proficiency	Spanish Proficiency
Grade	1	-.08	.28**
English Proficiency	-.08	1	-.26*
Spanish Proficiency	.28**	-.26*	1

*p<.05. ** p < .01

Reading and Math Self-Efficacy

Academic self-efficacy was comprised of both reading and math self-efficacy; however, exploratory analyses were conducted to investigate the effect of separating academic self-efficacy into its two respective parts (i.e., reading and math). Prior to beginning these exploratory analyses the internal consistency reliability estimates of scores was examined to determine the appropriateness of investigating math and reading self-efficacy separately, rather than just total academic self-efficacy. In the domain of math self-efficacy, Cronbach's α was calculated at .78 for the total sample. When separated by grade levels, Cronbach's α was calculated at .74 for 2nd grade, .80 for 5th grade, and also .80 for 8th grade. For reading self-efficacy, Cronbach's α was calculated at .79 across scores of the entire sample. Upon score grade level separation, Cronbach's α was individually calculated at .78 for 2nd grade, .80 for 5th grade, and .80 for 8th grade. As such, internal consistency reliability estimates of scores in both reading and math self-efficacy across the entire sample and separated by grade levels are adequate. These results appear similar to findings by Wigfield and colleagues (1997) in which they examined data obtained on the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire for 1st to 6th grade students. Internal consistency reliability estimates of their data were calculated at .74 to .90. However, in this study they not only considered math and reading self-efficacy, but also sports and music. Though the internal consistency reliability estimates of the present study are lower than Wigfield and colleagues' (1997) study, their heightened reliability estimates may be a result of the differing domains that were not considered in the present study. In addition, a correlation matrix for the total sample and differing grade levels

was generated to determine that independent variables that will be used in the following analyses were not perfectly correlated, as noted in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9
Correlation Matrix including Math and Reading Self-Efficacy across Grade Levels

	WJ-III	Batería R	Batería M	PE	TE	MSE	RSE
WJ-III	1	.35**	.48**	.40**	.46**	.05	-.03
Batería R	.35**	1	.32**	.18	.30**	-.20*	-.06
Batería M	.48**	.33**	1	.27**	.36**	.21*	-.26*
PE	.40**	.18	.27**	1	.54**	.08	.19
TE	.46**	.30**	.36**	.54**	1	.06	.19
MSE	.05	-.20*	.21*	.08	.06	1	.25*
RSE	-.03	-.06	-.26*	.19	.19	.25*	1

Note. Batería R= Batería Reading; Batería M= Batería Math; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; MSE= math academic self-efficacy; RSE=reading academic self-efficacy.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 10
Correlation Matrix including Math and Reading Self-Efficacy by Grade Levels

Grade	Measure	WJ-III	Batería R	Batería M	PE	TE	MSE	RSE
2nd	WJ-III	1	.610**	.69**	.54**	.71**	-.10	-.11
	Batería R	.61**	1	.52**	.36*	.54**	-.12	-.05
	Batería M	.69**	.52**	1	.38**	.51**	-.07	-.17
	PE	.54**	.36*	.38**	1	.64**	-.00	.11
	TE	.71**	.54**	.51**	.64**	1	-.00	.13
	MSE	-.10	-.12	-.07	-.00	-.00	1	.62**
	RSE	-.11	-.05	-.17	.11	.13	.62**	1
5th	WJ-III	1	.45*	.06	.01	.13	-.31	.14
	Batería R	.45*	1	.01	.07	-.22	-.19	-.04
	Batería M	.06	.01	1	.28	.20	.48*	-.16
	PE	.01	.07	.28	1	.50**	-.08	.24
	TE	.13	-.22	.2	.50**	1	.13	.42*
	MSE	-.31	-.19	.48*	-.08	.13	1	-.22
	RSE	.14	-.04	-.16	.24	.42*	-.22	1

Table 10 Continued

Grade	Measure	WJ-III	Batería R	Batería M	PE	TE	MSE	RSE
8th	WJ-III	1	-.06	.32	.35	.21	.39*	-.26
	Batería R	-.06	1	.30	-.10	.32	.03	.22
	Batería M	.32	.30	1	.00	.21	.52**	-.55**
	PE	.35	-.10	.00	1	.43*	.39*	.34
	TE	.21	.32	.21	43*	1	.26	.22
	MSE	.39*	.03	.52**	.39*	.26	1	-.31
	RSE	-.26	.22	-.55**	.34	.22	-.31	1

Note. Batería R= Batería Reading; Batería M= Batería Math; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; MSE= math self-efficacy; RSE= reading self-efficacy.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Math Self-Efficacy. Because the three main dependent variables of this study are separated by academic domains (i.e., English reading, Spanish reading, and math), exploratory analyses were conducted to determine if separating academic self-efficacy into domain specific areas (reading and math) as well as considering teachers' and parents' expectations impacts domain specific academic achievement (reading or math). Thus, with regard to math self-efficacy, a linear multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the impact of teacher expectations, parent expectations, and math self-efficacy on math achievement (Batería Math).

Independent variables were entered at once and the regression model that emerged was statistically significant (Batería Math model $F(3,95)=6.46$, $p<.001$). Findings were similar to results from research question one. Specifically, teachers' expectations continued to emerge as the sole statistically significant predictor of math achievement (Batería Math $\beta = .30$, $p<.01$). The R^2 effect size was similar to findings from research question one, given that there was only a slight increase of explained

variance in math achievement (Batería Math) from 14% (R^2 =.14, student academic self-efficacy as one of three independent variables) to 17% (R^2=.17, math self-efficacy included as one of three independent variable). Additionally, structure coefficients were calculated and they support that teacher expectations function as the greatest predictor of math achievement (Batería Math r_s=.87). Table 11 summarizes results from the linear regression analysis.

Table 11
Predictors of Math Achievement including Math Self-Efficacy across Grade Levels

Outcome	Predictor	B	SE B	β	P	r_s	R^2	Adj R^2
Batería	PE	.19	.22	.09	.40	.65	.17	.14
Math	TE	.52	.20	.30**	.009	.87		
	MSE	.56	.29	.18	.06	.50		

Note. Adj R^2= adjusted R2; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; MSE= math academic self-efficacy.
* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Math Self-Efficacy Split by Grade Levels. In order to determine if math self-efficacy impacted students' academic achievement at differing grade levels, one linear multiple regression was conducted in which the data was split by grade level. From the three grade levels, all three models emerged as statically significant (2^{nd} grade Batería Math F (3, 41) = 5.15, p<.005; 5^{th} grade Batería Math F (3, 24) = 3.94, p<.05; 8^{th} grade Batería Math F (3, 22) = 3.83, p<.05). When comparing the use of student academic self-efficacy or math self-efficacy as a predictor of math achievement, it seems that results are mixed as to the group of variables that best explains the variance of math achievement. By using student academic self-efficacy in addition to parent expectations

and teacher expectations, about 30% of the variance of math achievement is explained in 2nd grade (R^2=.30), but, the use of math self-efficacy slightly lowers the amount of explained variance to approximately 27% at this grade level (R^2=.27). However, in both 5th and 8th grade, the use of math self-efficacy over student academic self-efficacy in conjunction with parent expectations and teacher expectations increases the amount of explained variance. Specifically, in 5th grade math self-efficacy along with the other 2 independent variables explained about 33% of the variance (R^2=.33), while student academic self-efficacy explained approximately 14% of the variance (R^2=.14). In 8th grade, math self-efficacy in addition to the other two predictor variables explained approximately 34% of the variance (R^2=.34) in math achievement and student academic self-efficacy explained about .7% (R^2=.07). Table 12 summarizes results from the regression analysis.

Table 12
Predictors of Math Achievement including Math Self-Efficacy by Grade Levels

Grade	Predictors	B	SE B	β	P	r_s	R^2	Adj R^2
2nd	PE	.16	.31	.09	.61	.73	.27	.22
	TE	.77	.29	.46*	.01	.98		
	MSE	-.25	.47	-.70	.60	-.14		
5th	PE	.64	.37	.34	.10	.49	.33	.25
	TE	-.05	.27	-.04	.85	.35		
	MSE	1.17	.39	.51**	.007	.83		
8th	PE	-.81	.53	-.30	.15	.01	.34	.25
	TE	.45	.46	.19	.34	.36		
	MSE	2.31	.74	.59**	.005	.88		

Note. Adj R^2= adjusted R^2; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; MSE= math self-efficacy.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Reading Self-Efficacy. To determine the impact of reading self-efficacy on reading achievement, two linear multiple regression analyses were conducted. Independent variables were entered at once and included parent expectations, teacher expectations, and reading self-efficacy. Dependent variables encompassed Spanish reading (Batería Reading) and English reading (WJ-III) academic achievement. The two models that emerged were both statistically significant (WJ-III $F(3,95)= 11.41$, $p<.001$; Batería Reading $F(3,95)=3.82$, $p<.05$). In both English and Spanish reading, teacher expectations was a statistically significant predictor (WJ-III $\beta=.36$, $p<.005$; Batería Reading $\beta=.30$, $p<.05$). In addition, in English reading, parent expectations also emerged as a statistically significant predictor (WJ-III $\beta=.24$, $p<.05$). However, reading self-efficacy did not significantly predict either English or Spanish reading achievement. Table 13 summarizes results of these analyses including structure coefficients that support that teacher expectations explain the largest amount of explained variance in both English and Spanish reading achievement (WJ-III $r_s = .89$; Batería Reading $r_s = .92$).

Table 13
Predictors of Reading Achievement including Reading Self-Efficacy across Grade Levels

Outcome	Predictor	B	SE B	β	P	r_s	R^2	Adj R^2
WJ-III	PE	.43	.19	.24*	.03	.78	.27	.24
	TE	.58	.17	.36**	.001	.89		
	RSE	-.38	.24	-.14	.12	-.06		
Batería	PE	.13	.34	.05	.70	.56	.11	.08
Reading	TE	.77	.30	.30*	.01	.92		
	RSE	-.55	.42	-.13	.20	-.19		

Note. Adj R^2= adjusted R2; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; RSE= reading academic self-efficacy.
* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Reading Self-Efficacy Split by Grade Levels. Similar to the analysis conducted related to math self-efficacy and differing grade levels, linear multiple regression was utilized to determine the impact of reading self-efficacy, parent expectations, and teacher expectation on the measures of English and Spanish reading achievement (WJ-III and Batería Reading) in differing grade levels. Two linear multiple regressions were conducted and the 2nd grade level model in both English and Spanish reading achievement emerged as statistically significant (WJ-III $F(3,41)= 16.95$, $p<.001$; Batería Reading $F(3,41)= 6.01$, $p<.005$). Comparing the inclusion of either student academic self-efficacy or reading self-efficacy in addition to teacher expectations and parent expectations, the amount of explained variance typically increased with the use of reading self-efficacy, especially with regard to English reading achievement. Specifically, for 2nd graders, when using student academic self-efficacy, about 54% of the variance of English reading achievement was explained (WJ-III $R^2=.54$), while with the use of reading self-efficacy about 74% of the variance was explained (WJ-III

R^2=.74). In 5th grade, the use of student academic self-efficacy explained about 8% of the variance of English reading achievement (WJ-III R^2=.08) and about 18% of the variance was explained when using reading self-efficacy (WJ-III R^2=.18). In 8th grade, 15% of the variance of English reading achievement was explained when making use of student academic self-efficacy (WJ-III R^2=.15), but approximately 54% of the variance was explained when using reading self-efficacy (WJ-III R^2=.54). In Spanish reading achievement (Batería Reading), the majority of effect sizes were relatively similar when using either student academic self-efficacy or reading self-efficacy. For example, in 2nd grade 31% of the variance of Spanish reading achievement was explained by either student academic self-efficacy or reading self-efficacy (student academic self-efficacy R^2=.31; reading self-efficacy R^2=.31). In 5th grade, student academic self-efficacy explained about 10% of the variance of Spanish reading achievement (R^2=.10), while reading self-efficacy explained about 9% of the variance (R^2=.09). Finally, in 8th grade, student academic self-efficacy explained approximately 25% of the variance of Spanish reading achievement (R^2=.25) and reading self-efficacy explained about 23% (R^2=.23).

Looking at the individual predictors (i.e., teacher expectation, parent expectation, and reading self-efficacy), only teacher expectations is statistically significant across both English and Spanish reading measures. Specifically, teacher expectations is only significant in the 2nd grade (WJ-III β=.64, p<.001; Batería Reading β=.53, p<.005). Other than teacher expectations in the 2nd grade, no other predictor was statistically significant in Spanish reading achievement. In English reading achievement, reading

self-efficacy was statistically significant in the 8th grade (WJ-III β=-.44, p<.05). Table 14 summarizes results of these analyses.

Table 14
Predictors of Academic Achievement including Reading Self-Efficacy by Grade Levels

Grade	Predictor	B	SE B	β	P	r_s	R^2	Adj R^2
				WJ-III				
2nd	PE	.27	.24	.15	.26	.62	.74	.55
	TE	1.06	.23	.64**	.000	.82		
	RSE	-.60	.30	-.21	.05	-.12		
5th	PE	-.14	.42	-.08	.74	.02	.18	.03
	TE	.16	.33	.12	.63	.31		
	RSE	.27	.54	.11	.62	.34		
8th	PE	.78	.67	.44	.05	.47	.54	.29
	TE	.20	.32	.12	.54	.29		
	RSE	-1.07	.47	-.44*	.03	-.35		
				Batería Reading				
2nd	PE	.08	.43	.03	.85	.65	.31	.26
	TE	1.30	.41	.53**	.003	.97		
	RSE	-.53	.55	-.13	.34	-.09		
5th	PE	.86	.83	.23	.31	.22	.09	-.02
	TE	-.97	.65	-.36	.15	-.73		
	RSE	.24	1.07	.05	.82	-.14		
8th	PE	-.96	.57	-.37	.11	-.22	.23	.12
	TE	1.00	.50	.42	.06	.67		
	RSE	.91	.74	.25	.23	.46		

Note. Adj R^2= adjusted R^2; PE= parent expectations; TE= teacher expectations; RSE= reading self-efficacy.
* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Parent Rated Future Employment and Anticipated Schooling

Parents were asked what they hoped students' would be as adults. Because all parents were given questionnaires to complete in Spanish, it is necessary to indicate that

the parent questionnaire in Spanish asks the parent about the job they would like their child to obtain as an adult. Parents were provided 15 differing options. Of the sample of 99 parents, 4 did not respond to this question. Of those parents that did respond the majority desired for their children to be doctors/physicians (26.3%) and attorneys (18.2%). Parents expected 14.1% of their children to be in law enforcement and 14.1% to be teachers. Parents rated 6.1% of children to be college professors, 2% to be electricians, 1% to be managers of a store, 1% to be cashiers, and 13.1% indicated other (e.g., veterinarian, engineer, athlete).

Data of parents who believed that their children would be doctors/physicians, attorneys, or college professors (50.6% of parents) were separated from the remainder of the data file to investigate if there was a match between these professions and the amount of schooling the parent would like their child to obtain. The majority of parents desired that their child obtain a doctoral degree (44.7%) and graduate with a bachelor degree (23.4%). However, 23.4% desired for their child to obtain some college schooling, 4.3% of these parents desired for their child to go to technical school, 4.3% desired for their child to only graduate from high school, while 2.1% desired for their child to complete 9^{th} to 11^{th} grade. In addition, the parents who desired for their child to attain the profession of doctor/physician, attorney, or college professor also indicated the amount of schooling they believed their child would actually complete. The majority of these parents believed their child would actually graduate with a Bachelor Degree (23.4%). Table 15 summarizes these comparisons.

Table 15
Comparisons between Upper Level Professions and Amount of Schooling

Amount of schooling parent believes student will actually complete		Amount of schooling parent would like student to complete	
Schooling	Percentage	Schooling	Percentage
9th to 11th grade	2.1	9th to 11th grade	2.1
Graduate High School	14.9	Graduate High School	4.3
Technical School	2.1	Technical School	4.3
Some College	19.1	Some College	23.4
Graduate with Bachelor Degree	23.4	Graduate with Bachelor Degree	6.4
Some schooling beyond Bachelor Degree	10.6	Some schooling beyond Bachelor Degree	14.9
Master Degree	6.4	Master Degree	14.9
Doctoral Degree	21.3	Doctoral Degree	44.7

Teacher Rated Future Professions and Obstacles

Teachers were presented two open-ended questions to complete. Specifically, they were asked what they believed the child's job would be as an adult and what they believed was the biggest obstacle in the child's life. The researcher created categories in order to address the differing professions and obstacles. A qualitative sorting technique (i.e., Q-sort) was utilized to determine appropriate categories for responses. The researcher sorted both professions and obstacles independently while another graduate student in school psychology also sorted both areas independently. Thus, prior to discussing disagreements, both raters coded responses separately After the researcher and graduate student independently sorted the differing domains, percent agreement was then calculated as a measure of reliability. The initial sorting technique resulted in about

75% agreement (25.25% disagreement) between raters for students' future professions and about 91% agreement (90.9%) for obstacles students face. After discussing disagreements, agreement between raters was at 100%.

In the domain of professions, the majority of teachers, 24.24%, did not specify an occupation. For example, they would state that the child would work in an area "related to [their] chosen field of study" or teachers would indicate they would "rather not speculate on the future occupation" of students. Of those teachers that did specify occupations, 14.14% believed that students would be teachers and 13.13% thought students would find employment in careers involving technical training (no degree required; e.g., truck driver, mechanic).

In the realm of obstacles students' face, the majority of obstacles faced are related to parent involvement/family concerns (16.53%). In addition, from teachers' statements, 15.70% of students encounter the English language as an obstacle and 13.22% encounter motivation/interest as a primary obstacle. Still, teachers reported that 14.88% of students do not have obstacles. Table 16 summarizes teacher reported professions and obstacles related to their students.

Table 16
Professions and Obstacles

Students' Future Professions		Obstacles Students' Encounter	
Profession	Percentage	Obstacle	Percentage
Cashier	1.01%	Parent Involvement/Family Concerns	16.53%
Housewife	4.04%	Learning Problems	3.31%
Criminal	1.01%	Motivation/Interest	13.22%
Doctor/Physician	4.04%	Discipline	4.96%
Teacher	14.14%	Students' Personal Problems	9.92%
Office Assistant	6.06%	Behavioral Difficulties	5.79%
Law Enforcement	7.07%	Financial	4.96%
Work in Restaurant	1.01%	Student Illness	.83%
Blue Collar	5.05%	English Language	15.70%
Administrator/Director	4.04%	Peer Pressure	4.13%
Artist/Director	4.04%	No obstacle	14.88%
Business	6.06%	Other	.83%
Veterinarian	2.02%	No answer	4.96%
Lawyer	1.01%		
Technical Training (degree required)	4.04%		
Technical Training (no degree required)	13.13%		
Occupation not Specified	24.24%		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Hispanic students have been at the forefront of the school dropout problem in the United States (U.S.) for decades (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). This social ailment largely affects Hispanic Spanish-speaking English language learners (ELLs) in the U.S. When looking at predictors of school dropout, academic achievement appears to be a strong predictor (Englund et al., 2008; Strom & Boster, 2007) and it rises above most predictors because of its malleability. In order to enhance academic achievement in this population of students (i.e., Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs), it is important to determine alterable predictors of academic performance. After reviewing research to date, teacher expectations, parent expectations, and student academic self-efficacy were deemed to be malleable predictors of academic performance in largely White samples. As such, it was the purpose of this study to investigate the impact of teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, as well as students' academic self-efficacy on the academic achievement of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs as a method of potentially improving the underachievement and dropout problem. Participants of this study included students in 2nd, 5th, and 8th grade, their respective teachers, and parents.

Discussion of Results

This study posed and answered three research questions relating to the achievement gap in Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs from an ecological systems approach. The first research question hypothesized that teacher expectations, parent

expectations, and student academic self-efficacy would each significantly predict Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs' academic achievement in the total sample. Of these three variables, the variable of teacher expectations was hypothesized to be the greatest predictor. Analyses were first conducted controlling for socio-economic status (SES). However, SES did not serve as a predictor of English reading, Spanish reading, or math academic achievement. This finding was unexpected given previous research (e.g., DuPaul et al., 2004; Jimerson et al., 1999; Williams & Dawson, 2011) but could be related to a lack of variability with regard to SES in the sample. Particularly, parents' highest level of education was used as a proxy for SES and the majority of parents (55.6%) had not graduated from high school. Additionally, the sample came from a district where the majority of students are economically disadvantaged (86%). As such, with regard to SES, the sample appeared somewhat homogenous which can explain why SES did not serve as a predictor.

The analyses were then conducted without SES in the models. Findings indicated that only teacher expectations functioned as a predictor of the three differing types of academic achievement. Parent expectations functioned as a significant predictor of English reading achievement, while student academic self-efficacy served as a significant predictor (negative effect) of Spanish reading achievement. This finding supports the hypothesis that teacher expectations would be the greatest predictor of achievement. However, it does not support the hypothesis that all three variables (i.e., teacher expectations, parent expectations, and academic self-efficacy) would predict all domains of achievement as suggested by previous research (e.g., Bandura et al., 2001;

Dimmler, 2008; Gill & Reynolds, 1999; Hinnant et al., 2010). That only teacher expectations predicted achievement across all measures of academic performance (i.e., English reading, Spanish reading, and math) is somewhat unexpected based on previous literature. Because most studies have not focused on this population of students across the grade levels, this finding may be a function of the sample. In addition, because a large part of the sample were 2nd graders, this may be the cause for the greater predictability of teachers' expectations as noted in previous research (e.g., Good & Nichols, 2001) and lack of predictability of academic self-efficacy on English reading and math achievement. Self-efficacy involves interpretation and perception that develops with age as indicated by previous research (e.g., Smith et al., 2012); thus, these students may have been too young.

The second research question hypothesized that at earlier grade levels, specifically 2nd and 5th grade, teachers' expectations would be the better predictor of achievement, but in later grades (i.e., 8th grade) students' academic self-efficacy would be the greater predictor of academic achievement for Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs. Analyses were conducted and findings indicate that teachers' expectation was again the only significant predictor of Spanish reading, English reading, and math when disaggregating the sample by grade levels, but only in 2nd grade. In 5th and 8th grade, no predictors of academic achievement were found. Thus, the hypothesis was only somewhat supported considering that only in the 2nd grade was a predictor noted. It is possible that the limited sample sizes in 5th and 8th grade were not sufficient to uncover any significant predictor variables. In addition, because students' academic self-efficacy

comprised both math and reading self-efficacy, this may have affected the predictability of this variable. Considering that some students may have indicated that they were better at one content area over another, results may be different if math and reading self-efficacy were disaggregated from students' academic self-efficacy and these specific content areas were then matched to their respective achievement domains (e.g., math self-efficacy with math achievement, rather than total academic self-efficacy with math achievement).

The third research question hypothesized that academic self-efficacy would mediate effects of teacher expectations and parent expectations on academic achievement. This research question was not investigated because student academic self-efficacy did not predict or explain different models of academic achievement. Additional analyses were conducted in this research study. Interestingly, it was found that parent rated student English language proficiency predicted both English reading achievement and parents' expectations. It was expected that parent rated student English language proficiency would predict English reading achievement, as previously mentioned; yet, it was not expected for English language proficiency to predict parents' expectations. It is possible that this finding could be accounted for by the questions asked of parents when rating their expectations for their child. Questions related to parent expectations ask about the child's past and future performance in school. Because these children are in U.S. schools and live in the U.S., the parent may believe that should their child be limited in their English proficiency their opportunities to do well in school may not be as good as if the student were proficient in English. Furthermore, it was found that as

student grade level increased, parent ratings of students' Spanish proficiency increased, and also that as students' Spanish proficiency increased, their English proficiency decreased. Both findings are likely related to a lack of English exposure. Specifically, the majority of parents' of 8th grade students have lived in the U.S. for zero to five years (46.2%), while the majority in 5th grade have lived in the U.S. for 11 to 15 years (25%), and the majority of 2nd grade have always lived in the U.S. (26.7%). So, this finding is possibly the result of students in upper grade levels not having as much exposure to the English language and primarily speaking in Spanish given the limited amount of time the family has lived in the U.S. This lack of exposure to English in turn likely impacts students' English proficiency, and so older students who are proficient in Spanish are probably in turn less proficient in English.

Exploratory analyses also looked into disaggregating academic self-efficacy into domain specific parts (i.e., reading and math self-efficacy). Analyses were conducted in which teacher expectations, parent expectations, and reading self-efficacy functioned as independent variables and English and Spanish reading achievement were dependent variables. Moreover, teacher expectations, parent expectations, and math self-efficacy were also investigated on how they impacted math achievement. These analyses revealed that for the total sample the variable of teacher expectations was the greatest predictor of both math and reading achievements. However, parent expectations predicted English reading achievement, as noted previously. Thus, these results were expected. These analyses were also conducted by grade levels and findings indicate that teacher expectations were significant predictors for math, English reading, and Spanish

reading for the 2nd grade sample. Math self-efficacy was a significant predictor of math achievement in 5th and 8th grade, and reading self-efficacy was a significant predictor of English reading in 8th grade. So, as math self-efficacy increased so too did math achievement for 5th and 8th graders, but as reading self-efficacy increased English reading achievement decreased in 8th grade. This negative effect noted in reading self-efficacy may be attributed to the 8th grade sample and the limited amount of time the majority of these students' families have been in the U.S. as previously noted. Because reading self-efficacy questions were not language specific (e.g., questions related to self-efficacy of overall reading ability) this may explain the reason why there was a negative effect specifically with English reading. It is still unclear why there was no effect between reading self-efficacy for 8th grade students' Spanish reading achievement.

Additional analyses looked at students' future professions as rated by their parent. Approximately 51% of parents reported the desire for their child to be in a profession that required a doctorate degree (i.e., doctor/physician, attorney, or college professor). At the same time, 44.7% indicated that they *hoped* their child would complete graduate school (i.e., obtain a doctoral degree) and 21.3% indicated that they *expected* their child to complete graduate school. Thus, it appears that parents' desires for their child's future profession do not match with their hope for the amount of schooling their child will receive. However, the highest reported amount of schooling that parents expected for their child to complete was graduation with a bachelor degree (23.4%), while the highest reported amount of schooling related to parents' desires was for their child to graduate with a doctoral degree. When comparing parents' expectations

and desires for their child's future profession, it appears that parents do understand the necessity to obtain higher levels of education to attain upper level professions.

Finally, this study also investigated obstacles and future professions of the student as indicated by their teacher. The majority of teachers believed that the biggest obstacle their particular students encountered was parent involvement/family concerns. Moreover, the majority of teachers did not want to specify an occupation regarding the students' future professions. It is likely that teachers did not want to specify a profession for their students because they did not want to negatively affect the students' academic or future success. However, if the majority of teachers believed the biggest obstacle was parent involvement/family concerns and they did not want to speculate about the future occupations of the child for fear of adversely affecting them then where is the student obtaining their information, if at all, for their potential success? Given that in this study of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs, teacher expectations, particularly in 2nd grade, was the best predictor of academic achievement, it is likely that though these teachers do not want to state their beliefs about the future occupations of these students, they are probably imparting their expectations by their behaviors and interactions with the students. For example, teachers communicate their expectations to students by praise, warmth, the number of opportunities students have to answer more questions, and also the amount of time provided to the student to answer questions (Good, 1981; Snodgrass & Rosenthal, 1982; Rubie-Davies, 2007, 2010; Thompson et al., 2004; Weinstein et al., 2004).

Overall, this study examined malleable factors (parent expectations, teacher expectations, and student academic self-efficacy) related to dropout and achievement from an ecological/systems perspective. Given the results from this study, it seems that an ecological/systems perspective related to expectations and self-efficacy may not be fully explained by the factors considered in this study. In particular, only teachers' expectations were predictive across all reading and math measures of academic achievement. Additionally, based on the results of this study, in the total sample about 11% to 23% of the variance was explained when using teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy as predictors. Based on previous research, it is likely that the variance that was not accounted for by these predictor variables is possibly related to students' cognitive ability, previous academic achievement, academic thoughts, motivation, effort, and acculturation (Adelabu, 2008; Alvarez, 2003; Anderson & Keith, 1997; Duncan et al., 2007; Erkman et al., 2010; Park, 2011; Rumberger, 2011; Steinmayr et al., 2010; Stewart, 2007, 2008; Ruiz, 2009). It should be noted that in the 2nd grade sample about 30% to 54% of the variance across achievement measures was explained when using teachers' expectations, parents' expectations, and students' academic self-efficacy as predictors. This is likely reflective of the greater sample size that the 2nd grade population comprised in comparison to the much smaller sample sizes noted in the 5th and 8th grade samples. Alternatively, it may be a function of other factors not accounted in this model that come into play in later grades.

Conclusion

This study investigated a group of students that has not received much attention in the literature regarding teacher expectations, parent expectations, and academic self-efficacy. An ecological/systems perspective was taken to investigate the best predictors of academic performance. Above all, the variable of teacher expectations was the best predictor of English reading, Spanish reading, and math achievement. However, this primarily was the case with 2nd grade individuals. Parent expectations did not serve as a predictor of academic achievement with the exception of English reading achievement in the overall sample. Moreover, when looked at by individual domains (i.e., reading and math), self-efficacy did function as a predictor. Specifically, math self-efficacy had a positive effect on math achievement in both 5th and 8th grade, while reading self-efficacy did not have the same effect. In fact, it had a negative effect on English reading achievement in the 8th grade. Furthermore, it appears that there may be a disconnect between the amount of schooling parents desire for their children and the professions they desire for their children to attain. Though some parents are aware of the demands for differing professions, others seem unaware of these demands in schooling in order to achieve higher level professions. Teachers, however, often did not want to speculate as to the profession students would attain and they frequently believed that the biggest obstacle in their students' lives is parent involvement/family concerns.

Limitations

As is the case with most research studies, this study had several limitations. One limitation pertains to the restricted geographic location in which study participants were

recruited. Because study participants came from a medium-sized school district in Southwest Texas, the population from which the sample was obtained may not generalize to the actual target population (i.e., Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs in the U.S.). Considering the diversity within the Hispanic community, it is likely that the results of this study do not account for these differences and may not generalize to all individuals of this population. A second limitation of the study was its small sample size, which included 99 student participants. The limited sample size likely makes study results difficult to generalize across all Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELL students. Moreover, the small sample size may have also affected study findings due to limited power and the possibility of greater margins of sampling error. A third limitation is that all of the assumptions of multiple regression were not met, specifically homoscedasticity. Because all of the assumptions of multiple regression were not met, it is possible that the findings from this study are flawed and skewed. A large reason for not meeting the assumption of homoscedasticity was related to the use of standardized and unstandardized measures in the study. Thus, it would have been most beneficial to utilize all standardized measures in order to be closer in obtaining the equal variances of error scores needed for homoscedasticity.

A number of measurement issues also present limitations to the study. Because the expectancy measures were created by the researcher, it is difficult to determine if the measures are truly measuring teacher and parent expectations. It would have been beneficial to use norm-referenced measures; however, to date none have been created regarding these variables. The use of these researcher developed measures makes it

difficult to compare effect sizes with other studies as these measures may be in fact measuring more than just expectations. The Competence Beliefs Questionnaire has been utilized with students as young as 3rd grade (Wu et al., 2010), but not with 2nd graders as it was used in the present study. Thus, the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire may not be tapping academic self-efficacy on this population of 2nd graders as it may be that the terminology is too complicated or difficult to understand. Further, the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire was translated into Spanish in this study. Students had the option of choosing to complete the English or Spanish version. It is difficult to determine if both versions were equivalent; thus, the Spanish version may not be an accurate representation of the Competence Beliefs Questionnaire as it was initially created and may not be measuring the same concept in the same manner as the English version.

In addition, all independent variable measures were self-report; thus, individuals may have responded to items in socially appropriate ways that may not have been a true reflection of reality. With the expectation measures, had teacher and parent behaviors and interactions with students been observed, this would have assisted in corroborating information obtained on the expectancy reports. A final limitation is the cross-sectional design of the study. Information obtained in the study would have been more meaningful if a longitudinal design that accounted for very young children (e.g., first year of schooling) had been utilized. Because a cross-sectional design was used, it is difficult to determine if others' expectations were shaped by students' academic performance or if academic performance was shaped by others' expectations. These limitations limit the generalizability of the study's results and stress the need for further investigation.

Implications for Practice

This study investigated malleable methods to improve the academic achievement of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs, a population that continues to grow in this country. Given the finding that teacher expectations predict academic achievement, especially in 2nd grade, school psychologists are able to consult with teachers to enhance their expectations of their students in order to prevent further problems in the future. School psychologists can work toward mental health consultation if a teacher has negative feelings toward a student in order to intervene and enhance their expectations of the student. Furthermore, school psychologists can also provide school districts with teacher in-services that address the impact of expectations and methods in which teachers communicate their expectations to their students. With this information, teachers will be able to modify their behaviors and interactions with students in the hope of demonstrating higher expectations and increased levels of achievement. Moreover, considering that there is a mismatch between parents desired professions for their children and the amount of schooling parents desire their child to achieve, school psychologists and teachers can begin educating parents and students about the requirements of differing professions. This dissemination of information will assist students and their families in planning for the future.

Directions for Future Research

This study has taken an ecological/systems perspective in identifying predictors of academic achievement. It has taken predictor variables that are often not considered together and integrated them as a method of enhancing academic performance.

Additional research related to the target variables of teacher expectations, parent expectations, academic self-efficacy, and academic achievement is vital in order to pinpoint target predictors and grade levels of significant intervention. Replication studies should be conducted with a greater sample size and a population of Hispanic Spanish-speaking ELLs from all over the U.S. This will ensure that findings from this study are accurate and generalize to the target population at large. Furthermore, studies should include more heterogeneous samples with regard to SES in order to determine the genearlizability of results.

Additionally, future research should also investigate the relationship between the expectancy researcher developed measures of this study and the behaviors and interactions of teachers and parents toward specific students. By doing so, these future studies can provide support or discredit the expectancy measures created. Furthermore, studies should take a longitudinal approach to investigating the variables of this study, beginning from preschool, to assist in determining if previous academic achievement impacts expectations or if expectations impact academic achievement.

REFERENCES

Accordino, D. B., Accordino, M. P., & Slaney. (2000). An investigation of perfectionism, mental health, achievement, and achievement motivation in adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*, 535-545.

Acoach, C. L., & Webb, L. M. (2004). The influence of language brokering on Hispanic teenagers' acculturation, academic performance, and nonverbal decoding skills: A preliminary study. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 15,* 1-19.

Adelabu, D. H. (2008). Future time perspective, hope, and ethnic identity among African American adolescents. *Urban Education, 43,* 347-360.

Adeyemo, D. A. (2007). Moderating influence of emotional intelligence on the link between academic self-efficacy and achievement of university students. *Psychology and Developing Societies, 19*(2), 199-213.

Alpert, J. L. (1974). Teacher behavior across ability groups: A consideration of the mediation of Pygmalion effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 66,* 348-353.

Altschul, I., Oyserman, D., & Bybee, D. (2006). Racial-ethnic identity in mid-adolescence: Content and change as predictors of academic achievement. *Child Development, 77,* 1155-1169.

Alvarez, M. J. (2003) Hispanic pre-adolescents' academic resilience: Examining gender, Hispanicism, and school belonging as predictors of academic achievement, and relating level of linguistic validation in the school context to school belonging.

Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B. The Sciences and Engineering, 64(2-B), 981.

Anderson, S. L., & Betz, N. E. (2001). Sources of self-efficacy expectations: Their measurement and relation to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 98-117.

Anderson, E. S., & Keith, T. Z. (1997). A longitudinal test of a model of academic success for at-risk high school students. *Journal of Educational Research, 90*(5), 259-268.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language minority children and youth.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Aunola, K., Nurmi, J., Lerkkanen, M., & Rasku-Puttonen, H. (2003). The roles of achievement-related behaviours and parental beliefs in children's mathematical performance. *Educational Psychology, 23,* 403-421.

Babad, E. & Taylor, P. J. (1992). Transparency of teacher expectancies across language, cultural boundaries. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*(2), 120-125.

Bae, S., Holloway, S. D., Li, J., & Bempechat, J. (2008). Mexican-American students' perceptions of teachers' expectations: Do perceptions differ depending on student achievement levels? *Urban Review, 40,* 210-225.

Baird, G. L., Scott, W. D., Dearing, E., & Hamill, S. K. (2009). Cognitive self-regulation in youth with and without learning disabilities: Academic self-efficacy, theories

of intelligence, learning vs. performance goal preferences, and effort attributions. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 28,* 881-908.

Baker, B., Wood, T. A., & Flynt, S. W. (1993). The effect of the interaction of teacher and student expectation on reading achievement in second graders. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 20,* 179-187.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*(2), 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Service, 1*(2), 164-180.

Bandura, A. (2007). Reflections on an agentic theory of human behavior. *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening, 44,* 995-1004.

Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(3), 125-139.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. *Child Development, 72,* 187-206.

Bandura, A., Pastorelli, C., Barbaranelli, C., & Caprara, G. V. (1999). Self-efficacy pathways to childhood depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 258-269.

Bang, H. J., Suarez-Orozco, C., Pakes, J., & O'Connor, E. (2009). The importance of homework in determining immigrant students' grades in schools in the USA context. *Educational Research, 51,* 1-25.

Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., Rabasca, A., & Pastorelli, C. (2003). A questionnaire for measuring the big five in late childhood. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34,* 645-664.

Barling, J., & Snipelisky, B. (1983). Assessing the determinants of children's academic self-efficacy beliefs: A replication. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 7*(4), 371-376.

Barnard, W. M. (2004). Parent involvement in elementary school and educational attainment. *Children and Youth Services Review, 26,* 39-62.

Battin-Pearson, S., Newcomb, M. D., Abbott, R. D., Hill, K. G., Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (2000). Predictors of early high school dropout: A test of five theories. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92,* 568-582.

Begeny, J. C., Eckert, T. L., Montarello, S. A., & Storie, M. S. (2008). Teacher's perceptions of students' reading abilities: An examination of the relationship between teachers' judgments and students' performance across a continuum of rating methods. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23,* 43-55.

Benner, A. D., & Mistry, R. S. (2007). Congruence of mother and teacher educational expectations and low-income youth's educational competence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99,* 140-153.

Bernal, M. E., Saenz, D. S., & Knight, G. P. (1991). Ethnic identity and adaptation of Mexican American youths in school settings. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 13*(2), 135-154.

Bertrand, A. L. (1962). School attendance and attainment: Function and dysfunction of school and family social systems. *Social Forces, 40*(3), 228-233.

Bickel, R., Weaver, S., Williams, T., & Lange, L. (1997). Opportunity, community, and teen pregnancy in an Appalachian state. *The Journal of Educational Research, 90*(3), 175-181.

Blatchford, P., Burke, J., Farquhar, C., Plewis, I., & Tizard, B. (1989). Teacher expectations in infant school: Associations with attainment and progress, curriculum coverage and classroom interaction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 59,* 19-30.

Bleeker, M. M., & Jacobs, J. E. (2004). Achievement in math and science: Do mothers' beliefs matter 12 years later? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96,* 97-109.

Bong, M. (2004). Academic motivation in self-efficacy, task value, achievement goal orientations, and attributional beliefs. *Journal of Educational Research, 97*(6), 287-297.

Boveja, M. E. (1998). Parenting styles and adolescents' learning strategies in the urban community. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26*(2), 110-119.

Britner, S. L. (2008). Motivation in high school science students: A comparison of gender differences in life, physical, and earth science classes. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45,* 955-970.

Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of science self-efficacy beliefs of middle school students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43,* 485-499.

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75,* 631-331.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 61*(5), 365-374.

Brown, L., & Iyengar, S. (2008). Parenting styles: The impact on student achievement. *Marriage & Family Review, 43,* 14-38.

Brown, K. E., & Medway, F. J. (2007). School climate and teacher beliefs in a school effectively serving poor South Caroling (USA) African American students: A case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 529-540.

Buckner, J. C., Bassuk, E. L., & Weinreb, L. F. (2001). Predictors of academic achievement among homeless and low-income housed children. *Journal of School Psychology, 39,* 45-69.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). *College enrollment and work activity of 2007 high school graduates* (USDL 08-0559). Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/hsgec_04252008.pdf

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011). *Employment and earnings*. Retrieved from ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/special.requests/lf/aa2010/pdf/cpsaat7.pdf

Burchinal, M., McCartney, K., Steinberg, L., Crosnoe, R., Friedman, S. L., McLoyd, V., et al. (2011). Examining the Black-White achievement gap among low-income children using the NICHD study of early child care and youth development. *Child Development, 82,* 1404-1420.

Cagle, J. (1998, April). *One teacher's perspective on the difference of academic expectations for Hispanic students: A case study.* Paper presented at the meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED422424)

Campbell, T. C., & Duffy, M. (1998). Dropping out of secondary school: A descriptive discriminant analysis of early dropouts, late dropouts, alternative completers, and stayins. *Research in the Schools, 5,* 1-10.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., Bandura, A., & Zimbardo, P. (2000). Prosocial foundations of children's academic achievement. *Psychological Science, 11*(4), 302-306.

Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Alessandri, G., Gerbino, M., & Barbaranelli, C., (2011). The contribution of personality traits and self-efficacy beliefs to academic

achievement: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 81,* 78-96.

Carpenter, D. M. (2008). Expectations, aspirations, and achievement among Latino students of immigrant families. *Marriage & Family Review, 43,* 164-185.

Carroll, A., Houghton, S., Wood, R., Unsworth, K., Hattie, J., Gordon, L., et al. (2009). Self-efficacy and academic achievement in Australian high school students: The mediating effects of academic aspirations and delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence, 32,* 797-817.

Cassel, R. N. (2003). Use of personal development test to identify high school and college dropout students. *Education, 123,* 641-648.

Chavez, E. L., Oetting, E. R., & Swaim, R. C. (1994). Dropout and delinquency: Mexican-American and Caucasian non-Hispanic youth. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 23,* 47-55.

Chen, J. A., & Pajares, F. (2010). Implicit theories of ability of grade 6 science students: Relation to epistemological beliefs and academic motivation and achievement in science. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 35*, 75-87.

Christenson, S. L., Rounds, T., & Gorney, D. (1992). Family factors and student achievement: An avenue to increase students' success. *School Psychology Quarterly, 7*(3), 178-206.

Christian, V. L. (2009). Cognitive development and academic achievement: A study of African American, Caucasian, and Latino children. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B. Sciences and Engineering, 70*(3-B), 1967.

Christle, C. A., Jolivette, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2007). School characteristics related to high school dropout rates. *Remedial and Special Education, 28*(6), 325-339.

Clark, M. D., & Artiles, A. J. (2000). A cross-national study of teachers' attributional patterns. *Journal of Special Education, 34*(2), 77-89.

Conoley, J. C., & Haynes, G. (1992). An ecological approach to intervention. In R. C. D'Amato & B. A. Rothisberg (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on intervention: A case study approach to prescriptions for change* (pp. 177-189). New York, NY: Longman.

Coutinho, S. A., & Neuman, G. (2008). A model of metacognition, achievement goal orientation, learning style and self-efficacy. *Learning Environments Research, 11,* 131-151.

Crano, W. D., & Mellon, P. M. (1978). Causal influence of teachers' expectations on children's academic performance: A cross-lagged panel analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*, 39-49.

Davalos, D. B., Chavez, E. L., & Guardiola, R. J. (1999). The effects of extracurricular activity, ethnic identification, and perception of school on student dropout rates. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 21,* 61-77.

Davis-Kean, P. E. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement: The indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19,* 294-304.

Dimmler, M. R. H. (2008). Parent expectations, knowledge of student performance, and school involvement: Links to the achievement of African American and Latino

Children. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 68*(8-A), 3277.

Doll, B., Kurien, S., LeClair, C., Spies, R., Champion, A.,Osborn, A. (2009). The ClassMaps Survey: A frame for promoting positive classroom environments. In R. Gilman, S. Huebner, & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology in the schools* (pp. 213-227). New York: Routledge.

Dotter, A. M., & Lowe, K. (2011). Classroom context, school engagement, and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 40,* 1649-1660.

Draper, G. F. (1997). Social, cognitive, and academic factors associated with high school seniors' educational expectations. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 58*(6-A), 2146.

Duncan, G. J., Dowsett, C. J., Claessens, A., Magnuson, K., Huston, A. C., Klebanov, P., et al. (2007). School readiness and later achievement. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 1428-1446.

DuPaul, G. J., Volpe, R. J., Jitendra, A. K., Lutz, J. G., Lorah, K. S., & Gruber, R. (2004). Elementary school students with AD/HD: Predictors of academic achievement. *Journal of School Psychology, 42,* 285-301.

Elias, S. M., & Loomis, R. J. (2002). Utilizing need for cognition and perceived self-efficacy to predict academic performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32,* 1687-1702.

Englund, M. M., Egeland, B., & Collins, W. A. (2008). Exceptions to high school dropout predictions in a low-income sample: Do adults make a difference? *Journal of Social Issues, 64,* 77-93.

Englund, M. M., Luckner, A. E., Whaley, G. J. L., & Egeland, B. (2004). Children's achievement in early elementary school: Longitudinal effects of parental involvement, expectations, and quality of assistance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96,* 723-730.

Ensminger, M. E., & Slusarcick, A. L. (1992). Paths to high school graduation or dropout: A longitudinal study of a first grade cohort. *Sociology of Education, 65,* 95-113.

Erkman, F., Caner, A., Sart, Z. H., Borkan, B., & Saha, K. (2010). Influence of perceived teacher acceptance, self-concept, and school attitude on the academic achievement of school-age children in Turkey. *Cross-Cultural Research, 44*(3), 295-309.

Espinosa, L. M. (2007). English-language learners as they enter school. In R. Pianta, M. Cox, & K. Snow (Eds.), *School readiness and the transition to kindergarten in the era of accountability* (pp. 175-196). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Fan, X. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement. A growth modeling analysis. *Journal of Experimental Educaiton, 70,* 27-61.

Fan, W., & Williams, C. M. (2010). The effects of parental involvement on students' academic self-efficacy, engagement and intrinsic motivation. *Educational Psychology, 30,* 53-74.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.

Felner, R. F. (2000). Educational reform as ecologically-based prevention and promotion: The project on high performance learning communities. In D. Cicchetti , J. Rappaport, I. Sandler, & R. P. Weissberg(Eds.), *The promotion of wellness in children and adolescents* (pp. 271-307). Washington, DC: CWLA Press.

Ferguson, R. F. (2005). Teachers' perceptions and expectations and the Black-White test score gap. In O. Fashola (Ed.), *Educating African American males: Voices from the field* (pp. 79-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ferla, J., Valcke, M., & Cai, Y. (2009). Academic self-efficacy and academic self-concept: Reconsidering structural relationships. *Learning and Individual Differences, 19,* 499-505.

Fernandez, R. M., Paulsen, R., & Hirano-Nakanishi, M. (1989). Dropping out among Hispanic youth. *Social Science Research, 18,* 21-52.

Finn, K. V., & Frone, M. R. (2004). Academic performance and cheating: moderating role of school identification and self-efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research, 97*(3), 115-122.

Flisher, A. J., Townsend, L., Chikobvu, P., Lombard, C. F., & King, G. (2010). Substance use and psychosocial predictors of high school dropout in Cape Town, South Africa. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 20*, 237-255.

Flores, A. (2007). Examining disparities in mathematics education: Achievement gap or opportunity gap? *The High School Journal, 91,* 29-42.

Flowers, T. A., & Flowers, L. A. (2008). Factors affecting urban African American high school students' achievement in reading. *Urban Education, 43*(2), 154-170.

Galindo, C., & Sheldon, S. B., (2012). School and home connections and children's kindergarten achievement gains: The mediating role of family involvement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 27,* 90-103.

García-Nevarez, A. G., Stafford, M. E., & Arias, B. (2005). Arizona elementary teachers' attitudes toward English language learners and the use of Spanish in classroom instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29,* 295-317.

Geary, D. C. (2011). Cognitive predictors of achievement growth in mathematics: A 5-year longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology, 47*, 1539-1552.

Germain, C. B. (2002). An ecological perspective of social work in the schools. In R. Constable, J. Flynn, & S. McDonald (Eds.), *School social work: Practice, policy, and research perspectives* (5th ed.; pp. 25-35). Chicago, IL: Lyceum Books.

Germain, C. B., & Gitterman, A. (1996). *The life model of social work practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Ghosh, A. (2007). Academic self-efficacy and achievement in a group of siblings of primary schools. *Psychological Studies, 52,* 364-371.

Gill, S., & Reynolds, A. J. (1999). Educational expectations and school achievement of urban African American children. *Journal of School Psychology, 37*, 403-424.

Gingras, R. C., & Careaga, R. C. (1989). Limited English proficient students at risk: Issues and prevention strategies. *New Focus: The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education- Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education.* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED309635)

Goksen, F., & Cemalcilar, Z. (2010). Social capital and cultural distance as predictors of early school dropout: Implications for community action for Turkish internal migrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 34*, 163-175.

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

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does-and does not- say. *American Educator, 32*(2), 8-15.

Goldenberg, C., Gallimore, R., Reese, L., & Garnier, H. (2001). Cause or effect? A longitudinal study of immigrant Latino parents' aspirations and expectations, and their children's school performance. *American Educational Research Journal, 38,* 547-582.

Good, T. (1981). Teacher expectations and student perceptions: A decade of research. *Educational Leadership, 38*, 415-422.

Good, T. L. (1987). Two decades of research on teacher expectations: Findings and future directions. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38,* 32-47.

Good, T. L., & Nichols, S. L. (2001). Expectancy effects in the classroom: A special focus on improving the reading performance of minority students in first-grade classrooms. *Educational Psychologist, 36*, 113-126.

Goran, L. G., & Gage, N. A. (2011). A comparative analysis of language, suspension, and academic performance of students with emotional disturbance and students with learning disabilities. *Education and Treatment of Children, 34*(4), 469-488.

Gottfredson, D. C., Marciniak, E. M., Birdseye, A. T., & Gottfredson, G. D. (1995). Increasing teacher expectations for student achievement. *Journal of Educational Research, 88*(3), 155-163.

Grimm, K. J., Steele, J. S., Mashburn, A. J., Burchinal, M., & Pianta, R. C. (2010). Early behavioral associations of achievement trajectories. *Developmental Psychology, 46*, 976-983.

Gyanani, T. C., & Agarwai, T. (1998). Effect of classroom climate, teachers' leadership behavior and expectations on students' scholastic achievement. *Psycho-lingua, 28,* 61-66.

Hall, J. A., Rosenthal, R., Archer, D., DiMatteo, M. R., & Rogers, P. L. (1977). Nonverbal skills in the classroom. *Theory into Practice, 16*(3), 162-166.

Harris, M. J., Rosenthal, R., & Snodgrass, S. E. (1986). The effects of teacher expectations, gender, and behavior on pupil academic performance and self-concept. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*(3), 173-179.

Hauser-Cram, P., Sirin, S. R., & Stipek. D. (2003). When teachers' and parents' values differ: Teachers' ratings of academic competence in children from low-income families. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95,* 813-820.

Henry, K. L., Cavanagh, T. M., & Oetting, E. K. (2011). Perceived parental investment in school as a mediator of the relationship between socio-economic indicators and educational outcomes in rural America. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40*, 1164-1177.

Hinnant, J. B., O'Brien, M., & Ghazarian, S. R. (2009). The longitudinal relations of teacher expectations to achievement in the early school years. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101,* 662-670.

Hirano-Nakanishi, M. (1986). The extent and relevance of pre-high school attrition and delayed education for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 8,* 61-76.

Hornstra, L., Denessen, E., Bakker, J., van den Bergh, L, & Voeten, M. (2010). Teacher attitudes toward dyslexia: Effects on teacher expectations and the academic achievement of students with dyslexia. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 43*(6), 515-529.

Hunt, M. H., Meyers, J., Davies, G., Meyers, B., Grobb, K. R., & Neel, J. (2002). A comprehensive needs assessment to facilitate prevention of school drop out and violence. *Psychology in the Schools, 39,* 399-416.

Hyman, S., Aubry, T., & Klodawsky, F. (2011). Resilient educational outcomes: Participation in school by youth with histories of homelessness. *Youth and Society, 43*, 253-273.

Jacobs, J. E. (1991). Influence of gender stereotypes on parent and child mathematics attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83,* 518-527.

Jacobs, J. E., Lanza, S., Osgood, D. W., Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Changes in children's self-competence and values: Gender and domain differences across grades one through twelve. *Child Development, 73,* 509-527.

Jennings, J. L., & DiPrete, T. A. (2010). Teacher effects on social and behavioral skills in early elementary school. *Sociology of Education, 83*, 135-159.

Jeynes, W. H. (2005). Effects of parental involvement and family structure on the academic achievement of adolescents. *Marriage & Family Review, 37*(3), 99-116.

Jeynes, W. H. (2010). The salience of the subtle aspects of parental involvement and encouraging that involvement: Implications for school-based programs. *Teachers College Record, 112*, 747-774.

Jimerson, S., Egeland, B., & Teo, A. (1999). A longitudinal study of achievement trajectories: Factors associated with change. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91,* 116-126.

Jonson-Reid, M., Davis, L., Saunders, J., Williams, T. & Williams, J. H. (2005). Academic self-efficacy among African American youths: Implications for school social work practice. *Children & Schools, 27,* 5-14.

Joo, Y., Bong, M., & Choi, H. (2000). Self-efficacy for self-regulated learning, academic self-efficacy, and internet self-efficacy in web-based instruction. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 48*(2), 5-17.

Jordan, W. J., Lara, J., & McPartland, J. M. (1996). Exploring the causes of early dropout among race-ethnic and gender groups. *Youth & Society, 28,* 62-94.

Jozefowicz-Simbeni, D. M. H. (2008). An ecological and developmental perspective on dropout risk factors in early adolescence: Role of school social workers in dropout prevention efforts. *Children & Schools, 30,* 49-62.

Jussim, L., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). Teacher expectations II: Construction and reflection of student achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63,* 947-961.

Jussim, L., Eccles, J. S., & Madon, S. (1996). Social perception, social stereotypes, and teacher expectations: Accuracy and the quest for the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 28, pp. 281-388). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Jussim, L., & Harber, K. D. (2005). Teacher expectations and self-fulfilling prophecies: Knowns and unknowns, resolved and unresolved controversies. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*(2), 131-155.

Kelly, S. (2010). The prevalence of developmental instruction in public and catholic schools. *Teachers College Record, 112*, 2405-2440.

Kenealy, P., Frude, N., & Shaw, W. (1991). Teacher expectations as predictors of academic success. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 131,* 305-306.

Kennedy, E. (2010). Improving literacy achievement in a high-poverty school: Empowering classroom teachers through professional development. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(4), 384-387.

Klassen, R. M., & Lynch, S. L. (2007). Self-efficacy from the perspective of adolescents with LD and their specialist teachers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40,* 494-507.

Klassen, R. M., & Welton, C. (2009). Self-efficacy and procrastination in the writing of students with learning disabilities. In G. A. Troia (Ed.), *Writing instruction and assessment for struggling writers: From theory to evidence-based practice* (pp. 51-74. New York, NY: Guilford.

King, A. S. (1980). Pygmalion and pupillometry: Development of expectations in managers. *Society for Applied Anthropology, 38*, 248-254.

Kitsantas, A., Cheema, J., & Ware, H. W. (2011).Mathematics achievement: The role of homework and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 22*, 310-339.

Kitsantas, A., Ware, H. W., & Cheema, J. (2010). Predicting mathematics achievement from mathematics efficacy: Does analytical method make a difference? *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment, 5*, 25-44.

Krohn, M. D., Schmidt, N. M., Lizotte, A. J., & Baldwin, J. M. (2011). The multiple marginality on gang membership and delinquent behavior for Hispanic, African American, and White male adolescents. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 27*, 18-42.

Kuklinski, M. R., & Weinstein, R. S. (2001). Classroom and developmental differences in a path model of teacher expectancy effects. *Child Development, 72*, 1554-1578.

Lackaye, T. D., & Margalit, M. (2006). Comparisons of achievement, effort, and self-perceptions among students with learning disabilities and their peers from different achievement groups. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39,* 432-446.

Lackaye, T., D., Margalit, M., Ziv, O., & Ziman, T. (2006). Comparisons of self-efficacy, mood, effort, and hope between students with learning disabilities and their non-LD-matched peers. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 21*(2), 111-121.

Laidra, K., Pullmann, H., & Allik, J. (2007). Personality and intelligence as predictors of academic achievement: A cross-sectional study from elementary to secondary school. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42,* 441-451.

Langberg, J. M., Molina, B. S. G., Arnold, L. E., Epstein, J. N., Altaye, M., Hinshaw, S. P., et al. (2011). Patterns and predictors of adolescent academic achievement and performance in a sample of children with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 40*(4), 519-531.

Leach, M. T., & Williams, S. A. (2007). The impact of the achievement gap on the African American family: A social inequality perspective. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 15*(2), 39-59.

LeClair, C., Doll, B., Osborn, A., & Jones, K. (2009). English language learners' and non-English language learners' perceptions of the classroom environment. *Psychology in the Schools, 46,* 568-577.

LeCroy, C. W., & Krysik, J. (2008). Predictors of academic achievement and school attachment among Hispanic adolescents. *Children & Schools, 30*(4), 197-209.

Lee, T., Cornell, D., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2011). High suspension schools and dropout rates for Black and White students. *Education and Treatment of Children, 34*(2), 167-192.

Lent, R. W., Lopez, F. G., & Bieschke, K. J. (1991). Mathematics self-efficacy: sources and relation to science-based career choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38,* 424-430.

Liew, J., McTigue, E. M., Barrois, L., & Hughes, J. N. (2008). Adaptive and effortful control and academic self-efficacy beliefs on achievement: A longitudinal study of 1st through 3rd graders. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23,* 515-526.

Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. *School Psychology Review, 31*(3), 313-327.

Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement and learning in the classroom. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 19*, 119-137.

Lloyd, D. N. (1976). Concurrent prediction of dropout and grade of withdrawal. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 36,* 983-991.

Lopez, F. (2011). The nongeneralizability of classroom dynamics as predictors of achievement for Hispanic students in upper elementary grades. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 33*(3), 350-376.

Lucio, R., Rapp-Paglicci, L. Rowe, W. (2011). Developing an additive risk model for predicting academic index: School factors and academic achievement. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 28*, 153-173.

Lyon, M. A. (1993). Academic self-concept and its relationship to achievement in a sample of junior high school students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53,* 201-210.

Ma, X. (2001). Participation in advanced mathematics: Do expectation and influence of students, peers, teachers, and parents matter? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26,* 132-146.

Malecki, C. K., & Elliott, S. N. (2002). Children's social behaviors as predictors of academic achievement: A longitudinal analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly, 17,* 1-23.

Manlove, J. (1998). The influence of high school dropout and school disengagement on the risk of school-age pregnancy. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8*(2), 187-220.

Matthews, M. S. (2009). Gifted learners who drop out: Prevalence and prevention. In L. V. Shavinina (Ed.), *International Handbook on Giftedness* (pp. 527-536).

Mayes, S. D., Calhoun, S. L., Bixler, E. O., & Zimmerman, D. N. (2009). IQ and neuropsychological predictors of academic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 19,* 238-241.

McGrew, K.S., Schrank, F.A., & Woodcock, R.W. (2007). *Technical Manual. Woodcock-Johnson III Normative Update*. Rolling Meadows, IL: Riverside Publishing.

McKown, C., & Weisntein, R. S. (2002). Modeling the role of child ethnicity and gender in children's differential response to teacher expectations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32,* 159-184.

McKown, C., & Weinstein, R. S. (2008). Teacher expectations, classroom context, and the achievement gap. *Journal of School Psychology, 46,* 235-261.

McMahon, S. D., Wensman, J., & Rose, D. S. (2009). The relation of classroom environment and school belonging to academic self-efficacy among urban fourth and fifth-grade students. *The Elementary School Journal, 109*(3), 267-281.

Merton, R. K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *Antioch Review, 8,* 193-210.

Mistry, R. A., White, E. S., Benner, A. D., & Huynh, V. W. (2009). A longitudinal study of the simultaneous influence of mothers' and teachers' educational expectations on low-income youth's academic achievement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38,* 826-838.

Monsivais, G. I. (1990). *Latino teachers: Well educated but not prepared. An executive summary*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 372882)

Moore, G. (2010). The influence of student motivation and student self-efficacy on teacher behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International*: *Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 70*(7-A), 2326.

Muñoz-Sandoval, A.F., Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K.S., & Mather, N. (2005). *Bateria III Woodcock-Muñoz: Pruebas de aprovechamiento*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Museus, S. D., Harper, S. R., & Nichols, A. H. (2010). Racial differences in the formation of postsecondary educational expectations: A structural model. *Teachers College Record, 112*, 811-842.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Dropout rates in the United States 1998* (NCES 2000-022). Washington, DC: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *English language learner students in U.S. public schools: 1994 and 2000* (NCES 2004-035). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 483076)

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Dropout rates in the United States: 2005* (NCES 2007-059). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/ 2007059.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *The condition of education 2009* (NCES 2009-081). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009081.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011a). *Achievement gaps: How Hispanic and White students in public schools perform in mathematics and reading on the*

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NCES 2011-459). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/studies/2011459.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011b). *The condition of education 2011* (NCES 2011-033). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011033.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011c). *Trends in high school dropout and completion rates in the United States: 1972-2009* (NCES 2012-006). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012006.pdf

Nichols, J. D., & White, J. (2001). Impact of peer networks on achievement of high school Algebra students. *Journal of Educational Research, 94*(5), 267-273.

Odom, S., Brown, W. H., Schwartz, I. S., Zercher, C., & Sandall, S. R. (2002). Classroom ecology and child participation. In S. L. Odom (Ed.), *Widening the circle: Including children with disabilities in preschool programs* (pp. 25-45). New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Okagaki, L., & Frensch, P. A. (1994). Parental support for Mexican-American children's school achievement. In H. I. McCubbing, E. A. Thompson, A. I., Thompson, & J. E. Fromer (Eds.), *Resiliency in ethnic minority families: Native and immigrant American families* (Vol. 1, pp. 325-342). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin System.

Ouzts, D. T. (1986). Teacher expectation: Implications for achievement. *Reading Horizons, 26*(2), 133-139.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66,* 543-578.

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19,* 139-158.

Pajares, F., & Miller, M. D. (1994). Role of self-efficacy and self-concept beliefs in mathematical problem solving: A path analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(2), 193-203.

Pajares, F., Miller, M. D., & Johnson, M. J. (1999). Gender differences in writing self-beliefs of elementary school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91,* 50-61.

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1997). Influence of self-efficacy on elementary students' writing. *The Journal of Educational Research, 90*(6), 353-360.

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2001). Gender differences in writing motivation and achievement of middle school students: A function of gender orientation? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26,* 366-381.

Park, Y. (2011). How motivational constructs interact to predict elementary students' reading performance: Examples form attitudes and self-concept in reading. *Learning and Individual Differences, 21*, 347-358.

Patrikakou, E. N. (1997). A model of parental attitudes and the academic achievement of adolescents. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 31,* 7-26.

Peet, S. H., Powell, D. R., & O'Donnel, B. K. (1997). Mother-teacher congruence in perceptions of the child's competence and school engagement: Links to academic achievement. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 18,* 373-393.

Phan, H. P. (2012). Relations between information sources, self-efficacy and academic achievement: A developmental approach. *Educational Psychology, 32*, 81-105.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 33-40.

Ragland, D. D. (2009). Attitude variables affecting student achievement: An assessment of the relationship between student attitudes and achievement among Hispanic high school students. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 69*(7-A), 2663.

Ream, R. K., & Rumberger, R. W. (2008). Student engagement, peer social capital, and school dropout among Mexican American and non-Latino White students. *Sociology of Education, 81,* 109-139.

Reyes, X. A. (2003). Teachers' (re)constructions of knowledge: The other side of fieldwork. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 2,* 31-37.

Reynolds, A. J. (1998). Resilience among Black urban youth: Prevalence, intervention effects, and mechanisms of influence. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 68,* 84-100.

Reynolds, A., & Gill, S. (1994). The role of parental perspectives in the school adjustment of inner-city black children. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 23,* 671-694.

Reynolds, A. J., & Lee, J. S. (1991). Factor analyses of measures of home environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51*, 181-192.

Rhodes, W. C. (1970). A community participation analysis of emotional disturbance. *Exceptional Children, 36*(5), 309-314.

Rodriguez, D., Ringler, M., O'Neal, D., & Bunn, K. (2009). English language learners' perceptions of school environment. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 23,* 513-526.

Roeser, R. W., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1996). Perceptions of the school psychological environment and early adolescents' psychological and behavioral functioning in school: The mediating role of goals and belonging. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88,* 408-422.

Rosenthal, R. (1987). Pygmalion effects: Existence, magnitude, and social importance. *Educational Researcher, 16,* 37-41.

Rosenthal, R. (1994). Interpersonal expectancy effects: A 30-year perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 3*(6), 176-179.

Rosenthal, R. (1995). Critiquing Pygmalion: A 25-year perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4*(6), 171-172.

Rosenthal, R., & Babad, E.Y. (1985). Pygmalion in the gymnasium. *Educational Leadership, 43*, 36-39.

Rosenthal, R., & Fode, K. L. (1963a). The effect of experimenter bias on the performance of the albino rat. *Behavioral Science, 8*, 183-189.

Rosenthal, R., & Fode, K. L. (1963b). Psychology of the scientist: Three experiments in experimenter bias. *Psychological Reports, 12*, 491-511.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1966). Teachers' expectancies: Determinants of pupils' IQ gains. *Psychological Reports, 19*, 115-118.

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

Ross, S. I., & Jackson, J. M. (1991). Teachers' expectations for black males' and black females' academic achievement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17,* 78-82.

Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2007). Classroom interactions: Exploring the practices of high- and low-expectation teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 289-306.

Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2010). Teacher expectations and perceptions of student attributes: Is there a relationship? *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 121-135.

Ruiz, Y. (2009). Predictors of academic achievement for Latino middle schoolers. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 19,* 419-433.

Rumberger, R. W. (1983). Dropping out of high school: The influence of race, sex, and family background. *American Educational Research Journal, 20,* 199-220.

Rumberger, R. W. (1995). Dropping out of middle school: A multilevel analysis of students and schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 32,* 583-625.

Rumberger, R. W. (2011). High school dropouts in the United States. In S. Lamb, E. Markussen, R. Teese, N. Sandberg, & J. Polesel (Eds.), *School Dropout and Completion: International Comparative Studies in Theory and Policy* (pp. 275-294).

Rumberger, R. W., Ghatak, R., Poulos, G., Ritter, P. L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1990). Family influences on dropout behavior in one California high school. *Sociology of Education, 63,* 283-299.

Rumberger, R. W., & Larson, K. A. (1998). Student mobility and the increased risk of high school dropout. *American Journal of Education, 107,* 1-35.

Rumberger, R. W., & Thomas, S. L. (2000). The distribution of fropout and turnover rates among urban and suburban high schools. *Sociology of Education, 73,* 39-67.

Rutchick, A. M., Smyth, J. M., Lopoo, L. M., & Dusek, J. (2009). Great expectations: The biasing effects of reported child behavior problems on educational expectancies and subsequent academic achievement. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 28,* 392-413.

Ruus, V., Veisson, M., Leino, M., Ots, L., Pallas, L., Sarv, E., et al. (2007). Students' well-being, coping, academic success, and school climate. *Social Behavior and Personality, 35,* 919-936.

Ryabov, I. (2011). Adolescent academic outcomes in school context: Network effects reexamined. *Journal of Adolescence, 34,* 915-927.

Ryan, A. M., & Shin, H. (2011). Help-seeking tendencies during early adolescence: An examination of motivational correlates and consequences for achievement. *Learning and Instruction, 21*, 247-256.

Sandoval, S. R. (1997). Ethnic identity, acculturation, and class identity as predictors of academic achievement among Mexican-American adolescents: Asocial

contextual analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 58*(5-A), 1587.

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

Sarver, D. E., Rapport, M. D., Kofler, M. J., Scanlan, S. W., Raiker, J. S., Altro, T. A., et al. (2012). Attention problems, phonological short-term memory, and visuospatial short-term memory: Differential effects on near- and long-term scholastic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 22*, 8-19.

Saunders, J., Davis, L., Williams, T., Williams, J. H. (2004). Gender differences in self-perceptions and academic outcomes: A study of African American high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33,* 81-90.

Schlee, B. M., Mullis, A. K., & Shriner, M. (2009). Parents social and resource capital: Predictors of academic achievement during early childhood. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31,* 227-234.

Schrank, F.A., McGrew, K.S., Ruef, M.L., Alvarado, C.G., Munoz-Sandoval, A.F., & Woodcock, R.W. (2005). *Overview and technical supplement (Bateria III Woodcock-Munoz Assessment Service Bulletin No. 1).* Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Schulz, L. L., & Rubel, D. J. (2011). A phenomenology of alienation in high school: The experiences of five male non-completers. *Professional School Counseling, 14*(5), 286-298.

Schultz, G. F. (1993). Socioeconomic advantage and achievement motivation: Important mediators of academic performance in minority children in urban schools. *The Urban Review, 25*(3), 221-232.

Schweinle, A., & Mims, G. A. (2009). Mathematics self-efficacy: stereotype threat versus resilience. *Social Psychology of Education, 12,* 501-514.

Sciarra, D. T., & Ambrosino, K. E. (2011). Post-secondary expectations and educational attainment. *Professional School Counseling, 14*(3), 231-241.

Seyfried, S. F., & Chung, I. (2002). Parent involvement as parental monitoring of student motivation and parent expectations predicting later achievement among African American and European American middle school age students. *Social Work with Multicultural Youth, 11,* 109-113.

Siegel, P., Martin, E., & Bruno, R. (2000, November). Language use and linguistic isolation: Historical data and methodological issues. Paper presented at the meeting of Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, Bethesda, MD.

Sigel, I. E., & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. V. (2002). Parent beliefs are cognitions: the dynamic belief systems model. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Being and becoming a parent* (2nd ed., vol. 3, pp. 485-508). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Simner, M. L., & Barnes, M. J. (1991). Relationship between first-grade marks and the high school dropout problem. *Journal of School Psychology, 29,* 331-335.

Singer, A. T. B., & Weinstein, R. S. (2000). Differential parental treatment predicts achievement and self-perceptions in two cultural contexts. *Journal of Family Psychology, 14,* 491-509.

Shapiro, E. S. (2008). From research to practice: Promoting academic competence for underserved students. *School Psychology Review, 37,* 46-51.

Sirota, E., & Bailey, L. (2009). The impact of teachers' expectations on diverse learners' academic outcomes. *Childhood Education, 85*, 253-256.

Smith, J. K., Smith, L. F., Gilmore, A. & Jameson, M. (2012). Students' self-perception of reading ability, enjoyment of reading and reading achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 22*, 202-206.

Snodgrass, S. E., & Rosenthal, R. (1982). Teacher suspiciousness of experimenter's intent and the mediation of teacher expectancy effects. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 3*, 219-230.

Snow, R. E. (1995). Pygmalion and intelligence?. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4*(6), 169-171.

Steinberg, L., Blinde, P. L., & Chan, K. S. (1984). Dropping out among language minority youth. *Review of Educational Research, 54,* 113-132.

Steinmayr, R., Ziegler, M., & Trauble, B. (2010). Do intelligence and sustained attention interact in predicting academic achievement? *Learning and Individual Differences, 20,* 14-18.

Stevens, P. A. J., & van Houtte, M. (2011). Adapting to the system or the student? Exploring teacher adaptations to disadvantaged students in an English and a

Belgian secondary school. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 33*, 59-75.

Stewart, E. B. (2007). Individual and school structural effects on African American high school students' academic achievement. *The High School Journal,* 91(2), 16-34.

Stewart, E. B. (2008). School structural characteristics, student effort, peer associations, and parental involvement: The influence of school- and individual-level factors on academic achievement. *Education and Urban Society, 40*(2), 179-204.

Strom, R. E., & Boster, F. J. (2007). Dropping out of high school: A meta-analysis assessing the effect of messages in the home and in school. *Communication Education, 56,* 433-452.

Stroup, A. L., & Robins, L. N. (1972). Elementary school predictors of high school dropout among Black males. *Sociology of Education, 45,* 212-222.

Swaim, R. C., Beauvais, F., Chavez, E. L., & Oetting, E. R. (1997). The effect of school dropout rates on estimates of adolescent substance use among three racial/ethnic groups. *American Journal of Public Health, 87,* 51-55.

Sweet, A. P., Guthrie, J. T., & Ng, M. M. (1998). Teacher perceptions and student reading motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90,* 210-223.

Sy, S. R., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2005). Parent beliefs and children's achievement trajectories during the transition to school in Asian American and European American families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29,* 505-515.

Syverson, P. (2008). An ecological view of literacy learning. *Literacy, 42*(2), 109-117.

Tavani, C. M., & Losh, S. C. (2003). Motivation, self-confidence, and expectations as predictors of the academic performances among our high school students. *Child Study Journal, 33*(3), 141-151.

Tella, A. (2011). An assessment of mathematics self-efficacy of secondary school students in Osun State, Nigeria. *IFE PsychologIA, 19*, 430-440.

Tenenbaum, H. R., Porche, M. V., Snow, C. E., Tabors, P., & Ross, S. (2007). Maternal and child predictors of low-income children's educational attainment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 28,* 227-238. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2007.02.002

Tenenbaum, H. R., & Ruck, M. D. (2007). Are teachers' expectations different for racial minority than for European American students? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 253-273.

Texas Education Agency. (2011). Academic Excellence Indicator System: 2010-11 state performance report. Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2011/state.html

Thomas, R. J. (1954). An empirical study of high school drop-outs in regard to ten possibly related factors. *Journal of Educational Sociology, 28,* 11-18.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.

Thompson, G. L. (2004). Playing God with other people's children. *The High School Journal, 87*(3), 1-4.

Thompson, M. S., Alexander, K. L., & Entwisle, D. R. (1988). Household composition, parental expectations, and school achievement. *Social Forces, 67, 424-451.*

Thompson, G. L., Warren, S., & Carter, L. (2004). It's not my fault: Predicting high school teachers who blame parents and students for students' low achievement. *The High School Journal, 87*(3), 5-14.

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

Tournaki, N. (2003). Effect of student characteristics on teachers' predictions of student success. *The Journal of Educational Research, 96*(5), 310-319.

Tournaki, N., & Podell, D. M., (2005). The impact of student characteristics and teacher efficacy on teachers' predictions of student success. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 299-314.

Trouilloud, D., Sarrazin, P., Bressoux, P., & Bois, J. (2006). Relation between teachers' early expectations and students' later perceived competence in physical education classes: Autonomy-supportive climate as a moderator. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 75-86.

Trusty, J., Plata, M., & Salazar, C. F. (2003). Modeling Mexican Americans' educational expectations: Longitudinal effects of variables across adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 18,* 131-153.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to self-efficacy and

implementation of a new teaching strategy. *The Elementary School Journal, 110,* 228-245.

Tuckman, B. W., & Sexton, T. L. (1991). The effect of teacher encouragement on student self-efficacy and motivation for self-regulated performance. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6,* 137-146.

Tyler, K. M., & Boelter, C. M. (2008). Linking Black middle school students' perceptions of teachers' expectations to academic engagement and efficacy. *The Negro Educational Review, 59,* 27-44.

Tyler, K. M., Boelter, C. M., & Boykin, A. W. (2009). Linking teachers' perceptions of educational value discontinuity to low-income middle school students' academic engagement and self-efficacy. In D. L. Hough (Ed.), *Middle grades research: Exemplary studies linking theory to practice* (pp. 167-185). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Tyler, K. M., Boykin, A. W., & Walton, T. R. (2006). Cultural considerations in teachers' perceptions of student classroom behavior and achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 998-1005.

U.S. Census Bureau. (1996). *Population projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995-2050* (P25-1130). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/1/pop/p25-1130.pdf

U. S. Census Bureau. (2002). *Number of foreign-born up to 57 percent since 1990, according to census 2000* (CB02-CN.117). Retrieved from

http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/census_2000/cb02-cn117.html

U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). *The foreign-born population: 2000* (C2KBR-34). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-34.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). *Fact finder: General demographic characteristics*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?-ds_name=PEP_2006_EST&-qr_name=PEP_2006_EST_DP1&-geo_id=01000US

U.S. Census Bureau. (2008a). *Fact finder: General demographic characteristics.* Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?-ds_name=PEP_2008_EST&-qr_name=PEP_2008_EST_DP1&-geo_id=01000US

U.S. Census Bureau. (2008b). *An older and more diverse nation by midcentury* (CB08-123). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb08-123.html

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Language use in the United States: 2007*(ACS-12). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/acs-12.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011a). *The foreign-born from Latin America and the Caribbean 2010* (ACBR/10-15). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10-15.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011b). *The newly arrived foreign-born population of the United States: 2010* (ACSBR/10-16). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10-16.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011c). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010* (C2010BR-02). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau (2012). *The 2012 Statistical Abstract: Education.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/12statab/educ.pdf

U.S. Department of Justice. (1993). *Survey of state prison inmates, 1991* (NCJ-136949). Retrieved from http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/SOSPI91.PDF

U.S. Department of Justice. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report.* Retrieved from http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/nr2006/downloads /NR20prison 06.pdf

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of academic and self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of entering middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 31,* 125-141.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy in mathematics: A validation study. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34,* 89-101.

Valverde, L. A., & Scribner, K. P. (2001). Latino students: Organizing schools for greater achievement. *NAASP Bulletin, 85*(624), 22-31.

Van Matre, J. C., Valentine, J. C., & Cooper, H. (2000). Effect of students' after-school activities on teachers' academic expectancies. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25,* 167-183.

Vondra, J. I. (1999). Commentary for "Schooling and high-risk populations: The Chicago longitudinal study." *Journal of School Psychology, 37*, 471-479.

Walker, B. J. (2003). The cultivation of student self-efficacy in reading and writing. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19,* 173-187.

Walker-Dalhouse, D., & Risko, V. J. (2008). Learning from literacy successes in high-achieving urban schools. *The Reading Teacher, 61,* 422-424.

Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Iiams, M. (2004). "Not in my classroom": Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2*, 130-160.

Warren, S. R. (2002). Stories from the classrooms: How expectations and efficacy of diverse teachers affect the academic performance of children in poor urban schools. *Educational Horizons, 80*(3), 109-116.

Washington, J. A. (2001). Early literacy skills in African American children: Research considerations. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practices, 16*(4), 213-221.

Weinstein, R. S. (2002). Overcoming inequality in schooling: A call to action for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30,* 21-42.

Weinstein, R. S., Gregory, A., & Strambler, M. J. (2004). Intractable self-fulfilling prophecies: Fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education. *American Psychologist, 59,* 511-520.

Weiser, D. A., & Riggio, H. R. (2010). Family background and academic achievement: Does self-efficacy mediate outcomes? *Social Psychology of Education, 13*, 367-383.

Wentzel, K. R., Battle, A., Russell, S. L., & Looney, L. B. (2010). Social supports from teachers and peers as predictors of academic and social motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 35*, 193-202.

Wigfield, A., Eccless, J. S., Yoon, K. S., Harold, R. D., Arbreton, A. J. A., Freedman-Doan, C., et al. (1997). Change in children's competence beliefs and subjective task values across the elementary school years: A 3-year study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89,* 451-469.

Wigfield, A., Galper, A., Denton, K., & Seefeldt, C. (1999). Teachers' beliefs about former Head Start and non-Head Start first grade children's motivation, performance, and future educational prospects. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91,* 98-104.

Wiggan, G. (2007). Race, school achievement, and educational inequality: Toward a student-based inquiry perspective. *Review of Educational Research, 77*, 310-333.

Williams, S. A., & Dawson, B. A. (2011). The effects of familial capital on the academic achievement of elementary Latino/a students. *Families in Society: The Journal of Eontemporary Social Services, 92,* 91-98.

Wood, D., Kaplan, R., & McLloyd, V. C. (2007). Gender differences in educational expectations of urban, low-income, African American youth: The role of parents and the school. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36,* 417-427.

Wood, D., Kurtz-Costes, B., Rowley, S. J., & Okeke-Adeyanju, N. (2010). Mothers' academic gender stereotypes and education-related beliefs about sons and

daughters in African American families. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102,* 521-530.

Wood, R. E., & Locke, E. A. (1987). The relation of self-efficacy and grade goals to academic performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47,* 1013-1024.

Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K.S., & Mather, N. (2001). *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Woodgate, J. & Brawley, L. R. (2008). Use of an efficacy-enhancing message to influence the self-regulatory efficacy of cardiac rehabilitation participants: A field experiment. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 53,* 153-161.

Wu, F., & Qi, S. (2006). Longitudinal effects of parenting on children's academic achievement in African American families. *The Journal of Negro Education, 75,* 415-429.

Wu, W., West, S. G., & Hughes, J. N. (2010). Effect of grade retention in first grade on psychosocial outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102,* 135-152.

Xu, M., Benson, S. N. K., Mudrey-Camino, R., & Steiner, R. P. (2010). The relationship between parental involvement, self-regulated learning, and reading achievement of fifth graders: A path analysis using the ECLS-K database. *Social Psychology of Education, 13*, 237-269.

Xu, Y., & Drame, E. (2008). Culturally appropriate context: Unlocking the potential of response to intervention for English language learners. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 35,* 305-311.

Yamamoto, Y., & Holloway, S. P. (2010). Parental expectations and children's academic performance in sociocultural context. *Educational Psychology Review,* 22, 189-214.

You, S. & Nguyen, J. T. (2011). Parents' involvement in adolescents' schooling: A multidimensional conceptualisation and meditational model. *Educational Psychology, 31*(5), 547-558.

Youn, Y. (1994). Academic achievement of Asian-American students: Relating home environment and self-efficacy. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 54*(8-A), 2962.

Zarate, M. E., Bhimji, F., & Reese, L. (2005). Ethnic identity and academic achievement among Latino/a adolescents. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 4*(2), 95-114.

Zeldin, A. L., Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). A comparative study of the self-efficacy beliefs of successful men and women in mathematics, science, and technology careers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45,* 1036-1058.

Zeldin, A. L., & Pajares, F. (2000). Against the odds: Self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, scientific, and technological careers. *American Educational Research Journal, 37,* 215-246.

Zhan, M. (2006). Assets, parental expectations and involvement, and children's educational performance. *Children and Youth Services Review, 28,* 961-975.

Zhan, M., & Sherraden, M. (2011). Assets and liabilities, educational expectations, and children's college degree attainment. *Children and Youth Services Review, 33*, 846-854.

Zhang, D., Hsu, H., Kwok, O, Benz, M., & Bowman-Perrott, L. (2011). The impact of basic-level parent engagements on student achievement: Patterns associated with race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status (SES). *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 22*, 28-39.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

Project Title: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners
Investigator: Vivina Y. Rivera

Introduction
The purpose of this form is to provide you information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research study. If you decide to participate in this study, this form will also be used to record your consent.

You have been asked to participate in a research project investigating methods of improving the academic achievement of Spanish-speaking English language learners (ELLs). The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact that others' expectations and student's personal beliefs may have on the academic performance of ELLs in differing grade levels. You were selected to be a possible participant because you are the teacher of a student who was selected to participate in this study and able to provide valuable information about the student relevant to this research study.

What will I be asked to do?
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete questionnaires regarding your demographic information and expectations of your students who are participating in this study. The demographic questionnaire will take approximately 3 minutes to complete, while the expectations questionnaire will take about 5 minutes to complete. The number of expectations questionnaires you will be asked to complete is dependent on the number of your students that participate in this study. As such, the total amount of time this study will take varies for each teacher. You will only be asked to complete the demographic information once, while the expectations questionnaire related to your students will depend on the number of your students that participate. Still, you will only be asked to complete one expectations questionnaire per student.

What are the risks involved in this study?
The risks associated in this study are minimal, and are not greater than risks ordinarily encountered in daily life.

What are the possible benefits of this study?
You will receive no direct benefit from participating in this study; however, your participation will possibly benefit society by helping with the understanding of methods to enhance the achievement of Spanish-speaking ELLs.

Do I have to participate?
No. Your participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time without your current or future relations with Texas A&M University or XXXX Independent School District being affected.

Will I be compensated?
Upon completion of all relevant forms, you will receive a "thank you mug" in appreciation for your participation in this study. The mug will include a variety of things, such as pens, pencils, and candy.

Who will know about my participation in this research study?
The records of this study identifying your participation will be kept private and confidential. No identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely in a locked cabinet and only Vivina Y. Rivera will have access to the records.

Whom do I contact with questions about the research?
If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Vivina Y. Rivera by phone at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by e-mail at vivina@tamu.edu.

Whom do I contact about my rights as a research participant?
This research study has been reviewed by the Human Subjects' Protection Program and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact these offices at (979)458-4067 or irb@tamu.edu.

Signature
Please be sure you have read the above information, asked questions and received answers to your satisfaction. You will be given a copy of the consent form for your records. By signing this document, you consent to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name: _____

APPENDIX B

PARENT CONSENT FORM

Project Title: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners
Investigator: Vivina Y. Rivera

Introduction
This form is given to you to give you information that may affect your choice to take part in this research study. If you chose to take part in this study, this form will also be used to record your consent.

The reason for this research project is to study ways to help Spanish-speaking English language learners (ELLs) do better in school. This project is studying the impact others' expectations and student's personal beliefs may have on the school performance of ELLs in different grades. The reason you were chosen to possibly take part in this study is because you are the parent of a student who was chosen to take part in this project. Also, you are able to give information about your child that is relevant to this study.

What will I be asked to do?
If you choose to take part in this study, you will be asked to fill out two forms. One form is about demographic information. The other is about your expectations for your child who is taking part in this study. Each form will take about 5 minutes to complete. So, it will take you about 10 minutes to do your part of this study. You will only be asked to complete these forms once and you are to complete them in your home at a time that you will not have any distractions.

What are the risks involved in this study?
The risks related to this study are small. They are not more than risks that you typically come across in everyday life.

What are the possible benefits of this study?
You will get no direct benefit from taking part in this study. There are possible benefits to society if you take part in this study. These benefits include a better understanding of ways to help Spanish- speaking ELLs do better in school.

Will I be compensated?
You will not receive any direct compensation for taking part in this research study. However, if you decide to participate your name will be entered in a drawing for a chance to win one of three $50 HEB gift cards.

Do I have to participate?
No. Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time. If you choose to withdraw from the study your current or future relations with Texas A&M University or XXXX Independent School District will not be affected.

Who will know about my participation in this research study?
The records obtained in this study which identifies your participation will be kept private and confidential. No records linking you to this study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely in a locked cabinet. Only Vivina Y. Rivera will have access to the records.

Whom do I contact with questions about the research?
If you have questions about this study, you may contact Vivina Y. Rivera by phone at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by e-mail at vivina@tamu.edu.

Whom do I contact about my rights as a research participant?
This research study has been reviewed by the Human Subjects' Protection Program and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact these offices at (979)458-4067 or irb@tamu.edu.

Signature
Please be sure you have read the above information, asked questions and received answers to your satisfaction. You will be given a copy of the consent form for your records. By signing this form, you consent to take part in this study.

Signature of Participant: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name: _____

APPENDIX C

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO PARENTAL

Titulo del Proyecto: El impacto de las expectativas de los maestros, las expectativas de los padres, y la auto-eficacia académica en el aprovechamiento de los estudiantes aprendiendo inglés
Investigadora: Vivina Y. Rivera

Introducción
Este formulario es dado a usted para proporcionarle información que pudiese afectar su decisión de participar en este estudio de investigación. Si opta por participar en este estudio, este formulario también se utilizará para registrar su consentimiento.

Este proyecto tiene como propósito el estudiar diferentes formas de ayuda que permitan mejorar el desempeño escolar de los estudiantes de habla hispana que están aprendiendo inglés (ELLs). Este proyecto estudiará el impacto que las diferentes expectativas de maestros y padres, aunadas a las creencias personales del alumno pueden tener sobre el desempeño escolar de los ELLs en diferentes grados de escolaridad. La razón por la que usted fue elegido para posiblemente participar en este estudio es porque usted es el padre de un estudiante que también fue elegido para participar en este proyecto. Además de que usted es capaz de proporcionar información sobre su hijo que sea relevante para este estudio.

¿Qué me pedirán hacer?
Si decide participar en este estudio, se le pedirá que llene dos formularios. Un formulario solicita información demográfica. El otro es acerca de sus expectativas para con su hijo, quien está participando en este estudio. Cada formulario le tomará unos 5 minutos para contestarlo. Por lo tanto, le llevará aproximadamente 10 minutos para hacer su parte de este estudio. Sólo se le pedirá completar estos formularios una sola vez y se completarán en su casa mientras que no esté distraído/a.

¿Cuáles son los riesgos involucrados en este estudio?
Los riesgos relacionados con este estudio son pequeños. Son solamente los riesgos que usted suele enfrentar constantemente en su vida cotidiana.

¿Cuáles son los posibles beneficios de este estudio?
Usted no obtendrá ningún beneficio directo al participar en este estudio. Hay posibles beneficios para la sociedad si usted participa en este estudio. Estos beneficios incluyen una mejor comprensión de las formas de ayudar a los estudiantes de habla hispana para lograr que ellos aprendan más en la escuela.

¿Será compensado?
No recibirá ninguna compensación directa por participar en este estudio de investigación. Sin embargo, si decide participar su nombre se inscribirá en una rifa para que tenga la oportunidad de ganar uno de tres tarjetas de regalo de $50 de HEB.

¿Tengo que participar?
No. La participación en este estudio es voluntaria. Usted puede elegir no participar o dejar de participar en cualquier momento. Si decide retirarse de este estudio, sus relaciones actuales o futuras con la Universidad de Texas A&M o con el distrito escolar de XXXX no se verán afectadas en lo más mínimo.

¿Quién sabrá acerca de mi participación en este estudio de investigación?
Todos los registros que identifican su participación en este estudio se mantendrán privados y confidenciales. Los registros que lo vinculan a este estudio no se incluirán en ningún tipo de informe que pueda ser publicado. Todos los registros de esta investigación se almacenan de forma segura y bajo llave en un armario. Sólo Vivina Y. Rivera tendrá acceso a dichos registros.

¿A quién contacto con preguntas acerca de la investigación?
Si tiene alguna pregunta acerca de este estudio, puede comunicarse con Vivina Y. Rivera por teléfono al xxx-xxx-xxxx o por correo electrónico a vivina@tamu.edu.

¿A quién contacto acerca de mis derechos como un participante de esta investigación?
Este estudio de investigación ha sido revisado por el Programa de Protección de Sujetos Humanos y/o la Junta de Revisión Institucional en la Universidad de Texas A&M. Para problemas relacionados con esta investigación o preguntas con respecto a sus derechos como un participante en esta investigación, usted puede comunicarse con la cualquiera de las anteriores oficinas al (979) 458-4067 o irb@tamu.edu.

Por favor asegúrese que ha leído la información anterior, la ha entendido y ha realizado todas las preguntas pertinentes, y ha recibido respuestas a su entera satisfacción. Se le dará una copia del formulario de consentimiento para sus registros. Al firmar este formulario, usted consiente participar en este estudio.

Firma del Participante: _____ **Fecha:** _____

Nombre en letra de molde: _____

Firma de persona quien está obteniendo el consentimiento: _____ **Fecha:** _____

Nombre en letra de molde: _____

APPENDIX D

PARENT PERMISSION FORM

Project Title: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners
Investigator: Vivina Y. Rivera

Introduction
The purpose of this form is to give you (as the parent of a possible research study participant) information that may affect your decision to let your child take part in this research study. If you choose to let your child take part in this study, this form will be used to record your consent.

If you agree, your child will be asked to take part in a research project studying ways to help Spanish-speaking English language learners (ELLs) do better in school. This project is studying the impact others' expectations and student's beliefs may have on the school performance of ELLs in different grades. Your child was chosen to possibly take part in this study because they are Spanish-speaking English language learners.

What will my child be asked to do?
If you allow your child to take part in this study, they will be asked to fill out a questionnaire about their academic beliefs. Your child will also be asked to complete reading and math tests. Your child's part in this study will take about 20 minutes. The form your child will complete takes about 10 minutes to finish. The reading and math tests will take about 10 minutes to complete. These tasks will be done during school hours at a space (e.g., empty school office or classroom) inside your child's elementary or middle school building only one time.

What are the risks involved in this study?
The risks associated in this study are small. They are not more than risks your child typically encounters in daily life.

What are the possible benefits of this study?
Your child will receive no direct benefit from taking part in this study. There possible benefits to society if your child takes part in this study. These benefits include a better understanding of ways to help Spanish- speaking ELLs do better in school.

Does my child have to participate?
No, your child doesn't have to be in this research study. You can choose to let your child be in the study now and change your mind later without any penalty.

What if my child does not want to participate?
In addition to your permission, your child must agree to take part in the study. If you child does not want to participate they will not be included in the study and there will be no penalty. If your child at first chooses to be in the study he/she can change their mind later without any penalty.

Will there be any compensation?
Your child will receive a goody bag for participating in this study. This goody bag will contain differing items. For example, a coupon for a personal pizza, stickers, and pencils. The full goody bag will be given to your child once they complete the forms and tests related to this research study. Should your child only complete the testing or forms, and not both activities, they will be given the goody bag without the pizza coupon.

Who will know about my child's participation in this research study?
The records of this study identifying your child's participation will be kept private and confidential. No identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely in a locked cabinet. Only Vivina Y. Rivera will have access to the records.

Whom do I contact with questions about the research?
If you have questions about this study, you may contact Vivina Y. Rivera by phone at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by e-mail at vivina@tamu.edu.

Whom do I contact about my child's rights as a research participant?
This research study has been reviewed by the Human Subjects' Protection Program and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact these offices at (979)458-4067 or irb@tamu.edu.

Signature
Please be sure you have read the above information, asked questions and received answers to your satisfaction. You will be given a copy of the consent form for your records. By signing this document, you consent to allow your child to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

APPENDIX E

FORMA DE AUTORIZACIÓN PARENTAL

Project Title: El impacto de las expectativas de los maestros, las expectativas de los padres, y la auto-eficacia académica en el aprovechamiento de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés
Investigator: Vivina Y. Rivera

Introducción
El propósito de este formulario es para darle a usted información (como el padre de un posible participante de este estudio de investigación) que pueda afectar su decisión de permitir que su hijo participe en este estudio de investigación. Si decide darle permiso a su hijo para participar en este estudio, se utilizará este formulario para registrar su consentimiento.

Si usted está de acuerdo, se le pedirá a su hijo que acepte participar en esta investigación. El propósito de esta investigación es estudiar las maneras de ayudar a mejorar las calificaciones de los estudiantes de habla española que están aprendiendo inglés (ELLs). Este proyecto estudiará el impacto que tener las expectativas de los demás y las creencias de los propios alumnos en el desempeño escolar de los ELLs en diferentes grados de escolaridad. Su hijo/a fue elegido para posiblemente participar en este estudio porque es estudiante de habla española que está aprendiendo inglés.

¿Qué se le pedirá hacer a mi hijo/a?
Si permite a su hijo/a participar en este estudio, se le pedirá que llene un cuestionario sobre sus creencias académicas. También se le pedirá que complete unas pruebas de lectura y de matemáticas. La participación de su hijo en este estudio le tomará en total únicamente unos 20 minutos: unos 10 minutos para llenar el formulario, y otros 10 minutos para contestar las pruebas de lectura y matemáticas. Estas actividades se realizaran durante las horas de la escuela en un espacio (por ejemplo un despacho o salón) dentro del edificio de la escuela primaria o secundaria de su hijo/a, y se harán sólo una vez.

¿Cuáles son los riesgos involucrados en este estudio?
Los riesgos relacionados con este estudio son pequeños. Son solamente los riesgos que su hijo/a suele enfrentar constantemente en su vida diaria.

¿Cuáles son los posibles beneficios de este estudio?
Su hijo/a no obtendrá ningún beneficio directo al participar en este estudio. Hay posibles beneficios para la sociedad si su hijo/a participa en este estudio. Estos beneficios incluyen una mejor comprensión de las formas de ayudar a los estudiantes de habla hispana para lograr que ellos aprendan más en la escuela.

¿Su hijo/a tiene que participar?
No, su hijo/a no tiene que participar en este estudio de investigación. Usted puede elegir que su hijo/a participe en el estudio ahora y después cambiar de opinión sin problema.

¿Qué sucede si mi hijo/a no quiere participar?
Además de su permiso, su hijo/a tiene que aceptar participar personalmente en el estudio. Si el muchacho/a no quiere participar, él/ella no se incluirá en el estudio y no habrá ninguna sanción. Si su hijo primero elige participar en el estudio, él/ella puede cambiar de opinión más tarde sin problema.

¿Habrá alguna compensación?
Su hijo recibirá una bolsita por participar en este estudio. Esta bolsita contendrá diferentes cosas. Por ejemplo, un cupón para una pizza personal, calcomanías y lápices. La bolsita completa se dará a su hijo/a una vez que complete los formularios y los ensayos relacionados con este estudio de investigación. Si su hijo/a sólo completa las pruebas o formularios, y no ambas actividades, se les dará la bolsita sin el cupón de pizza.

¿Quién sabrá acerca de la participación de mi hijo/a en este estudio de investigación?
Todos los registros que identificán la participación de su hijo/a en este estudio se mantendrán privados y confidenciales. Los registros que vinculan a su hijo/a a este estudio no se incluirán en ningún tipo de informe que pueda ser publicado. Todos los registros de esta investigación se almacenan de forma segura y bajo llave en un armario. Sólo Vivina Y. Rivera tendrá acceso a dichos registros.

¿A quién contacto con preguntas acerca de la investigación?
Si tiene alguna pregunta sobre este estudio, puede comunicarse con Vivina Y. Rivera al teléfono xxx-xxx-xxxx o por correo electrónico a vivina@tamu.edu.

¿A quién contacto sobre de los derechos de mi hijo/a como un participante de esta investigación?
Este estudio de investigación ha sido revisado por el Programa de Protección de Participantes Humanos y/o la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad de Texas A&M. Si tiene problemas relacionados con esta investigación o preguntas con respecto a los derechos de su hijo/a como un participante en esta investigación, usted puede comunicarse con un representante de la junta antes mencionada al (979) 458-4067 o irb@tamu.edu.

Por favor asegúrese que haya leído la información anterior, la ha entendido y que todas las preguntas pertinentes se le han aclarado a su entera satisfacción. Se le dará una copia del formulario de consentimiento para sus archivos. Al firmar este formulario, usted da permiso para que su hijo/a participe en este estudio.

Firma del Participante: _____ Fecha: _____

Nombre en letra de molde: _____

Firma de persona quien está obteniendo el consentimiento: _____Fecha: _____

Nombre en letra de molde: _____

APPENDIX F

ASSENT FORM: 2ND GRADE

"Hi, my name is Vivina Rivera, I'm a student at Texas A&M. What's your name? (Child responds). It is very nice to meet you (child's name). What grade are you in? (Child responds). That is great! So, (child's name), what is your favorite game to play? (Child responds). How do you play that game? (Child responds). That sounds like fun! Do you know how to play tick-tack-toe? Why don't we play a quick game of tick-tack-toe, what do you say? (Child responds).

If child says no to playing tick-tack-toe or after one tick-tack-toe game is finished:
"Well, (child's name), I have some activities that we can work on together? These tasks will be done inside your school building during school hours. Do you want to try them?"

Assent Denied
If child verbally or by action shows signs of distress, disinterest, or seems uncomfortable (e.g., refusing to answer questions or crying) the researcher will not continue seeking participation.

Assent Given
If the child agrees verbally by action (head nod, following along) the researcher will continue with the activity.

Withdrawal of Assent
"If you decide you don't want to do these activities anymore, just say so and we'll stop. Or you can touch your nose like this (model) and we'll stop.

APPENDIX G

ASSENT FORM- SPANISH: 2ND GRADE

"Hola, me llamo Vivina Rivera, soy una estudiante de Texas A&M. ¿Y tú, cómo te llamas? (Child responds). Me da mucho gusto conocerte (child's name). ¿En qué año estás? (Child responds). ¡Qué bueno! (child's name), ¿cuál es tu juego favorito? (Child responds). ¿Cómo juegas ese juego? (Child responds). Suena muy divertido. ¿Te gusta jugar al juego del gato (tres en raya)? Porque no jugamos un jueguito del gato (tres en raya), ¿quieres? (Child responds)."

If child says no to playing tick-tack-toe or after one tick-tack-toe game is finished:
"Bueno, (child's name), necesito que por favor me ayudes contestando unas pregunta que podemos hacer juntos. Estas actividades se harán dentro del edificio de tu escuela durante las horas de la escuela. ¿Quieres ayudarme?"

Assent Denied
If child verbally or by action shows signs of distress, disinterest, or seems uncomfortable (e.g., refusing to answer questions or crying) the researcher will not continue seeking participation.

Assent Given
If the child agrees verbally by action (head nod, following along) the researcher will continue with the activity.

Withdrawal of Assent
"Recuerda que si en algún momento ya no quieres contestar estas preguntas solamente necesitas decírmelo y paramos. O también puedes tocar tu nariz así (model) y paramos."

APPENDIX H

ASSENT FORM: 5TH GRADE

Title of Study: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners

"Hi, my name is Vivina, I'm a student at Texas A&M University. What's your name? (Child responds). It's very nice to meet you. So, (child's name), what grade are you in? (Child responds). Wow! How's school going? (Child responds).

(Child's name), I am doing a study about kids like you. I'm trying to learn different ways to help kids do better in school. So, I would like to know a little bit about the way you think and have you answer some math and reading questions. This study will take place during school hours and inside your school building. If you decide to be in this study, you'll be asked to do a few things."

1. Achievement: "You will be asked to answer some math and reading questions. It will take about 10 minutes for you to complete.

2. Questionnaire: "After you finish the math and reading questions you will then be asked to complete a questionnaire. It has 10 questions and will take about 10 minutes to complete. It will ask your thoughts about reading and math.

3. Compensation: "Participating in a study like this can be fun. But to thank you for the time you'll spend helping me, I will give you a goody bag filled with different things. For example a personal pizza coupon, stickers, and pencils.

So, (child's name), do you have any questions about the study or what you would be asked to do if you decide to be in the study? I would like for you to be in the study, but you don't have to be. The choice is yours. Do you have any questions about the study? (Answer child's questions).

Take some time to read over the things we've talked about (hand out information sheet) and feel free to ask any questions that you think of. (Answer child's questions).

Would you like to be in the study?

Assent Denied
If child indicates they do not want to be in the study, they will immediately be thanked for their time and released back to their regular school activities. Assent denied includes

verbally denying being in the study or by action (head shake, signs of distress, seeming uncomfortable).
"Thank you for talking with me. I understand your decision. You may return to your class now."

Assent Given
If child says yes, reinforce they can stop at any time. Assent given includes verbally agreeing that they would like to be in the study or by action (head nod).

"You can decide that you want to be in the study now, and change your mind later. If you decide later that you don't want to be in the study, you can let me know or touch the colored card, and we can stop. (If child asks about early withdrawal and the goody bag, I will tell them they will receive the goody bag without the pizza coupon for partial completion of the study).

APPENDIX I

ASSENT FORM- SPANISH: 5TH GRADE

Title of Study: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners

"Hola, me llamo Vivina Rivera, soy una estudiante de Texas A&M. ¿Y tu cómo te llamas? (Child responds). Me da mucho gusto conocerte (child's name), ¿en qué año estas? (Child responds). ¡Qué bien! ¿Cómo te va en la escuela? (Child responds).

(Child's name), estoy trabajando en un proyecto de investigación sobre jóvenes como tú. Estoy tratando de saber más acerca de las diferentes formas que permiten a los jóvenes mejorar sus calificaciones en la escuela. Para esto, quisiera saber un poco de tu forma de pensar y también pedirte que contestaras unas cuantas preguntas acerca de matemáticas y lectura. Este proyecto se llevara a cabo durante las horas de la escuela y dentro del edificio de tu escuela. Si aceptas participar en este estudio, te pediré que hagas unas cuantas cosas."

1. Achievement: "Te pediré que contestes unas preguntas sobre matemáticas y lectura. Te tomará alrededor de 10 minutos para contestarlas."

2. Questionnaire: "Después de que termines las preguntas sobre matemáticas y lectura te pediré que completes un cuestionario. El cuestionario tiene 10 preguntas y te tomará alrededor de 10 minutos más. Te preguntaré acerca de tus ideas sobre lectura y matemáticas."

3. Compensation: "Participar en un estudio de este tipo puede ser divertido. Pero para agradecerte tu ayuda, te regalaré una bolsita que contendrá diferentes cosas, por ejemplo un cupón para una pizza personal, calcomanías, y lápices."

Bueno, (child's name), ¿tienes alguna pregunta acerca del proyecto de investigación o de las cosas que se te pedirán que hagas si participas en este estudio? Me daría mucho gusto que aceptaras participar en este estudio, pero no tienes que hacerlo. La decisión es tuya. ¿Tienes alguna pregunta o dudas sobre este estudio? (Answer child's questions).

Tómate unos minutos y lee acerca de las cosas de las que estuvimos platicando (hand out information sheet) y no dudes en preguntarme sobre cualquier duda que tengas. (Answer child's questions).

¿Te gustaría participar en este estudio?

Assent Denied

If child indicates they do not want to be in the study, they will immediately be thanked for their time and released back to their regular school activities. Assent denied includes verbally denying being in the study or by action (head shake, signs of distress, seeming uncomfortable).

"Gracias por tu tiempo en hablar conmigo. Entiendo tu decisión. Ahora puedes regresar a clase."

Assent Given

If child says yes, reinforce they can stop at any time. Assent given includes verbally agreeing that they would like to be in the study or by action (head nod).

"Tú puedes aceptar participar en este estudio ahora, y después puedes cambiar de opinión. Si después decides que no quieres participar, puedes decírmelo o tocar la tarjetita de color, e inmediatamente detendremos la actividad. (If child asks about early withdrawal and the goody bag, I will tell them they will receive the goody bag without the pizza coupon for partial completion of the study).

APPENDIX J

ASSENT FORM: 8TH GRADE

Title of Study: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners

"Hi, my name is Vivina and I'm a student at Texas A&M University. What's your name? (Child responds). It's very nice to meet you. So, (child's name), what grade are you in? (Child responds). Wow! How's school going? (Child responds).

(Child's name), I am doing a study about kids like you. I'm trying to research different ways to help kids do better in school. So, I would like to know a little bit about your personal beliefs and have you answer some math and reading questions. This study will take place during school hours and inside your school building. If you decide to be in this study, you'll be asked to do a few things."

1. Achievement: "You will be asked to answer some math and reading questions. This will take about 10 minutes for you to complete.

2. Questionnaire: "After you finish the math and reading questions you will then be asked to complete a questionnaire that has 10 questions and will take about 10 minutes to complete. It will ask your thoughts and personal beliefs about reading and math.

3. Compensation: "Participating in a study like this can be fun. But to thank you for the time you'll spend helping me, I will give you a goody bag filled with different things. For example, a personal pizza coupon, stickers, and pencils.

So, (child's name), do you have any questions about the study or what you would be asked to do if you decide to be in the study? I would like for you to be in the study, but you don't have to be. The choice is yours. Do you have any questions about the study? (Answer child's questions).

Take some time to read over the things we've talked about (hand out information sheet) and feel free to ask any questions that you think of. (Answer child's questions).

Would you like to be in the study?

Assent Denied
If child indicates they do not want to be in the study, they will immediately be thanked for their time and released back to their regular school activities. Assent denied includes

verbally denying being in the study or by action (head shake, signs of distress, seeming uncomfortable).
"Thank you for talking with me. I understand your decision. You may return to your class now."

Assent Given
If child says yes, reinforce they can stop at any time. Assent given includes verbally agreeing that they would like to be in the study or by action (head nod).

"You can decide that you want to be in the study now, and change your mind later. If you decide later that you don't want to be in the study, you can let me know or touch the colored card, and we can stop. (If child asks about early withdrawal and the goody bag, I will tell them they will receive the goody bag without the pizza coupon for partial completion of the study).

APPENDIX K

ASSENT FORM- SPANISH: 8TH GRADE

Title of Study: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners

"Hola, me llamo Vivina Rivera, soy una estudiante de Texas A&M. ¿Y tu cómo te llamas? (Child responds). Me da mucho gusto conocerte (child's name), ¿en qué año estas? (Child responds). ¡Qué bien! ¿Cómo te va en la escuela? (Child responds).

(Child's name), estoy trabajando en un proyecto de investigación sobre jóvenes como tú. Estoy tratando de saber más acerca de las diferentes formas que permiten a los jóvenes mejorar sus calificaciones en la escuela. Para esto, quisiera saber un poco de tus creencias personales y también pedirte que contestaras unas cuantas preguntas acerca de matemáticas y lectura. Este proyecto se llevara a cabo durante las horas de la escuela y dentro del edificio de tu escuela. Si aceptas participar en este estudio, te pediré que hagas unas cuantas cosas."

1. Achievement: "Te pediré que contestes unas preguntas sobre matemáticas y lectura. Te tomará alrededor de 10 minutos para contestarlas."

2. Questionnaire: "Después de que termines las preguntas sobre matemáticas y lectura te pediré que completes un cuestionario. El cuestionario tiene 10 preguntas y te tomará alrededor de 10 minutos más. Te preguntaré acerca de tus ideas y creencias personales sobre lectura y matemáticas."

3. Compensation: "Participar en un estudio de este tipo puede ser divertido. Pero para agradecerte tu ayuda, te regalaré una bolsita que contendrá diferentes cosas. Por ejemplo, un cupón para una pizza personal, calcomanías, y lápices."

Bueno, (child's name), ¿tienes alguna pregunta acerca del proyecto de investigación o de las cosas que se te pedirán que hagas si participas en este estudio? Me daría mucho gusto que aceptaras participar en este estudio, pero no tienes que hacerlo. La decisión es tuya. ¿Tienes alguna pregunta o dudas sobre este estudio? (Answer child's questions).

Tómate unos minutos y lee acerca de las cosas de las que estuvimos platicando (hand out information sheet) y no dudes en preguntarme sobre cualquier duda que tengas. (Answer child's questions).

¿Te gustaría participar en este estudio?

Assent Denied

If child indicates they do not want to be in the study, they will immediately be thanked for their time and released back to their regular school activities. Assent denied includes verbally denying being in the study or by action (head shake, signs of distress, seeming uncomfortable).

"Gracias por tu tiempo en hablar conmigo. Entiendo tu decisión. Ahora puedes regresar a clase."

Assent Given

If child says yes, reinforce they can stop at any time. Assent given includes verbally agreeing that they would like to be in the study or by action (head nod).

"Tú puedes aceptar participar en este estudio ahora, y después puedes cambiar de opinión. Si después decides que no quieres participar, puedes decírmelo o tocar la tarjetita de color, e inmediatamente detendremos la actividad. (If child asks about early withdrawal and the goody bag, I will tell them they will receive the goody bag without the pizza coupon for partial completion of the study).

APPENDIX L

INFORMATION SHEET: AGE 8-11

Title: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners

Introduction
You have been asked to be in a research study. This study looks at ways to help students who are learning English (ELLs) do better in school. We are doing this study to see the effect that other people's expectations and student's own beliefs may have on the way ELLs do in school in different grades.

What will I be asked to do?
If you choose to be in this study, you will be asked to do a reading and math task. You will also be asked to fill-out a 10 item worksheet about your beliefs. This study will take about 20 minutes to complete. It will take you about 10 minutes to finish the reading and math tasks. It will take about 10 minutes to finish the worksheet. You will work on these tasks during school hours inside your school building. You will only do each task one time.

Do I have to be in the study?
No. You should only be in the study if you want to. You decide if you want to be in the study, or if you don't want to be in the study. You can even decide you want to be in the study now, and change your mind later.

Will I get anything for being in the study?
For taking part in the study and completing the math and reading activities as well as worksheet, you will get a goody bag. This goody bag will be filled with different things. For example, a coupon for a personal pizza, pencils, and stickers.

Who will know that I was in this research study?
The records of this study will be kept private. No one other than the researcher will know you are taking part in the study.

Participation
If you would like to take part in this study please let the researcher know. You may keep this paper to look at later.

APPENDIX M

HOJA DE INFORMACION: 8-11 AÑOS

Title: El impacto de las expectativas de los maestros, las expectativas de los padres, y la auto-eficacia académica en el aprovechamiento de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés

Introducción
A usted se le ha pedido participar en un estudio de investigación. Este estudio busca encontrar formas de ayudar a mejorar las calificaciones escolares de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés (ELLs). Estamos realizando este estudio para ver el efecto que las expectativas de otras personas y las creencias personales de los estudiantes ELLs en diferentes grados (niveles) escolares tienen sobre su aprendizaje

¿Qué se me pedirá hacer?
Si decide participar en este estudio, se le pedirá hacer unas actividades de lectura y matemáticas. También se le pedirá que complete un cuestionario de 10 preguntas acerca de sus creencias. En total este estudio solamente le tomara unos 20 minutos para completar: unos 10 minutos para terminar las actividades de lectura y matemáticas y otros 10 minutos para finalizar la hoja de sus creencias. Usted solamente hará cada actividad una sola vez.

¿Tengo que participar en el estudio?
No. Usted solamente participará en este estudio si usted lo desea. Usted decide si desea participar en el estudio, o si no desea estar en el estudio. Incluso puede decidir que desea estar ahora en el estudio y cambiar de opinión más tarde.

¿Recibiré algo por participar en el estudio?
Por participar en el estudio y completar las actividades de matemáticas y lectura, así como la hoja de cálculo, usted obtendrá una bolsita. Esta bolsita tendrá cosas diferentes. Por ejemplo, la bolsa podrá contener un cupón para una pizza personal, lápices y calcomanías.

¿Quién sabrá que estuve en este estudio de investigación?
Sus respuestas a todas las preguntas de este estudio serán confidenciales. Nadie excepto los investigadores sabrá que está participando en el estudio.

Participación
Si desea participar en este estudio por favor dígale a la investigadora. Usted puede mantener este documento para estudiarlo más tarde.

APPENDIX N

INFORMATION SHEET: AGE 12-17

Title: The Impact of Teachers' Expectations, Parents' Expectations, and Academic Self-Efficacy on the Achievement of English Language Learners

Introduction
You have been asked to participate in a research study that looks at ways to help students who are learning English (ELLs) do better in school. We are doing this study to see the effect that other people's expectations and student's personal beliefs may have on the school performance of ELLs in different grades.

What will I be asked to do?
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a reading and math activity. In addition, you will be asked to fill-out a 10 item questionnaire about your beliefs. This study will take about 20 minutes to complete. It will take you about 10 minutes to finish the reading and math tasks, and 10 minutes to finish the questionnaire. You will work on these tasks during school hours inside your school building and will only do each task once.

Do I have to participate?
No. Your participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time and no one will be upset.

Will I be compensated?
For participating in the study and completing the math and reading activities as well as questionnaire, you will get a goody bag filled with different items. For example, a coupon for a personal pizza, pencils, and stickers.

Who will know about my participation in this research study?
This study is confidential and the records of this study will be kept private in a locked cabinet. No one other than the researchers will know you are involved in the study.

Participation
If you would like to participate please let the researcher know. You keep this information sheet.

APPENDIX O

HOJA DE INFORMACION: 12-17 AÑOS

Titulo: El impacto de las expectativas de los maestros, las expectativas de los padres, y la auto-eficacia académica en el aprovechamiento de los estudiantes aprendiendo inglés

Introducción
Se le ha pedido a usted que participe en un estudio de investigación que busca formas de ayudar a mejorar el aprendizaje escolar de los estudiantes que están aprendiendo inglés (ELLs). Estamos realizando este estudio para ver el efecto que las expectativas de otras personas y las propias creencias personales del estudiante que aprende inglés (ELL) tienen sobre su propio desempeño (trabajo) escolar en diferentes grados escolares.

¿Qué se me pedirá hacer?
Si acepta participar en este estudio, se le pedirá que conteste una actividad sobre matemáticas y lectura. Además, se le pedirá que llene un cuestionario de solamente 10 preguntas acerca de sus ideas. En total, le tomará unos 20 minutos participar: aproximadamente 10 minutos para terminar las tareas de matemáticas y lectura y otros10 minutos para completar el cuestionario. Solamente se le pedirá que realice cada actividad una sola vez.

¿Tengo que participar?
No. Su participación es voluntaria. Puede decidir no participar o retirarse en cualquier momento y nadie se molestará con su decisión.

¿Será compensado?
Por participar en el estudio y completar las actividades de matemáticas y lectura, así como el cuestionario, usted obtendrá una bolsita que contendrá diferentes objetos. Por ejemplo, su bolsita contendrá un cupón para una pizza personal, lápices y calcomanías.

¿Quién sabrá acerca de mi participación en este estudio de investigación?
Este estudio es confidencial y sus documentos con respuestas serán guardados en un gabinete con llave. Nadie excepto los investigadores sabrán que usted participó en este estudio.

Participación
Si acepta participar en este estudio, por favor hágaselo saber a la investigadora. Usted puede quedarse con esta hoja informativa.

APPENDIX P

TEACHER DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Data

1. Name _____
2. School _____
3. Age _____ years

4. Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female

5. Race/Ethnicity
   - ☐ White (non-Hispanic)
   - ☐ Black or African American
   - ☐ Hispanic/Latino/of Spanish origin
   - ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
   - ☐ American Indian (specify tribe): _____
   - ☐ Biracial: _____
   - ☐ Other (specify): _____

6. If you are Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin please indicate which best describes you.
   - ☐ Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
   - ☐ Puerto Rican
   - ☐ Cuban
   - ☐ Other (specify): _____

7. Languages spoken: ☐ English ☐ Spanish ☐ Other (specify) _____

8. Please rate your level of proficiency in English. A rating of 1 means that you know a few words, a 3 to 4 means that you are able to converse with ease but have difficulty with writing in English, and a 6 means that you are able to speak and write with complete ease in English. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Few Words		Somewhat Proficient			Fully Proficient

9. If you speak Spanish, please rate your level of proficiency in Spanish. A rating of 1 means that you know a few words, a 3 to 4 means that you are able to converse with ease but have difficulty with writing in English, and a 6 means that you are able to speak and write with complete ease in English. (circle one number)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Few Words		Somewhat Proficient			Fully Proficient

Professional Data

10. Position in School

- ☐ Teacher (General Education)
- ☐ Teacher (Bilingual Education)
- ☐ Teacher (English as a Second Language)
- ☐ Teacher (Special Education)
- ☐ Paraprofessional
- ☐ Student Teacher
- ☐ Administrator
- ☐ Counselor
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

11. What grade(s) do you currently teach?

- ☐ 1st
- ☐ 2nd
- ☐ 3rd
- ☐ 4th
- ☐ 5th
- ☐ 6th
- ☐ 7th
- ☐ 8th

12. What subjects(s) do you currently teach?

- ☐ Reading
- ☐ Math
- ☐ English
- ☐ Science
- ☐ Social Studies/History
- ☐ Physical Education
- ☐ Bilingual Education
- ☐ English as a Second Language
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

13. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

- ☐ 0-5 years
- ☐ 6-10 years
- ☐ 11-15 years
- ☐ 16-20 years
- ☐ 21-25 years
- ☐ 26-30 years
- ☐ 31-35 years
- ☐ 36-40 years
- ☐ 41 or more years

14. Type of Certification

- ☐ Traditional Certification (Education degree)
- ☐ Alternative Certification
- ☐ Certification still pending

15. Highest level of Education

- ☐ Bachelor degree
- ☐ Enrolled in a Bachelor Program
- ☐ Some schooling beyond college
- ☐ Master Degree
- ☐ Doctoral Degree

APPENDIX Q

PARENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Parent Data

1. Parent's/Legal Guardian's Name _____
2. Age of Parent _____ years
3. Gender ☐Male ☐Female
4. Child's Name _____
5. Relationship to the child ☐ Mother ☐ Father ☐Other (specify): ____
6. Number of children in the family? _____
   a. Please indicate the age of each child:
   _____
7. Were you born in the United States? ☐Yes ☐No
   a. If no, please indicate your country of national origin?
   _____
8. Years living in the United States
   - ☐ 0-5 years
   - ☐ 6-10 years
   - ☐11-15 years
   - ☐ 16-20 years
   - ☐ 21-25 years
   - ☐ 26-30 years
   - ☐ 31-35 years
   - ☐ 36-40 years
   - ☐ 41 or more years
   - ☐ Always lived in United States
9. What is the highest level of Education you have received?
   - ☐ No Schooling
   - ☐ 1st - 6th grade
   - ☐ 7th – 8th grade
   - ☐ 9th – 11th grade
   - ☐ Completed High School
   - ☐ Technical School
   - ☐ Currently Enrolled in a Bachelor Program
   - ☐Completed Bachelor Degree
   - ☐Some schooling beyond Bachelor Degree
   - ☐ Master Degree
   - ☐ Doctoral Degree
10. Where did you obtain your highest level of education?
    ☐ United States ☐ Mexico ☐ Other (specify): _____

11. Has any member of the family graduated high school? ☐ Yes ☐ No
    a. If yes, please indicate the individual(s) relationship to the child.
    _____

12. Has any member of the family graduated college? ☐ Yes ☐ No
    a. If yes, please indicate the individual(s) relationship to the child.
    _____

13. Race/Ethnicity
    ☐ White
    ☐ Hispanic/Latino
    ☐ Black or African American
    ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
    ☐ American Indian (specify tribe): _____
    ☐ Biracial: _____
    ☐ Other (specify): _____

14. If you are Hispanic/Latino, are you Mexican/Mexican American? ☐ Yes ☐ No

15. Languages spoken by the Parent
    ☐ English ☐ Spanish ☐ Other (specify) _____

16. Please rate your level of proficiency in English. A rating of 1 means that you know a few words, a 3 to 4 means that you are able to converse with ease but have difficulty with writing in English, and a 6 means that you are able to speak and write with complete ease in English. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Few Words			Somewhat Proficient		Fully Proficient

17. If you speak Spanish, please rate your level of proficiency in Spanish. A rating of 1 means that you know a few words, a 3 to 4 means that you are able to converse with ease but have difficulty with writing in Spanish, and a 6 means that you are able to speak and write with complete ease in Spanish. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Few Words			Somewhat Proficient		Fully Proficient

Child Data

18. Child's Name: _____

19. Child's School: _____

20. Child's relationship to the parent:
☐ Daughter ☐ Son ☐ Other (specify): _____

21. How many adults are involved in the child's life on a regular basis? _____ adults

22. What grade is your child currently in?
☐ 1st ☐ 5th
☐ 2nd ☐ 6th
☐ 3rd ☐ 7th
☐ 4th ☐ 8th

23. Is your child currently in Bilingual Education or English as a Second Language?
☐ Yes ☐ No

24. Has there been a time when your child did not attend school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If yes, what grade level(s)? _____ grade

25. Has your child ever been retained (repeated a grade level)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

26. If yes, what grade level(s)? ____ grade

27. Has your child ever attended a school outside the United States? ☐ Yes ☐ No
a. If **yes**, please specify what grade level. _____ grade(s)
b. If **yes**, specify what country. _____

28. Child's Race/Ethnicity
☐ White
☐ Hispanic/Latino
☐ Black or African American
☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
☐ Biracial: _____
☐ Other (specify): _____

29. If your child is Hispanic/Latino is your child Mexican/Mexican American?
☐ Yes ☐ No

30. In what country was your child born?_____

31. Languages spoken by the Child
☐English ☐ Spanish ☐Other (specify) _____

32. Please rate your child's level of proficiency in English. A rating of 1 means that your child know a few words, a 3 to 4 means that your child is able to converse with ease but have difficulty with writing in English, and a 6 means that your child is able to speak and write with complete ease in English. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Few Words			Somewhat Proficient		Fully Proficient

33. If your child speaks Spanish, please rate his/her level of proficiency in Spanish. A rating of 1 means that your child knows a few words, a 3 to 4 means that your child is able to converse with ease but has difficulty with writing in English, and a 6 means that your child is able to speak and write with complete ease in English. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Few Words			Somewhat Proficient		Fully Proficient

APPENDIX R

CUESTIONARIO DEMOGRÁFICO SOBRE LOS PADRES E HIJO/A

Datos del Padre/Madre

1. Nombre del Padre/Madre, o Tutor legal _____
2. Edad del Padre/Madre: _____años (de edad)
3. Sexo del Padre/Madre ☐Masculino ☐Femenino
4. Nombre del hijo/a _____
5. ¿Cuál es su parentesco con el niño/a?
   ☐ Madre ☐ Padre ☐Otro (especifique): _____
6. ¿Número de hijos en su familia? _____
   a. Por favor señale (escriba) la edad de cada niño:
      _____
7. ¿Usted nació en los Estados Unidos? ☐Sí ☐No
   a. ¿Si contesto negativamente (no), por favor indique en qué país nació usted? _____
8. ¿Cuántos años ha vivido en los Estados Unidos?

   ☐ 0-5 años
   ☐ 6-10 años
   ☐ 11-15 años
   ☐ 16-20 años
   ☐ 21-25 años
   ☐ 26-30 años
   ☐ 31-35 años
   ☐ 36-40 años
   ☐ 41 o más años
   ☐ Siempre he vivido en los Estados

9. ¿Cuál es el nivel más alto de educación que usted ha recibido?

   ☐ Nada de educación
   ☐ 1ro – 6to grado
   ☐ 7mo – 8vo grado
   ☐ 9no – 11vo grado
   ☐ Terminé la Preparatoria
   ☐ Escuela Técnica
   ☐ Actualmente estoy inscrito en la Universidad
   ☐ Termine una carrera Universitaria
   ☐ Algunos estudios más allá de la carrera Universitaria (Diplomado)
   ☐ Maestría
   ☐ Doctorado

10. ¿Dónde obtuvo su más alto nivel educativo?
☐ En los Estados Unidos ☐ En México ☐ Otro (especifique): ____

11. ¿Algún miembro de su familia ha terminado la preparatoria? ☐ Sí ☐ No
Si su contestación es afirmativa (sí), por favor indique el parentesco de estos individuos con su hijo: _____

12. ¿Algún miembro de su familia ha terminado la universidad? ☐ Sí ☐ No
Si la contestación es afirmativa (sí), por favor indique el parentesco de estos individuos con su hijo: _____

13. Raza/Etnia
☐ Blanco
☐ Hispano/Latino
☐ Negro/Afro-americano
☐ Asiático/De las Islas del Pacífico
☐ Indio Americano (especifique la tribu): _____
☐ Biracial (especifique):_____
☐ Otro (especifique):_____

14. Si usted es Hispano/Latino, ¿es usted mexicano/méxico-americano? ☐Sí ☐No

15. Idiomas hablados por el padre/madre
☐ Inglés ☐ Español ☐Otro (especifique): _____

16. Por favor evalúe su nivel de conocimientos del idioma inglés. Una calificación de 1 significa que usted sabe unas pocas palabras, un 3 a 4 significa que es capaz de conversar con facilidad pero tiene dificultades para escribir en inglés, y un 6 significa que es capaz de hablar y escribir con facilidad completa en inglés. (circule el número más adecuado)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Pocas Palabras			Algo Proficiente		Completamente Proficiente

17. Si usted habla español, por favor, evalúe su nivel de conocimientos del idioma español. Una calificación de 1 significa que usted sabe unas pocas palabras, un 3 a 4 significa que es capaz de conversar con facilidad pero tiene dificultades para escribir en español, y un 6 significa que es capaz de hablar y escribir con facilidad completa en español. (circule el número más adecuado)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Pocas Palabras			Algo Proficiente		Completamente Proficiente

Datos del Niño/a

1. Nombre del niño/a: _____
2. Nombre de la escuela del niño/a: _____
3. Parentesco del niño/a con el padre:
   ☐ Hija ☐ Hijo ☐ Otro (especifique): _____
4. ¿Cuántos adultos están involucrados regularmente en la vida del niño? __ adultos
5. ¿En qué grado esta actualmente su hijo/a?
   ☐ 1º ☐ 5to
   ☐ 2do ☐ 6to
   ☐ 3ro ☐ 7mo
   ☐ 4to ☐ 8vo
6. ¿Esta su hijo tomando actualmente clases de educación bilingüe o de inglés como segundo idioma?
   ☐ Si ☐ No
7. ¿Ha habido un período de tiempo durante el cual su hijo/a no asistió a la escuela?
   ☐ Si ☐ No
   a. En caso afirmativo (sí), ¿en qué grado(s)? _____ grado
8. ¿Su hijo/a ha reprobado (repetido) un año escolar? ☐ Si ☐ No
9. En caso afirmativo (sí), ¿en qué grado(s)? ____ grado¿Ha estudiado su hijo en alguna escuela fuera de los Estados Unidos? ☐ Si ☐ No
   a. En caso afirmativo (sí), ¿en qué grado(s)?_____ grado(s)
   b. En caso afirmativo (sí), ¿en qué país(es)?_____
10. Raza/Etnicidad del niño/a
    ☐ Blanco
    ☐ Hispano/Latino
    ☐ Negro/Afro-americano
    ☐ Asiático/De las Islas del Pacifico
    ☐ Indio Americano (especifique la tribu): _____
    ☐ Biracial (especifique):_____
    ☐ Otro (especifique):_____
11. ¿Si su hijo es Hispano/Latino, es su hijo mexicano/méxico-americano?
    ☐Si ☐No

12. ¿En qué país nació su hijo/a? _____

13. Idiomas que habla su hijo/a
☐ Ingles ☐ Español ☐Otro (especifique) _____

14. Por favor evalúe el nivel de conocimientos del idioma inglés de su hijo/a. Una calificación de 1 significa que sabe unas pocas palabras, un 3 a 4 significa que es capaz de conversar con facilidad pero tiene dificultades para escribir en inglés, y un 6 significa que es capaz de hablar y escribir con facilidad completa en inglés. (circule el número más correcto)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Pocas Palabras			Algo Proficiente		Completamente Proficiente

15. Si su hijo(a) habla español, por favor, evalúe su nivel de dominio del idioma español. Una calificación de 1 significa que solo sabe unas pocas palabras, un 3 a 4 significa que es capaz de conversar con facilidad pero tienes dificultades para escribir en español, y un 6 significa que es capaz de hablar y escribir con facilidad completa en español. (circule el número más correcto)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Pocas Palabras			Algo Proficiente		Completamente Proficiente

APPENDIX S

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher's Name:_____
Student's Name: _____ Grade Level: _____
Class: _____

If Bilingual Education or ESL please specify what kind:

☐ ESL ☐ Dual Language ☐ Early-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education

☐ Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education ☐ Other (specify): _____

1. Is this child receiving Special Education services? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If YES, for what? _____
2. Have you had this student in class before? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   a. If YES, how long have you had this student in class before this school year (do NOT include this school year)?
      ☐ 1-2 years ☐ 5-6 years
      ☐ 3-4 years ☐ 7+ years
3. What do you anticipate will be the highest level of education this student will complete?
   ☐ 1st - 6th grade
   ☐ 7th – 8th grade
   ☐ 9th – 11th grade
   ☐ Graduate High School
   ☐ Technical School
   ☐ Some college
   ☐ Graduate with Bachelor Degree
   ☐ Some schooling beyond Bachelor Degree
   ☐ Master Degree
   ☐ Doctoral Degree
4. How well do you believe this child is currently performing in reading?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bottom 10% of class			In 50% of class		Top 10% of class

5. How well do you believe this child is currently performing in math?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bottom 10% of class			In 50% of class		Top 10% of class

6. How well do you believe this child will perform in reading at the end of the school year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bottom 10% of class			In 50% of class		Top 10% of class

7. How well do you believe this child will perform in math at the end of the school year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bottom 10% of class			In 50% of class		Top 10% of class

8. How likely is it that this student will pass the TAKS the next time they have to take it?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not Likely			Possibly		Very Likely

9. How likely do you believe this student will be retained this school year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Likely			Possibly		Not Likely

10. How involved do you expect this parent to be?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not Involved			Sometimes Involved		Always Involved

11. What do you believe is the biggest obstacle in this child's life to be successful?

_____

_____

12. As an adult, what do you believe this child's job will be?

_____

APPENDIX T

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Child's name: _____ Grade: _____
Teacher: _____

1. How much schooling would you like your child to obtain?
   - ☐ 1st - 6th grade
   - ☐ 7th – 8th grade
   - ☐ 9th – 11th grade
   - ☐ Graduate High School
   - ☐ Technical School
   - ☐ Some college
   - ☐ Graduate with Bachelor Degree
   - ☐ Some schooling beyond Bachelor Degree
   - ☐ Master Degree
   - ☐ Doctoral Degree

2. How far do you actually think your child will go in school?
   - ☐ 1st - 6th grade
   - ☐ 7th – 8th grade
   - ☐ 9th – 11th grade
   - ☐ Graduate High School
   - ☐ Technical School
   - ☐ Some college
   - ☐ Graduate with Bachelor Degree
   - ☐ Some schooling beyond Bachelor Degree
   - ☐ Master Degree
   - ☐ Doctoral Degree

3. How well do you believe your child performed in reading at the end of LAST school year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Below Grade Level		At Grade Level			Above Grade Level

4. How well do you believe your child performed in math at the end of LAST school year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Below Grade Level		At Grade Level			Above Grade Level

5. How well do you believe your child is currently performing in reading?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Below Grade Level		At Grade Level			Above Grade Level

6. How well do you believe your child is currently performing in math?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Below Grade Level			At Grade Level		Above Grade Level

7. How well do you believe your child will perform in reading at the end of THIS school year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Below Grade Level			At Grade Level		Above Grade Level

8. How well do you believe your child will perform in math at the end of THIS school year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Below Grade Level			At Grade Level		Above Grade Level

9. How invested do you think your child's teacher is with your child's academic success?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not invested			Somewhat invested		Very invested

10. As an adult, what job do you expect your child to have?

- ☐ law enforcement
- ☐ manager of store
- ☐ mental health professional
- ☐ work in a restaurant
- ☐ attorney
- ☐ bus driver
- ☐ doctor/physician
- ☐ agricultural worker
- ☐ plumber
- ☐ electrician
- ☐ cashier
- ☐ teacher
- ☐ custodian/maintenance
- ☐ college professor
- ☐ factory worker
- ☐ other (please specify): _____

APPENDIX U

CUESTIONARIO PARA LOS PADRES

Nombre del niño/a: _____ Grado: _____
Maestro/a: _____

1. ¿Cuál es el grado escolar máximo que usted desearía que su hijo/a obtuviera?
   - ☐ 1ro – 6to grado
   - ☐ 7mo – 8vo grado
   - ☐ 9no – 11vo grado
   - ☐ Gradúe de la preparatoria
   - ☐ Escuela Técnica
   - ☐ Algunos estudios universitarios
   - ☐ Título universitario
   - ☐ Algunos estudios más allá de la carrera universitaria (Diplomado)
   - ☐ Maestría
   - ☐ Doctorado

2. ¿Hasta qué año o nivel cree usted realmente que su hijo/a estudiará?
   - ☐ 1ro – 6to grado
   - ☐ 7mo – 8vo grado
   - ☐ 9no – 11vo grado
   - ☐ Gradúe de la preparatoria
   - ☐ Escuela Técnica
   - ☐ Algunos estudios universitarios
   - ☐ Título universitario
   - ☐ Algunos estudios más allá de la carrera universitaria (Diplomado)
   - ☐ Maestría
   - ☐ Doctorado

3. ¿Qué tan buena calificación cree usted que su hijo/a obtuvo (sacó) en LECTURA a finales del año PASADO? (circule un número)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Reprobó			promedio del grupo		Muy avanzadas

4. ¿Qué tan buena calificación cree usted que su hijo/a obtuvo (sacó) en MATEMATICAS a finales del año PASADO? (circule un número)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Reprobó			promedio del grupo		Muy avanzadas

5. ¿Qué tan buenas calificaciones cree usted que su hijo/a está ACTUALMENTE obteniendo (sacando) en LECTURA? (circule un número)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Reprobando			promedio del grupo		Muy avanzadas

6. ¿Qué tan buenas calificaciones cree usted que su hijo/a está ACTUALMENTE obteniendo (sacando) en MATEMATICAS? (circule un número)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Reprobando			promedio del grupo		Muy avanzadas

7. ¿Qué tan buenas calificaciones cree usted que su hijo/a obtendrá en LECTURA al final de ESTE año escolar? (circule un número)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Reprobará			promedio del grupo		Muy avanzadas

8. ¿Qué tan buenas calificaciones cree usted que su hijo/a obtendrá en MATEMATICAS al final de ESTE año escolar? (circule un número)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Reprobará			promedio del grupo		Muy avanzadas

9. ¿Qué tan comprometido con el éxito académico de su hijo/a piensa usted que está el/la profesor/a de su hijo/a? (circule un número)

1	2	3	4	5	6
No muy comprometido/a			Algo comprometido/a		Muy comprometido/a

10. ¿Qué trabajo le gustaría que su hijo desempeñe (tenga) como adulto? (señale uno)

- ☐ Policía
- ☐ Gerente de una tienda
- ☐ Professional de la salud mental
- ☐ Trabajo en un restaurante
- ☐ Abogado/a
- ☐ Conductor de camiones
- ☐ Médico/a
- ☐ Trabajador/a de agricultura
- ☐ Plomero
- ☐ Electricista
- ☐ Cajero/a
- ☐ Maestro/a
- ☐ Conserje
- ☐ Profesor/a de nivel universitario
- ☐ Trabajado en una maquiladora
- ☐ Otro (especifique): _____

APPENDIX V

COMPETENCE BELIEFS QUESTIONNAIRE

1) How good in <u>MATH</u> are you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all good					Very good

2) If you were to list all the students in your class from the worst to the best in <u>MATH</u> where would you put yourself?

1	2	3	4	5	6
One of the worst					One of the best

3) Some kids are better in one subject than in another. For example, you might be better in math than in reading. Compared to most of your other school subjects, how good are you in <u>MATH</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
A lot worse in math than other subjects					A lot better in math than other subjects

4) How well do you expect to do in <u>MATH</u> this year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all well					Very well

5) How good would you be at learning something new in <u>MATH</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all good					Very good

6) How good in <u>READING</u> are you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all good					Very good

7) If you were to list all the students in your class from the worst to the best in <u>READING</u> where would you put yourself?

1	2	3	4	5	6
One of the worst					One of the best

8) Some kids are better in one subject than in another. For example, you might be better in reading than in math. Compared to most of your other school subjects, how good are you in <u>READING</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
A lot worse in reading than other subjects					A lot better in reading than other subjects

9) How well do you expect to do in <u>READING</u> this year?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all well					Very well

10) How good would you be at learning something new in <u>READING</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all good					Very good

APPENDIX W

CUESTIONARIO SOBRE LA OPINIÓN DE SU CAPACIDAD

1) ¿Qué tan bueno eres en <u>MATEMÁTICAS</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
No muy bueno/a					Muy bueno/a

2) Si hicieras una lista de todos tus compañeros en la clase de <u>MATEMÁTICAS</u>, y los enlistaras de peor al mejor, ¿dónde te pondrías tú mismo?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Uno de los peores					Uno de los mejores

3) Algunos alumnos son mejores en una materia que en otra. Por ejemplo, podrías ser mejor en matemática que en lectura. En comparación con las otras materias que tomas en la escuela, ¿qué tan bueno eres en las <u>MATEMÁTICAS</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Mucho más malo en matemáticas que en las otras materias					Mucho mejor en matemáticas que en las otras materias

4) ¿Qué tan buena calificación esperas sacar en <u>MATEMÁTICAS</u> este año?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Muy mala					Muy buena

5) ¿Qué bueno serías en aprender algo nuevo en <u>MATEMÁTICAS</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Nada bueno/a					Muy bueno/a

6) ¿Qué tan bueno eres en la <u>LECTURA</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
No muy bueno/a					Muy bueno/a

7) Si hicieras una lista de todos tus compañeros de la clase de <u>LECTURA</u>, y los enlistaras de peor al mejor, ¿dónde te pondrías tú mismo?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Uno de los peores					Uno de los mejores

8) Algunos alumnos son mejores en una materia que en otra. Por ejemplo, podrías ser mejor en lectura que en matemáticas. En comparación con las otras materias que tomas en la escuela, ¿qué tan bueno eres en la <u>LECTURA</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Mucho más malo en lectura que en las otras materias					Mucho mejor en lectura que en las otras materias

9) ¿Qué tan buena calificación esperas sacar en <u>LECTURA</u> este año?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Muy mala					Muy buena

10) ¿Qué bueno serías en aprender algo nuevo en <u>LECTURA</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Nada bueno/a					Muy bueno

VITA

Name:	Vivina Yukari Rivera
Address:	Department of Educational Psychology Texas A&M University 704 Harrington Tower MS 4225 College Station, TX 77843
Email Address:	vivina@tamu.edu
Education:	B.A., Speech Communication, Texas A&M University, 2005 Ph.D., School Psychology, Texas A&M University, 2012