Teacher Expectation Effects On Need-Supportive Teaching and Student Motivation

Arfita Wahyuni Hrp[1]*, Sholihatul Hamidah Daulay[2]
State Islamic University of North Sumatera, Indonesia
arfitawahyuni.hrp@uinsu.ac.id[1], sholihatulhamidah.daulay@uinsu.ac.id[2]

Abstract

Prior studies have demonstrated that teachers modify their conduct in accordance with their expectations of pupils. Self-determination theory (SDT) elucidates the connection between teacher conduct and students' motivation and engagement, namely through the provision of instruction that supports their needs. Its purpose is to gather information on the impacts of teacher expectations on the provision of supportive teaching and student motivation. The study conducted here employs a descriptive design with the aim of elucidating various elements, facts, or phenomena of a specific scenario. In this study, we integrated two research traditions and investigated the connections between teacher expectations, need-supportive teaching, and students' motivation and engagement. The findings demonstrated a moderate yet positive correlation between teacher expectations and students' intrinsic motivation and engagement, while showing a negative correlation with amotivation. The associations were completely mediated, but with minimal effect sizes, by need-supportive instruction. These findings emphasise the need of integrating studies on teacher expectations and SDT to enhance our comprehension of how teacher expectations might lead to differential provision of need assistance to students, thereby impacting their motivation and engagement.

Keywords: *Teacher Expectation, Student Motivation, Need-Supportive Teaching*

INTRODUCTION

An underlying premise in studies on teacher expectations is that teachers modify their behavior towards various students based on their expectations of them (e.g., Babad, 2009; Rubie-Davies, 2018). The variation in behavior can have an impact on the achievements of students, such as their level of interest and involvement (Urhahne, 2011; Zhu, Urhahne, &

Rubie-Davies, 2018). Self-determination theory (SDT) is valuable for comprehending these processes, since it clearly elucidates the connection between certain instructor behaviors and students' motivation and involvement. In SDT, it is posited that teachers may enhance students' motivation and engagement by addressing their requirements for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Similarly, the field of SDT research might enhance its knowledge by including findings from studies on teacher expectations. This would provide light on the reasons for instructors' differential provision of need assistance to certain students, as demonstrated by Jang, Reeve, and Deci (2010).

Until now, there have been very few studies that have combined the knowledge from the research on teacher expectations with SDT (Self-Determination Theory). However, there is one exception, which is the study conducted by Hornstra, Mansfield, Van der Veen, Peetsma, and Volman in 2015. The objective of this study was to address this gap by investigating the relationship between teacher expectations and the provision of supportive instruction, and how this relates to various elements of students' motivation and behavioral engagement.

Teacher expectations

Ever since Rosenthal and Jacobson's study, Pygmalion in the Classroom (1968), educational researchers have been intrigued by the subject of teacher expectations and their impact on student performance (Rubie-Davies, 2018). In the original Pygmalion research, teachers were informed that certain kids, who were really chosen at random, would excel academically. As a matter of fact, these children demonstrated a greater increase in IQ points compared to other students over a period of time. Despite the study's criticism and the potential for its conclusions to be less dramatic than initially thought, this research has served as a significant foundation for additional investigations into teacher expectations (Jussim & Harber, 2005).

The influence of teacher expectations on students is considered to be mediated by the behaviors exhibited by instructors towards their students. In other words, teacher expectations can lead to varying behaviors from teachers towards various students, which in turn may have an effect on student results. The literature describes two processes to account for teacher expectation effects: self-fulfilling prophecy effects, also known as "self-maintaining expectations" or sustaining effects. Self-fulfilling prophesies arise when a mistaken perception of a circumstance, such as a teacher's expectation that is either excessively low or excessively high, leads to a new behavior that ultimately confirms the initial mistaken perception (Merton, 1957). Therefore, in educational settings, when a teacher has a mistaken

assumption about a student's abilities, it might lead to specific instructional actions that prompt the student to behave in alignment with that mistaken assumption. A study conducted by Jussim and Harber (2005) revealed that self-fulfilling prophecy effects do exist in the field of education. However, these impacts are often minimal due to the fact that instructor predictions are frequently correct. When there are self-maintaining expectations or sustaining effects, expectations are grounded in actual differences, but they can still influence students because the expectations prompt consistency in their behavior, thus hindering any change (Babad, 1993a; Babad et al., 1982; Cooper & Good, 1983; Salomon, 1981).

Multiple research have substantiated the connections between teacher expectations and distinct teacher behaviors (Babad, 1993b; Chaikin, Sigler, & Derlega, 1974; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Rosenthal, 1994). For instance, Brophy and Good (1970) conducted an observation of dyadic classroom interactions and discovered that teachers exhibited distinct behaviors towards students with high expectations and those with low expectations in several aspects. When high-achieving students provided incorrect answers or were unable to answer a teacher's question, the teachers were more inclined to rephrase the question and provide another chance for them to respond. In contrast, low-achieving students were more frequently given the correct answer by the teachers instead of having the question rephrased.

Prior research on teacher expectations has primarily focused on their impact on academic performance, revealing a positive correlation between teachers' expectations and students' achievement levels. This relationship remains significant even when accounting for students' previous academic success. Several studies (e.g., Friedrich et al., 2015; Hinnant et al., 2009; McKown & Weinstein, 2008; Trouilloud et al., 2002; Zhu et al., 2017) have confirmed these findings, suggesting that the effects of teacher expectations can be enduring. Furthermore, a well-known meta-analysis conducted by Hattie (2009) demonstrated that teacher expectations have a moderate influence on academic achievement.

The expectations set by teachers can have a significant and immediate influence on student motivation. This is because student motivation is a key factor that affects their actions and ultimately their academic success. Teacher behavior, such as providing clear expectations, can greatly impact student motivation according to Perry, Turner, and Meyer (2006). Urhahne (2015) proposes that teachers convey their expectations to students by their actions, which subsequently influences students' motivation and, consequently, their academic performance (also see Brophy, 1983).

While there is limited research on the connection between teacher expectations and student motivation, several studies have discovered that having more positive teacher expectations is linked to increased levels of motivation (Boerma, Mol, & Jolles, 2016; Gilbert et al., 2014; Urhahne, 2015; Wentzel, Battle, Russell, & Looney, 2010; Woolley, Strutchens, Gilbert, & Martin, 2010). Moreover, several studies have demonstrated that intrinsic motivation has an impact on students' academic performance (e.g., Baker, 2003; Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014; Guay, Ratelle, Roy, & Litalien, 2010; Taylor et al., 2014).

Self-determination theory

SDT, which stands for Self-Determination Theory, is a well recognized theoretical framework in the field of education research (e.g., Wentzel & Miele, 2016). As stated in the Introduction, SDT proposes that there are three essential human needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The concept of autonomy pertains to individuals' innate inclination to operate as causal agents and to exercise volition in their acts (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000b). The demand for competence pertains to the desire to experience efficacy and autonomy, and to expand one's talents. Students' need for relatedness pertains to their craving for social connection and a sense of belongingness (e.g., Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Ryan, 1995). To be more precise, individuals have a fundamental requirement to establish social connections with others that are defined by regular good encounters and an absence of negative emotions or disagreements (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Psychological development can take place when the social environment facilitates these fundamental demands (Ryan & Deci, 2000b).

The current study centered on instructional strategies that facilitate these three requirements in students as per SDT. These instructional methods are commonly known as need-supportive teaching. There are three distinct elements of need-supportive teaching: autonomy support, which helps students with their need for independence; structure, which assists students with their need for competence; and participation, which supports students' desire for connection (Stroet, Opdenakker, & Minnaert, 2013). Autonomy support involves offering choices, promoting the importance of learning tasks, recognizing negative emotions, and supporting students' internal motivation (Reeve & Jang, 2006; Skinner & Belmont, 1993; Stroet et al., 2013; Su & Reeve, 2011). Furthermore, students can be given structure through the provision of clear instructions, guidance, support, and constructive feedback that focuses on providing information rather than evaluation (Skinner & Belmont, 1993; Stroet et al., 2013). Furthermore, teachers can provide a sense of organization by maintaining a regular pattern

in responding to students and adapting their approach to accommodate individuals' individual proficiency levels (Skinner & Belmont, 1993). These behaviors facilitate students' comprehension of the expectations placed upon them and how they might proficiently fulfill these expectations, thereby promoting their need to feel capable (Jang et al., 2010). Finally, instructors may meet their pupils' demand for connection by actively engaging them. Engagement may manifest in several forms, such as demonstrating fondness, concern, and curiosity; aligning with their students' requirements; and being accessible to provide emotional assistance to their students (Stroet et al., 2013).

Motivation and engagement

Through the incorporation of necessary assistance in their instructional methods, educators foster students' enthusiasm and promote their willingness to actively participate in the learning process (Khoiroh, 2023), rather than being compelled to do so under duress (Jang et al., 2010; Stroet, Opdenakker, & Minnaert, 2015). Consequently, education that provides support for students' needs stimulates motivation and engagement of high quality, as demonstrated by extensive research (see to Stroet et al., 2013, for a comprehensive analysis). Optimal motivation encompasses substantial levels of internal motivation, while exhibiting comparatively little degrees of external motivation and amotivation. Students exhibit intrinsic motivation while engaging in an activity that brings them enjoyment or fulfills a personal interest (Ryan & Deci, 2000a). Research has shown that intrinsic motivation has a beneficial effect on student performance (Baker, 2003; Cerasoli et al., 2014; Guay et al., 2010; Taylor et al., 2014) as well as other positive outcomes, such as increased well-being (e.g., Burton, Lydon, D'Alessandro, & Koestner, 2006; or refer to Deci & Ryan, 2008, for a summary). Externally regulated extrinsic motivation, also known as extrinsic motivation, refers to the situation where an activity is not pursued for its own enjoyment, but rather for external reasons such as rewards or avoiding shame (Ryan & Deci, 2000a; Vallerand et al., 1992).

Deci and Ryan (1985) posited that it is crucial to take into account not just intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, but also amotivation. Amotivation is the state of lacking motivation, which happens when a learner finds neither intrinsic nor extrinsic motivation in an activity. If a student has amotivation, they lack any incentive to exert effort in an activity, which can result in disengagement within the classroom (Legault, Green-Demers, & Pelletier, 2006). Amotivation has been specifically linked to negative outcomes such as boredom, shallow learning strategies, unhappiness, lack of involvement, and poor performance (Aelterman et al., 2012; Ntoumanis, 2001; Pelletier, Fortier,

Vallerand, & Briere, 2001; Shen, Wingert, Li, Sun, & Rukavina, 2010; Standage, Duda, & Pensgaard, 2005). A substantial body of research has investigated the components that contribute to motivation. However, only a limited number of studies have also explored the causes behind students' lack of desire to participate in their schoolwork and display amotivation (Legault et al., 2006).

The three motivational types mentioned above pertain to the reasons why students either engage or do not engage in their school work. These types can be seen as emotional aspects of motivation. On the other hand, behavioral engagement refers to the actions and behaviors that students exhibit as a result of their motivation. This distinction is supported by various studies (Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Reeve, Jang, Carrell, Jeon, & Barch, 2004; Skinner, Kindermann, & Furrer, 2009). Behavioural engagement pertains to the active participation of students in their academic tasks, encompassing the initiation, level of commitment, and sustained effort exerted (e.g., Skinner & Belmont, 1993). In the present study, the outcome variables investigated were intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation (externally regulated), amotivation, and behavioral engagement, in order to comprehensively reflect the entire range of motivation.

Differential need-supportive teaching

As stated in the section regarding teacher expectations, research on teacher expectations has identified various teaching behaviors that vary between students who are ranked as the highest or lowest achievers by their teachers (Bohlmann & Weinstein, 2013; Brophy & Good, 1970; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985). In the following discussion, we will present evidence on how these behaviors might be connected to the three aspects of need-supportive teaching: autonomy support, structure, and engagement. By establishing a connection between these behaviors and the practice of providing support for students' needs, we can clearly demonstrate how teacher expectations may impact the provision of such assistance, as well as students' motivation and engagement. As previously stated in the Introduction, this research is valuable for comprehending the impact of differentiated instruction on students' motivation and engagement. Additionally, it sheds light on the reasons behind teachers' tendency to offer more help to certain students compared to others.

Studies on teacher expectations indicate that teachers offer a greater number of options to students with high expectations compared to those with low expectations. They also provide more opportunities for students to contribute their own ideas, demonstrate greater acceptance of students' ideas, and issue fewer direct commands (Babad, 1993b; Brattesani,

Weinstein, & Marshall, 1984; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Rosenthal, 1994). All of these behaviors are strongly associated with what is termed autonomy-supportive behaviors in SDT.

Prior study findings pertaining to the dimension of structure, specifically in relation to supporting the desire for competence, appear to be more inconclusive. Research indicates that teachers tend to provide high-expectation students with greater amounts of positive feedback, positive remarks, and encouragement. Conversely, low-expectation students are given less time to contemplate their responses and are more quickly passed over for someone else to answer (Brophy & Good, 1970; Rosenthal, 1994). In addition, research has shown that students with high expectations of themselves tend to start a greater number of interactions with their instructor and receive more support and feedback, as opposed to students with low expectations (Brophy & Good, 1970). Additionally, research indicates that teachers tend to engage in more procedural and work-related interactions with students who have low expectations. These students also receive more learning support, explanations, and directions compared to students with high expectations. Therefore, these findings indicate that teachers should offer increased support and feedback to students with high expectations, while providing clearer instructions and advice to those with low expectations. Consequently, the general perception of organization may be comparable amongst students with high and low expectations.

Research has shown that in terms of the dimension of involvement, which refers to the level of support for the need for relatedness, teachers tend to exhibit more contact initiation, maintain more eye contact, display a more positive attitude, and express themselves more positively towards students with high expectations compared to those with low expectations (Babad, 1993b; Chaikin et al., 1974; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Rubie-Davies, 2018). Teachers also exhibit a greater number of non-verbal indicators of acceptance towards pupils with high expectations (Chaikin et al., 1974; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985). This can augment pupils' sense of being comprehended. Furthermore, research suggests that instructors allocate a greater amount of time and exert more effort towards students whom they hold higher expectations for, compared to students whom they have lesser expectations for (Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Rist, 1970). This differential treatment may contribute to the perception of teachers as being more supportive and engaged.

Furthermore, previous research on Self-Determination Theory (SDT) has indicated significant variations among students in the extent to which they get education that supports their needs (e.g., Domen, Hornstra, Weijers, Van

der Veen, & Peetsma, 2018; Reeve, 2009). Studies examining the distribution of variance in student perceptions of need-supportive teaching have shown that teachers treat students differently. Specifically, the class-level intraclass correlations (ICCs) for student perceptions of need-supportive teaching range from .05 to .31 (Bieg, Backes, & Mittag, 2011; Danielsen, Wiium, Wilhemsen, & Wold, 2010; Hospel & Galand, 2016). Additionally, the ICCs for teachers' student-specific perceptions of need-supportive teaching range from .24 to .31 (Domen et al., 2018). These results suggest that the majority of the variation in these variables is found within classes rather than across classes. Therefore, students in the same class exhibit significant variations in their perception of the level of autonomy support, structure, and participation provided by their instructor. Traditionally, research on self-determination theory have not investigated the factors that contribute to variations in the implementation of need-supportive instruction among students. Nevertheless, a study conducted through interviews with a limited number of teachers revealed that they provided varying levels of autonomy support and structure depending on their assessment of their students' capabilities and backgrounds (Hornstra et al., 2015). This implies that differences in need-supportive teaching may be attributed to teacher expectations.

METHOD

The study conducted here employs a descriptive design with the aim of elucidating various elements, facts, or phenomena of a specific scenario. Its purpose is to gather information on the impacts of teacher expectations on the provision of supportive teaching and student motivation. According to Shuttleworth (2008), the descriptive research technique is a scientific approach that entails watching and documenting the behavior of a topic without exerting any influence on it. The data was gathered using three separate methodologies, including surveys, focus groups, and document analysis. The questionnaire utilized includes an attitudinal scale towards disability (AFI) that encompasses several types of questions. If any of these assumptions were not satisfied, non-parametric tests were employed. In order to expand the scope of this study, two additional data collections were conducted by means of two focus groups, each consisting of eight participants. These focus groups were selected based on diverse models. To assess the expectations of instructors towards their pupils, a brief questionnaire (Van den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, & Holland, 2010) was administered by teachers for each individual student. The teachers were explicitly instructed to evaluate several academic attributes of the pupils using a Likert-type scale, which varied from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (completely

relevant). In order to assess students' impressions of need-supportive teaching from their teachers, a questionnaire was administered to students during their math, English, or Dutch class. This questionnaire aimed to determine the level of need-supportive teaching delivered by their teacher in that specific class (Kampshof, 2017). The items may be assessed using a Likert-type scale with a range of 1 (not relevant) to 5 (completely appropriate). Student questionnaires were used to measure students' intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amotivation, and behavioral engagement. The items may be assessed using a Likert-type scale with a range of 1 (not relevant) to 5 (completely appropriate). The students' inherent motivation and external motivation were evaluated using two scales from the Self-Regulation Questionnaire Academic (SRQ-A; Ryan & Connell, 1989). The participants were shown eight items that represented various motivations for their academic engagement. Prior to each topic, the question "What motivates you to excel in this subject?" was asked. There were four answers that related to intrinsic reasons, such as "Because I enjoy this subject," and four things that related to external reasons, such as "Because it's the rule, and I'm supposed to do it."

DISCUSSION

The objective of this study was to establish a connection between studies on teacher expectations and Self-Determination Theory (SDT), in order to enhance our comprehension of motivational processes occurring in the classroom. Prior studies on SDT have provided evidence that teachers exhibit varying degrees of need-supportive teaching towards different students (e.g., Bieg et al., 2011; Danielsen et al., 2010; Hornstra et al., 2015; Hospel & Galand, 2016). However, the influence of teacher expectations on these differences in need-supportive teaching has not been thoroughly investigated. Consistent with our predictions, we discovered that teacher expectations were linked to many characteristics of students' motivation. These connections were completely influenced, although to a limited extent, by need-supportive teaching. The results demonstrated that students experienced greater need-supportive instruction when their instructor held higher expectations of them. Consequently, these favorable connections were associated with increased levels of inherent drive, reduced lack of motivation, and heightened behavioral involvement.

Our findings confirm previous research by demonstrating a positive correlation between higher teacher expectations and increased perceived autonomy support. In other words, students whose teachers had higher expectations reported a greater sense of autonomy support, such as being

offered more choices, compared to students whose teachers had lower expectations. In addition, as anticipated, these pupils also received more engagement from their instructor, including greater displays of affection, curiosity, or emotional support. Prior research has yielded contradictory findings about the correlation between instructor expectations and structure. Our findings indicated that pupils who were subject to higher demands from their teachers had a greater perception of structure. This challenges the idea that teachers could believe that students with low expectations require more structure and hence offer them with additional help to meet their demand for competence (e.g., Hornstra et al., 2015). In contrast, our findings corroborate earlier research indicating that students with high expectations get greater levels of contact, encouragement, and positive feedback from their instructor (e.g., Brophy & Good, 1970), leading to an enhanced impression of structure. It is important to note that our study specifically examined how students perceive organization, while Hornstra et al. (2015) investigated how teachers perceive structure. It is possible that students may not always receive the structure provided by teachers in the same manner. Even though teachers may attempt to give the same or higher levels of organization to students with low expectations, students may interpret it differently.

Furthermore, we hypothesized that the aspects of need-supportive teaching would have a correlation with intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amotivation, and behavioral engagement. The majority of our assumptions were validated, since a considerable number of the anticipated relationships were seen and aligned with our predictions. Nevertheless, several anticipated connections were shown to lack statistical significance. Consistent with expectations, autonomy support and structure were shown to be significant predictors of intrinsic motivation, whereas engagement did not show a significant relationship. In addition, it was observed that structure had a greater ability to predict a wide range of motivational outcomes, including intrinsic motivation, a motivation, and behavioral engagement. On the other hand, autonomy support and involvement only predicted specific aspects of students' motivation, such as intrinsic motivation or a motivation and behavioral engagement, respectively. The results of this study are consistent with the ideas proposed by Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which suggest that structure is a more powerful predictor of various aspects of motivation compared to autonomy support and involvement. This is because feeling competent, which is facilitated by structure, is a prerequisite for almost all aspects of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Furthermore, it has been proposed that engagement has a less direct impact on forecasting motivating outcomes when compared to the effects of autonomy support and structure

(Deci & Ryan, 2000). Nevertheless, Stroet and colleagues (2013) propose that further investigation is necessary to explore the varying efficiency of different aspects of need-supportive education.

Significantly, there was no observed correlation between need-supportive teaching and extrinsic motivation. Past studies (Haerens, Aelterman, Vansteenkiste, Soenens, Van Petegem, 2015; Van-steenkiste & Ryan, 2013) have indicated that teaching methods that support students' needs are primarily linked to positive motivational results, such as intrinsic motivation and active participation (referred to as the "bright pathway"). On the other hand, teaching behaviors that hinder students' needs, such as control and neglect, are more strongly associated with less desirable motivational outcomes like extrinsic motivation and lack of motivation (referred to as the "dark pathway"). Future study on the correlations among teacher expectations, teaching behavior, and student motivation should include including need-thwarting behaviors to investigate if low teacher expectations might lead to need-thwarting instruction and thereby enhance extrinsic motivation.

Significance for further investigation and application

The outcomes of our study have produced several significant ramifications for both research and practical application. The findings indicated that SDT, particularly the concept of need-supportive teaching, might provide a valuable framework for categorizing distinct teaching behaviors towards students with varying levels of expectations. Our research findings suggest that the integration of these two research traditions reveals a potential explanation for the variation in instructors' level of need-supportive teaching towards various students, including the influence of teacher expectations and other factors. Future research might enhance its findings by including instructor expectations into studies on differentiated need-supportive teaching.

Furthermore, it has been observed that teachers differ in their level of need supportive teaching towards students, as evidenced by studies conducted by Bieg et al. (2011), Danielsen et al. (2010), and Hospel & Galand (2016). Additionally, research suggests that teacher expectations are influenced by various student characteristics (Ready & Wright, 2011) and teacher characteristics (Gershenson, Holt, & Papageorge, 2016). Therefore, we propose that need-supportive teaching should not be viewed solely as a general teaching style, but rather as a characteristic of the teacher-student relationship. Put simply, the variation in need-supportive teaching may be attributed to the attributes of both the instructor and the student, and possibly even the specific combination of the two. Future research on teacher

expectations would benefit from employing a cross-classified approach to separate and analyze these factors. This approach would enhance our comprehension of the factors that contribute to both motivating and demotivating teacher-student relationships. For an illustration of such an approach, refer to Mainhard, Oudman, Hornstra, Bosker, & Goetz (2018).

Furthermore, this study has demonstrated a correlation between instructor expectations and students' motivation. These results, together with findings from prior research on the impacts of teacher expectations (Rubie-Davies, 2018), emphasize the significance of considering teacher expectations in teacher training programs and educational interventions. One way to do this is by enhancing instructors' understanding of how their expectations might impact their students' motivation. Additionally, it is important to emphasize effective methods of communicating high expectations to all students.

Furthermore, while SDT proposes that students' motivation is best supported by extensive support in all three dimensions, our research, along with previous studies, has shown that not all students are provided with this ideal teaching approach. Specifically, pupils who were subject to lesser demands from their professors reported seeing less autonomous support, structure, and engagement. Previous studies have shown that interventions targeting teacher expectations can have a favorable impact on students' academic performance (Rubie-Davies & Rosenthal, 2016). Furthermore, research has shown that teacher interventions focused on providing support for students' needs have proven to be successful in improving students' motivation (Su & Reeve, 2011). It would be worthwhile to investigate in future studies if treatments that combine these two research traditions, by emphasizing the improvement of teacher expectations and the promotion of teachers' need-supportive teaching, might potentially provide even greater effectiveness. Additionally, it is important to consider whether these interventions would be particularly advantageous for students with low expectations. This is because these students are more likely to receive inadequate levels of supportive teaching, as indicated by the findings of this study. Furthermore, these students often belong to stigmatized groups and have been shown to be particularly susceptible to the effects of teacher expectations, as demonstrated by previous research (Jussim, Eccles, & Madon, 1996; Jussim & Harber, 2005).

CONCLUSION

This study is one of the initial attempts to combine research on Self-Determination Theory (SDT) with research on teacher expectations. By

combining these two viewpoints, we demonstrated that instructor expectations influenced the provision of supportive instruction, thereby impacting students' motivation. The current study emphasized the need of considering instructor expectations in order to comprehend how motivation among all students may be nurtured through need-supportive teaching.

REFERENCES

Babad, E. (1993a). Pygmalion – 25 years after interpersonal expectations in the classroom. In P. D. Blanck (Ed.), Interpersonal expectations: Theory, research, and applications (pp. 125–153). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Babad, E. (1993b). Teachers' differential behavior. Educational Psychology Review, 5, 347–376. doi:10. 1007/bf01320223

Brattesani, K. A., Weinstein, R. S., & Marshall, H. H. (1984). Student perceptions of differential teacher treatment as moderators of teacher expectation effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 236–247. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.76.2.236

Brophy, J. E. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 631–661. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.75.5.631

Cooper, H., & Good, T. (1983). Pygmalion grows up: Studies in the expectation communication process. New York, NY: Longman.

Furrer, C., & Skinner, E. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 95, 148–162. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.148

Harris, M. J., & Rosenthal, R. (1985). Mediation of interpersonal expectancy effects: 31 meta-analyses. Psychological Bulletin, 97, 363–386. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.97.3.363

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Abingdon: Routledge

Merton, R. K. (1957). Social theory and social structure. New York, NY: Free Press. Muthén, B., &

Ready, D. D., & Wright, D. L. (2011). Accuracy and inaccuracy in teachers' perceptions of young children's cognitive abilities: The role of child background and classroom context. American Educational Research Journal, 48, 335–360. doi:10.3102/0002831210374874

Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive.

Educational Psychologist, 44, 159–175. doi:10.1080/00461520903028990

Reeve, J., & Jang, H. (2006). What teachers say and do to support students' autonomy during a learning activity. Journal of Educational Psychology, 98, 209–218. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.209

Su, Y.-L., & Reeve, J. (2011). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of intervention programs designed to support autonomy. Educational Psychology Review, 23, 159–188. doi:10.1007/s10648-010-9142-7

Van den Bergh, L., Denessen, E., Hornstra, L., Voeten, M., & Holland, R. W. (2010). The implicit prejudiced attitudes of teachers: Relations to teacher expectations and the ethnic achievement gap. American Educational Research Journal, 47, 497–527. doi:10.3102/0002831209353594

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. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.03.002