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Abstract
Educational decisions made about students often have consequences for their subsequent employment and financial well-being, therefore it is imperative to determine whether teacher decisions are discriminatory. This study examines how factors such as race, class, and gender influence the decisions teachers make regarding Aboriginal students. The study demonstrates that teachers do attribute certain factors to Aboriginal students, which may influence students' classroom placement. Findings may help both sensitize teachers to the implications of their beliefs and biases as well as promote the development of policies and practices to eliminate biased decision-making.

Résumé
Les décisions éducatives concernant les étudiants ont souvent des conséquences sur leur emploi futur et leur bien-être financier. Par conséquent, il est impératif de déterminer si les décisions des enseignants sont discriminatoires. Cette étude examine comment des facteurs tels que la race, la classe sociale et le sexe influent sur les décisions des enseignants concernant les étudiants autochtones. L’étude démontre que certains facteurs peuvent effectivement jouer un rôle dans la prise de décisions des enseignants visant les étudiants autochtones, et ainsi influer sur le placement des élèves en classe. Les résultats peuvent aider à la fois à sensibiliser les enseignants aux implications de leurs convictions et de leurs préjugés, et à promouvoir le développement de politiques et de pratiques visant à éliminer la prise de décisions biaisées.
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Introduction

By 2017, Aboriginal people will represent 3.4% of the working-age population within Canada (Statistics Canada, 2005), identifying Aboriginal youth as playing an essential role to Canada’s future educational and economic development (Preston, 2008). Considering that education is a central tool for economic development and in establishing one’s sense of self-worth, the need for increased educational attainment for Aboriginal youth is integral for labour integration and future employment (Bazylak, 2002; Duncan & Sokal, 2003; Hampton & Roy, 2002; James, 2001; R.A. Malatest & Associates, 2004) and would also provide more Aboriginal peoples the means for acquiring leadership roles in academic and political institutions (Preston, 2008; Wotherspoon & Schissel, 1998). Despite some educational advances (Friesen & Friesen, 2005; Hull, 2005; Preston, 2008; Rae, 2005), Aboriginal learners continue to fall behind their non-Aboriginal peers with regards to educational outcomes (Levin, 2009).

Aboriginal students in Canada continue to be less likely than non-Aboriginal peers to enrol in academically challenging courses (Cowley & Easton, 2004); they are also more likely to leave school prior to graduation and less likely to return (Council of Ministers of Education, 1999). The 2006 Census of Canada (Bougie, 2009, p.17) reported that 31% of the off-reserve First Nations population aged 25-64 did not have a high school diploma compared with 15% of their counterparts in the total Canadian population. This does not bode well for First Nation youths’ future employment prospects, as half the jobs in Canada require at least a secondary school education (MNGE, 2002). The 2004 Auditor General’s Report indicated that it would take approximately 28 years for the current educational divide between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people to close (Auditor General’s Report, 2004).

Wotherspoon (2008) asserts that teachers play a significant role when it comes to fostering “a strong grounding for Aboriginal people’s incorporation into a social and economic environment dominated by emphasis on information and knowledge work” (p. 3). Researchers also suggest that teachers’ attributions and stereotypes may be a contributing factor when it comes to Aboriginal/minority drop-out rate in schools (Brandon, 2002; Farkas, 2003; Garcia, 2001; Riley & Ungerleider, 2008). It is the recognition of the significant influence teachers may have upon the educational success of students combined with the influence their attributions may have on the decisions made about their students that raises questions about bias.

This study explores the following three research questions: (1) How do teachers’ regard Aboriginal students?; (2) What factors influence how teachers assign pupils to different opportunities?; and (3) What reasons do teachers give for their recommendations about the opportunities that are afforded to students? This study invites 21 teachers to participate in a task that probes teachers’ ideas regarding issues of race, class, gender, and discrimination in the classroom in order to offer a rare assessment of the basis of classroom decision-making. This topic is timely as more attention needs to be paid to how the experiences and perceptions of teachers might influence the success of Canada’s increasingly diverse student body.

Teachers’ Expectations

The term teachers’ expectations describe the inferences teachers make regarding students’ potential to achieve in the classroom. These inferences may be influenced by a number
of factors. Some factors may be internal to the student, such as a student’s aptitude for academic achievement. External factors such as IQ test scores, a student’s family background, and comments made by former teachers regarding a student’s performance may shape teachers’ perceptions of students before they enter the classroom.

In a study regarding teachers’ perceptions of students, Smith, Jussim, and Eccles (1999) found that while “self-fulfilling prophecies in terms of effect size were relatively small, their presence over time was quite remarkable” (p. 563). They discovered that a teacher’s belief regarding a student’s potential could influence that student several years after the initial point of contact (Smith et al., 1999). They also discovered that students “who were targets of higher expectations in 7th grade took a greater number of non-remedial high school math courses than students who were targets of lower expectations” (Smith et al., 1999, p. 559). This process is described as “accumulation expectancy effect” and describes the process in which self-fulfilling prophecy or perceptual bias accumulates overtime (Smith et al., 1999). Self-fulfilling prophecies may also be sustained by situation. For example, if a teacher has low expectations for a student and decides to place the student in a remedial classroom one year, the student may find it difficult to move out of that placement for the remainder of their school career (Blau, 2003; Broussard and Joseph, 1998; Moller, Stearns, Blau, & Land, 2006; Oakes, 1995).

Race, Ethnicity, and Underachievement

In The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy, Merton (1948) alluded to how expectations potentially shaped and maintained ethnic and racial discrimination. He described how the false perception that African American people are “inferior” in education was at risk of becoming a reality if the dominant White authorities continued to spend less than one-fifth as much on education for African American students as it did on White students (Merton, 1948). While Merton did not specifically address teacher expectations and student achievement, his speculations inspired others to consider the influence of arbitrary factors such as race and ethnicity on students’ performance outcomes (Bianchi, 1984; Heubert & Hauser, 1999; Hauser, 1999; Jencks & Phillips, 1998; Meisels & Liaw, 1993; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992). Such studies suggest that teachers’ stereotypes regarding gender, ethnic group membership, and socio-economic status may lead to lowered expectations which could trigger self-fulfilling prophecies or perceptual biases that could potentially influence students’ academic success. A study by Clifton, Perry, Parsonson, and Hryniuk (1986) on teachers’ expectations revealed that, after intellectual ability, “ethnicity has the second most powerful effect on both normative and cognitive expectations” (p. 64). After analyzing 10 years of two data sets from the Department of Education’s National Center for Educational Statistics, Blau (2003) similarly concluded, “The best single indicator of children’s vulnerability (in school) is the colour of their skin” (p. 203). Numerous studies to date have been largely anecdotal. The evocative nature of these accounts offers insight into how seemingly innocuous decisions affect people’s lives. Yet, empirical data is required to ensure that policy-makers are able to effectively develop and administer policies and programs that can address instances of discrimination in the classroom. Some researchers may balk at having to “prove” that teachers’ stereotypes and biases may affect the lives of minority students (Del, Karumanchery, & Karumanchery-Luik, 2004), but other researchers remark that—without the “empirical evidence to convince teachers of the need for innovation” (Moodley, 1999, p. 148)—teachers may be unwilling to change their behaviour and resist the suggestion of the need for change.
Stigma, Stereotypes, and Attributional Theory

Combining theories of stigma and stereotyping with attribution theory may provide policy-makers and practitioners with an understanding of the subtlety of discrimination and its influence upon student placement. The combined theories may provide a basis for collecting data that would pinpoint instances of discrimination within the classroom setting.

Attribution theory. Attribution theory (Weiner, 1984) is founded upon the assertion that people seek to understand the causes of specific events. By developing explanations to justify unexpected outcomes, people are better able to make sense of what is happening around them (Georgiou, 2008; Janes, 1996). Often, it is the interpretation of an event, rather than the event itself, that is most significant (Georgiou, Christou, Stravrinides, & Panaoura, 2002). In attribution theory, causes for an event may be seen as: (1) external (an event created by something/someone outside the individual affected by the event) or internal (an event created by something inherent to the individual), (2) stable (consistent over time) or unstable (changes over time), and (3) controllable (something that the individual can manipulate or change) or uncontrollable (something that the individual has little ability to manipulate or change) by the one who makes the attribution. The attributes an individual uses to explain event outcomes will often reflect the attitudes an individual holds (Weiner, 1984).

Stigma and stereotyping. Goffman (1963) describes stigma as “an attribute that is deeply discrediting” (p. 3). Stigmatization is created by the initial recognition of differences based upon the individual’s distinct attributed characteristics and by the subsequent devaluation of that individual (Dovidio, Major, & Crocker, 2000). Once an individual has been stigmatized, they are often treated as “less human” and may be subjected to various levels of discrimination that may limit that individual’s life-chances (Goffman, 1963). Stigma has more recently been described as a social construction “determined by the broader cultural context (involving stereotypes, values, and ideologies), the meaning of the situation for participants, and the features of the situation that influence this meaning” (Dovidio et al., 2000, p.3). This definition elaborates how what was once perceived as “unusual” or “normal” may alter over time. Stereotypes can be used to rationalize individual acts through offering explanations as to why someone did well (or not well) at something. Since it is sometimes assumed that certain characteristics exist among people sharing the same race, ethnicity, or gender, individuals belonging to a stigmatized collective may apt to be negatively stereotyped than individuals belonging to a non-stigmatized group (Biernat & Dovidio, 2000).

Stereotypes in the Classroom

Teachers are not immune to the influence of stereotypes. However, researchers have noted that the study of race and discrimination in the classroom has a history of making White teachers uncomfortable (Earick, 2006; hooks, 1994, p.39; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Schick, 2000b). Teachers’ influential position means that the attributions they place on students that are based upon stereotypes can have a larger effect on students. The attributions teachers communicate through behavioural cues or academic assessments can positively or negatively influence the attributional interpretations the students have of their academic potential (Georgiou, 2008).

Reyna (2000) explains that “although the content of stereotypes varies, the casual components associated with stereotypes are the same” (p. 88). Reyna uses Weiner’s (1984) three-dimensional classification model of attribution: locus of causality, controllability, and
stability to propose her own model illustrating “the social and personal consequences of stereotypes based on their attributional signatures” (p.88). She claims,

Attribution conveyed through stereotypes always represent one of three patterns; stereotypes can communicate causes that are (1) internal/stable/controllable by the stereotyped person (e.g., laziness), (2) internal/stable/uncontrollable by the stereotyped person (e.g., low intelligence), and (3) external/stable/uncontrollable by the stereotyped person (e.g., being the victim of discrimination). Each attributional signature is associated with specific emotions and behavioural responses following either desirable or undesirable events (pp. 90-91).

**Internal/Stable/Controllable**

Reyna discusses how some minority groups have been stereotyped as “inherently lazy.” Since laziness is an undesirable but controllable trait, a teacher influenced by this stereotype may assume that a stereotyped student who hasn’t completed his or her homework has *chosen* to be lazy. Research demonstrates that students with perceived behavioural problems are more likely to be placed in remedial classrooms (Broussard & Joseph, 1998; Oakes, 1985; Oakes, 1995), thus stigmatized students who are perceived as lazy may be more likely to be placed in a lower-ability classroom regardless of ability. The student in turn may be more inclined to feel guilt. The teacher’s negative behaviour toward the student may provoke the student’s frustration and disengagement from classroom activities. Alternatively, “positive” stereotypes, such as perceiving Asians as “model minorities” might lead to students feeling increased confidence in their ability to achieve.

**Internal/Stable/Uncontrollable**

A group or individual may be stereotyped as low-ability. This stereotype evokes the notion that a learner’s poor test performance is the result of inherent (and thus uncontrollable) ability. Attributions like this are damaging to a student’s motivation and self-image. Students who believe their poor performance is due to lack of effort rather than inherent ability may feel more convinced of their potential for success. Students who are made to feel their poor performance is innate may feel incompetent and more inclined to withdraw from the course (Reyna, 2000; Tollefson, 1988; Weiner, 1985; Weiner, 1994). A teacher who believes a student is incapable of success due to lack of ability may be less likely to recommend that student for future opportunities.

A group may also be identified as in control of positive outcomes (“high-ability”) students. An example of positive stereotyping of a collective group is the stereotype that ‘all Asians are good at math.’ Teachers who subscribe to this stereotype may have increased belief in Asian students’ ability to excel in areas in which math-related skills are required. Outcomes of this might include more Asian students streamed towards math-related domains as well as increased recognition in these areas. Positive reinforcement in this area may increase Asian students’ motivation to excel in these domains. However, this stereotype might lead to individual needs or desires being ignored and may be harmful to ascribed group members who do not fulfill the requirements of the “positive” group stereotype.
**External/Stable/Uncontrollable**

In the case of attributional signature “external/stable/uncontrollable,” the teacher perceives the stereotyped student as having no control over external factors that influence their situation. The stereotype absolves the learner of responsibility for their situation. Teachers may feel sympathetic towards low-achieving students, as they are perceived to be at a greater disadvantage than other learners. Teachers may be more inclined to offer learners remedial assistance as a form of social support. While this response may maintain the confidence of the stereotyped individual in the short-term, it could have a damaging influence over time (Roderick, Nagaoka, Bacon, & Easton, 2000). Teachers may feel unable to assist the student if they believe that the problems the student faces are insurmountable. Likewise, stereotyped students may feel overwhelmed if they believe they can not change teachers’ negative perceptions.

High-achieving stereotyped students may be more inclined to receive recognition from teachers for achieving despite perceived barriers. This may seem positive, but the stereotyped individual doesn’t receive proper credit for their achievements. Others who may presume that the student’s accolades were due to their ascribed social status as opposed to their ability may question their recognition and rewards. This could lead to the stereotyped individual having a diminished sense of self-worth and increase the frustration at having to “prove” their deservedness of recognition.

**Research Design**

In our previous study, *The face of achievement: Influences of teacher decision-making on Aboriginal students* (Riley and Ungerleider, 2008), we provided the first empirical evidence of teacher discrimination in the Canadian context. Fifty pre-service teachers were asked to make placement recommendations for Grade 8 students. Findings revealed that “Aboriginal students consistently earned lower recommendations than their non-Aboriginal counterparts (F=5.643, p=0.021, df=1.50) despite the fact that the fictional students in Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal categories had identical records of prior achievement” (p. 383). While generalizations from this study should be done with caution, this behaviour raised some concerns because Aboriginal students were at a greater risk of being placed in remedial classrooms. Some researchers suggest that students placed in remedial classrooms may have difficulty moving to a more advanced classroom regardless of their academic potential (Blau, 2003; Broussard & Joseph, 1998; Moller, Stearns, Blau, & Land, 2006; Oakes, 1995; Sitrotnik, 1994). Advanced placements tend to prepare students for university-level courses, while remedial classrooms tend to more often be geared towards vocational lines of work. Aboriginal students who have been misdirected into remedial classrooms may be less likely to receive opportunities for scholarships and professional employment.

The aforementioned literature illustrates the need for a further study that investigates the factors that influence teachers’ decision-making, and the reasons teachers give for their recommendations about the opportunities afforded to students. The current study is situated in the context of contemporary public schooling in Canada in which opportunities are intended to be allocated on the basis of ability (merit) rather than on the basis of one’s gender, ethnicity, socio-economic position, or one’s attributed ‘racial’ identity. The task asked that teachers make recommendations about the students’ placement based on the grades they received for their prior school performance. While grades, like any other shorthand, are subject to interpretation both in their assignment and in their evaluation, it was assumed that, as an indicator of merit, grades would be relatively unambiguous markers of student achievement. We refer to placement in
Grade 8 with supplementary learning assistance, regular Grade 8 placement, or advanced high school programs as **opportunities**, a descriptive term without any intended evaluative judgment as to their desirability.

**The Task**

There were 21 volunteer teachers recruited from a metropolitan area in Western Canada to participate in this study; they were asked to take part in a one-hour interview in which they reviewed 24 records of Grade 7 students (see Appendix Table 1). All teachers had two or more years’ experience teaching in the classroom and had experience teaching Grade 7 classes where recommendations regarding student placement were most likely to be made. Eighteen female teachers and three male teachers were recruited for the study. This sample is representative of the Canadian teaching body, as the Canadian Teachers’ Federation data demonstrates that 72.6% of teachers across Canada are women (Canadian Teachers Federation, 2012). Teachers were informed prior to the interview that the record cards were fictitious; however, they were directed to treat the records as if they were genuine. Each record card described a student’s academic history from Grades 4 to 7 and provided information about the student’s background (see Appendix Figures 1, 2, 3). Academic information was systematically varied within each category of students (Aboriginal, ESL, non-Aboriginal) and within each gender (M, F). Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Music, and Art were included in the student records (refer to Appendix for sample).

The 24 student record cards were constructed so that eight would represent English Second Language students, eight would represent Aboriginal students, and eight would appear to be neither ESL nor Aboriginal (see Appendix Table 2). Teachers were cued to recognize that a student was Aboriginal or ESL by the inclusion of information that the school board had received targeted funding for the student in one or more years. Similarly, by leaving the Aboriginal and ESL funding categories blank for eight students, the respondent would infer that they were neither Aboriginal nor English as a Second Language. The students’ records were manipulated to ensure that students in the three categories would have identical records of prior achievement.

Teachers were asked to explain their rationale for recommendations using a technique described as the “think aloud method”\(^1\) (Van Someren, Barnard, & Sandberg, 1994). Teachers were presented with a task and asked to articulate their thinking while performing that task. This enables the researcher to have insight into the participant’s decisions from moment to moment as they complete an assigned task.

Teachers were instructed to (a) review the 24 permanent student records one at a time, (b) consider the criteria for program options (remedial, standard or advanced), and (c) place the card in one of three folders laid out on the table before them labelled either “Supplementary Learning assistance (Grade 8 placement with additional learning support),” “Regular Grade 8 Program,” or “Rapid Advance program” (an accelerated program in which five years of secondary education is compressed into four years).

---

\(^1\) Researchers using the "think aloud" methodology have found certain tasks are more conducive to this approach than others. Tasks less suited to this method are those that involve non-verbal information or those where speed is inherent in the nature of the task.
At the completion of the task, teachers were asked to reflect upon comments they made during the assignment process. Teachers who placed all students into one folder were asked to respond to selected student record cards individually. If teachers could note differences between the cards’ achievement levels, they were asked to reflect upon why they opted to place record cards of varying levels within the same class.

For the context of this study, “teachers’ judgement” refers to the ways teachers evaluated student record cards in arriving at their recommendations regarding the students’ placement. When a teacher’s judgment concurred with the grades on a student’s record card, we described that judgment as accurate, meaning it conformed to the instruction to make a recommendation based upon student’s prior achievement as indicated by the grades students had earned. When a teacher makes judgments on any other basis, we described those judgments as exhibiting bias.

Once interviews were completed, each was transcribed for analysis. Final transcripts were read for themes that would illuminate the teachers’ interpretations and observations. What was looked for, in essence, was not a validation of previous, pre-determined theoretical understandings but rather an understanding of teachers’ interpretations and observations. The connection noted between and across interviews helped to examine pre-conceptions and assumptions. Using a method adapted from Boyatziz (1998) and outlined by Rubin and Rubin (2005, p. 216), a list was created to recognize and label each concept. For each theme that was used, the following questions were considered: (a) how would the concept be labelled/coded, (b) how would each code be defined, (c) how would the concept be recognized in interviews, (d) what would be excluded, and (e) what is an example of the concept? The list was kept on file for referral so as to ensure that assignments were consistent with the codes.

Findings

This study takes the point of view that Canada strives to ensure equality among persons such that no person is discriminated against on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, or any other prohibited grounds without good reason (The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Section 15, 1992; Ontario Human Rights Act, Part 1, Freedom from Discrimination, 1990). As moral and political philosopher John Rawls (1971, 1985) states, “Each person has an equal right to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties, which scheme is compatible with a similar scheme for all” and that all positions must be “open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity” (1985, p. 227). For example, one should not be denied an opportunity to become an airline pilot unless there is a demonstrable reason as to why they should not have such an opportunity (such as physical or mental incapacity). The findings of this study revealed that while teachers do think about how a student is being assessed, the way they think about their students reveals more about their expectations and biases than it does about student potential as represented by the grades expressed on the record cards.

Responses of teachers fell into one of four categories: (1) teachers who placed student record cards accurately according to three levels of achievement, (2) teachers who placed according to two levels of achievement, (3) teachers who refused to differentiate among student record cards regardless of achievement level, and (4) teachers whose placement recommendation demonstrated bias toward one or more students.

A note on teacher assessment beliefs. While teachers were willing to make recommendations based solely upon the student record cards, all expressed discomfort in doing so. According to teachers, lack of interaction with the students hindered their capability to assess the student’s ability to achieve in the classroom. Some teachers spoke of grades as being too
limited to represent what was commonly referred to as the “whole child”. The concept of “whole child” consisted of factors beyond the student’s academic ability and included external and internal factors. External factors that teachers noted consisted of a student’s family background, socio-economic status, the geographical location of the school, and the number of books in a student’s household. Internal factors teachers noted included a student’s perceived work ethic and effort, social behaviour, and maturity as displayed in the classroom. It is imperative to note that if such factors were included in an organization’s hiring process, the organization could be liable for human rights discrimination.

**Accurate placement according to three levels of achievement.** Of the 21 teachers, only one teacher placed student record cards accurately according to three levels of achievement. Students were only differentiated by grades earned and not by group affiliation. This teacher noted making a *conscious choice* to focus on student achievement *rather than* student designation labels. She noted her awareness of student designation labels precisely because she was surprised they were included, as she believed they could incite biased student placement decisions.

**Placement according to two levels of achievement.** Of the 21 teachers, five teachers placed all student record cards within two achievement level folders: regular Grade 8 and rapid-advance. These teachers opted to place student record cards ranging from low, low-medium, to high-medium in the “regular Grade 8 folder” regardless of group designation. These teachers relayed that they did not feel comfortable placing students into the supplementary learning class since none of the students represented on the record cards received a grade below C-. While these five teachers did not differentiate according to group designation, two of the five teachers did have difficulty recommending whether to place two low-achieving ESL students in the supplementary learning assistance class or the regular classroom.

**Refusal to differentiate among student record cards.** While most teachers placed students in the folders they felt best corresponded to the achievement level depicted on the record card, there were four notable exceptions. Four teachers made it clear they objected to streaming and placed all students, regardless of achievement level, into a regular Grade 8 classroom. These teachers claimed to be opposed to student placement for at least one of the following reasons: they felt: a) all students, regardless of achievement level, should be able to learn from each other; b) students placed in a rapid advanced classroom might miss out on benefits of elective courses; c) opposition to accelerating students through school; d) placement according to ability may disconnect students from their peers. Of the four teachers, two teachers announced they would not place students according to ability *prior to* looking through the student record cards. Denial of opportunity without good reason constitutes discrimination. While all four teachers were articulate advocates of ideas regarding social justice and equality, by placing 24 students into a regular classroom, all four teachers had effectively denied eight high-achieving students the possible benefits and opportunities of advanced placement.

**Teacher placement bias.** Of the 21 teachers, 11 teachers demonstrated bias towards one or more students in their selection process. With the exception of the four teachers who refused to place students in separate folders, most teachers were consistent in placing all high-achieving students regardless of group affiliation into the rapid advance class. However, one teacher decided to *place only one student*, a high-achieving female ESL student, into the rapid advanced class, while her high-achieving peers were placed into a regular classroom. This teacher noted that this was because she was an ESL student who achieved an A+ in language arts, something he regarded as “exceptional” and demonstrated her high capability for achievement.
Overall, the tendency to place high-medium and low-medium achieving students in the regular Grade 8 classroom was consistent. Another notable exception was a teacher’s decision to place two mid-achieving female students in an advanced classroom while keeping their male counterparts in a regular classroom. The teacher attributed her decision to the fact that “they were girls and would mature faster.” Seven teachers debated about placing a non-Aboriginal, non-ESL male student and high-medium achiever, in an advanced classroom based on the fact that he was a “male student who achieved an A+ in language arts.” Four teachers decided to promote the male, non-Aboriginal, non-ESL student into the advanced class while three teachers opted to have him remain in the regular Grade 8 room.

While only one teacher accurately placed all low-achieving students in the supplementary learning assistance folder, there were several occasions where teachers placed some but not all of the low-achieving students into the supplementary learning assistance folder. With the exception of one outlier, all students were either Aboriginal or ESL students. A low-achieving female Aboriginal student was placed into a supplementary learning assistance classroom three times and considered for supplementary learning assistance by two other teachers. A low-achieving ESL student was placed into the supplementary learning assistance nine times and considered for supplementary learning assistance an additional two times. His ESL female counterpart was placed into supplementary learning assistance five times and considered for supplementary learning assistance once. With the exception of one outlier (who was subsequently switched to the regular Grade 8 classroom during the question portion of the interview), non-Aboriginal, non-ESL students were not placed in supplementary learning assistance unless it was later pointed out that they had received the same grades as the other either Aboriginal or ESL students who were placed in the supplementary learning assistance folder.

In all cases, record cards of non-Aboriginal, non-ESL students did not elicit much commentary, whereas record card marks of Aboriginal and ESL students did. The remainder of this article will focus on teachers’ expectations and biases with regards to Aboriginal students.

Aboriginal Students: Exceeding Teachers’ Expectations

Grades contrary to a teacher’s expectations of a student were more likely to elicit a response. High marks achieved by Aboriginal students were more likely to receive positive reactions than the high-achieving marks of other students, suggesting a negative expectation (Reyna, 2000). Eight of the 21 teachers made remarks that indicated high-achieving Aboriginal students received extra attention in this study because they exceeded expectations.

When teachers were asked why Aboriginal students’ high marks were surprising, they attributed their reaction to their perception that Aboriginal students had more adverse life circumstances. Steve, who encountered the record card of a high-achieving Aboriginal student, paused briefly to observe:

Given what we know about Aboriginal people and not necessarily always achieving at the levels where they should be, um, this is really impressive that Hubie has achieved A+ in a variety of grades and a variety of different subjects over the years and I would recommend that Hubie be put in the rapid advance program as well.

---

2 All teachers’ names are pseudonyms.
When asked why there are lower graduation rates for Aboriginal students, Steve speculates that it may have something to do with a history of “great oppressive forces from the Western world imposing their way upon them.” When Steve considers Canada’s history regarding Aboriginal peoples, he acknowledges, “It may become culturally more important for the student to do something other than achieve in the quote, ‘White man’s world’. Rather than holding Aboriginal students responsible for lower achievement, Steve suggests that Aboriginal peoples may feel negatively about the educational system and may have different priorities. Steve also cites life circumstance as a factor for lower Aboriginal achievement. He states:

… a lot of Aboriginal people, as I understand, live less affluently than non-Aboriginal people, and I guess going back to other backgrounds, I guess those backgrounds can affect how a student achieves in school.

While most teachers expressed the belief that Aboriginal students had the ability to do well, they presumed that “negative life circumstances” inhibited their potential to succeed. This is an example of what Reyna (2000) describes as an external/stable/uncontrollable stereotype. Lack of achievement is not ascribed as being a fault of the learner, but is attributed to stable factors outside of the learner’s control. The fact that some teachers do not hold Aboriginal students as responsible for their lower graduation rates may be perceived as positive in that the learner’s perception of self-ability is less likely to be negatively influenced. However, these perceptions can still be detrimental to the success of Aboriginal students. For example, teachers interviewed indicated they would be less willing to consider advanced placement if they believed the student lacked family support or had to cope with negative life circumstances.

The notion that Aboriginal students have led more adverse life circumstances and were less inclined to do well in school prompted four teachers to suggest that enabling an Aboriginal student to showcase their success may have a benefit that goes beyond the student’s personal gains. When speaking about the record card of Rosalyn Wallace, a high-achieving female Aboriginal student, Stephanie’s primary concern is whether the learner has family support to guide her through a challenging class. Stephanie does not inquire this of her fictional high-achieving female, non-Aboriginal counterpart. Stephanie does clarify that if Rosalyn does have this support, it is an excellent opportunity for Rosalyn to become a role model for other Aboriginal woman. She exclaims:

And then, if indeed, she did make it through the rapid advance and did well, then what a great role model for other Aboriginal girls to sort of look to her and say, you know, ‘Wow! She did it! If she did it, I could do it.’ So, that’s sort of my reasoning in there.

While Judith made it clear she opposed the concept of streamed classes such as “rapid advance” by placing all students in a regular classroom, she did consider what may be one potential value of placing high-achieving Aboriginal student, Rosalyn Wallace, in an advanced classroom;

And if anything, I would place her here [in the advanced folder] even though she doesn’t have straight A’s because I think that it would be really good to give a First Nations person this opportunity to showcase their academic skills. So I think that I would consider her even if she was slightly less than straight A’s.
For teachers like Judith and Stephanie, successful Aboriginal students are celebrated for their potential to act as role models for their Aboriginal peers and to challenge misperceptions that Aboriginal students are not capable.

Like many of her peers, Olivia consistently described Aboriginal students as having more difficult life circumstances than their non-Aboriginal peers, however her reaction was to place some Aboriginal students in higher level folders than their counterparts. When Olivia was asked to comment upon why she placed Melissa Janette Doyle, a non-Aboriginal student of mid-range achievement, in a regular classroom, while placing Irene Battiste, an Aboriginal student at the same academic level, in a rapid advance class, she explains:

You know, I hate to say it [pause] because of the Ab. Ed. [funding designation] [sic]. Because I felt like, you know, these kids have so many [pause], a lot of times they have so much going against them and the fact that she had scored this kind of record, I mean, I know nothing whatsoever about her background. I have to say, I based it solely on the Ab. Ed. [sic]. And I felt like, you know, if she’s doing that well against whatever her circumstances may be and I’m assuming she has circumstances which is probably wrong but, you know, I am assuming that she’s up against [pause], a few things. I know nothing against Melissa Janette Doyle except that she has no indicators of any kind. I mean she just seems like a plain, old, regular student so I would have to say the Ab. Ed. [Sic] was the deciding factor. So I guess it’s kind of like affirmative action. [...] That’s interesting, I never even thought about that because their records are virtually identical aren’t they?

While Olivia acknowledged her recommendations were biased, she believed they were warranted because it counter-balanced what she felt were “extenuating circumstances in [Aboriginal students’] life history.”

Reyna (2000) suggests that people holding external/stable/uncontrollable stereotypes are more apt to offer their stereotyped targets assistance through means such as “affirmative action, social programs, or even individualized assistance” (p.102). While increasing opportunities for Aboriginal students is a worthy endeavour, this too can have negative consequences. Overzealous teachers—in their attempts to create some “equilibrium within the educational system” or in effort to appear “unbiased” or “not racist”—may place lower achieving students at a level for which they may be unprepared. A student placed at a higher level than their achievement warrants may struggle, become discouraged, and disengage from the classroom. Reyna cautions, “The buffering effects of external attributions can also backfire when it comes to making attributions for positive outcomes.” If high-achieving Aboriginal students feel their success is only acknowledged because of who they are and not because of what they have achieved, they may be less inclined to believe in their ability. Students will only benefit from positive evaluations if they feel their achievement is worthy of recognition and not as serving an alternative agenda, however admirable the intention.

In addition, the same “extenuating circumstances” that may seemingly benefit one Aboriginal student, may be detrimental to another. For example, while Olivia opts to place a high-middle performing Aboriginal student in an advanced classroom because of her perception that the student has achieved despite perceived adverse circumstances, Olivia later opts to switch Minnie Skwistwugh (a low-performing Aboriginal student) from a regular class to a supplementary learning assistance class because of the same “extenuating circumstances.” It could be that low-achieving Aboriginal students are at a double disadvantage if teachers perceive
these students as needing not only to boost their achievement but also needing to overcome adverse life circumstances.

**Mistaken Attributions Leading to Stereotypes**

All 21 teachers agreed that factors outside the classroom could influence a student’s achievement. Teachers wished to “know more about” the student because they felt these factors provide an indication of the most appropriate placement. Family background, socio-economic status, maturity, behaviour, work ethic, leadership skills, assertiveness, and neatness were all identified as factors *beyond academic ability* that could influence student achievement and/or placement. Students perceived as “lacking” with regards to any of these qualities were deemed as having less potential to succeed in school.

a) *External/stable/uncontrollable: Family and socio-economic status*

Teachers who assumed Aboriginal students came from more adverse life circumstances than their non-Aboriginal peers were more inclined to inquire about the learner’s family background. For example, Stephanie consistently wanted additional information on the family background of high-achieving Aboriginal students. This was not asked of their high-achieving, non-Aboriginal peers. This may be due to a strong belief in the influence “family” has upon a student’s educational success combined with pre-conceived notions of Aboriginal learners’ life circumstances. When looking at Hubie’s record card, she remarks:

> He’s self-identified as an Aboriginal kid but he’s, you know, often Aboriginal kids struggle but he’s done really, really well. I would urge him, I would probably put him in the rapid advance or at least recommend him but without knowing the family history, it’s really hard to say for sure. I mean, as a teacher myself, I would always look in the family history and whether the student wanted to do, you know, I think, knowing kids have gone through something like rapid advance, we don’t call it that here but, it’s very tough on them, and if they don’t have the family support and the family help, they sometimes fall by the way side.

Derek expresses a similar desire to explore the background of the two high-achieving Aboriginal students because of his interest in the influence a family’s socio-economic status may have upon a child’s learning. After examining two high-achieving Aboriginal student record cards, he inquires, “Um, can we imagine, is this an inner-city school these kids are at? Is it West end, East end, or does it...?” When asked to explain the importance of this information, he elaborates:

> Just ‘cause I know that socio-economic status does influence things. I’m just wondering ‘cause these two kids with the A+’s both have received some Aboriginal, you know, education or at least funded as such so I’m just wondering, sort of, what city they’re from, or if it even matters.

When asked where he imagines the students might be from, he responds:

> Well, that’s what I’m wondering ‘cause they’re both, so far the ones that I’ve put into the rapid advanced were Aboriginal kids and it’s like, I’ve never taught Aboriginal kids so it’s just, I know that, I know the [pause] kid’s family background and everything with
socio-economic status does influence, you know, how they, how they perform, so [pause], just curious.

Some teachers described parents of Aboriginal students as less interested in education. Sarah remarked that she was pleasantly surprised by the marks of high-achieving Aboriginal students. Reflecting upon why the high-achieving student record cards triggered such a response, she states:

You’re not use to seeing it necessarily from Aboriginal students, and the reasons why you’re not necessarily used to seeing it we don’t always know. Sometimes it’s family situations, or, um, you know, having parents who are professional or who value education. So, like, I taught up in the North too and it was really hard. You really notice the difference between the parents who value education and the parents who didn’t because it just showed so clearly in their children and how successful their children are.

A study by Hauser-Cram, Selchuk, and Stipek (2003) found that “when teachers believed the education-related values of parents differed from their own, they rated children as less competent academically and had lower expectations for their future academic success” (p. 818). Teachers may be less inclined to recommend high-achieving Aboriginal students to advanced classrooms if they assume Aboriginal students have less family support or a lower socio-economic status. They also may be more inclined to recommend low-achieving Aboriginal students to remedial classes.

b) Contradictions

While all teachers articulated a clear opposition to the negative stereotyping of Aboriginal peoples, their comments occasionally revealed the same stereotypes they opposed. For example, while Janet (a) ascribes the poor performance of Aboriginal students to negative external factors (“they’re just so stereotyped”/ “there a lot of bad stuff happening in the Aboriginal communities”) and, (b) expresses her belief in Aboriginal students’ capability to achieve (“If more Aboriginals...” /“Aboriginals can help themselves too...” and “If I was in the Aboriginal community, I would...”), making assertions that suggest an underlying perception that Aboriginal peoples could be extending more effort towards making positive change. While emphasizing her belief in the capacity Aboriginal people have for success, she remarks, “I also happen to know some really intelligent Aboriginal lawyers and things like that so I have maybe a different...I know smart Aboriginal people.” This assertion, intended to be positive, implies an exception. Finally, Janet speaks of her admiration for an Aboriginal businessman because he encourages Aboriginal bands to “not take handouts” and speculates that if Aboriginal youth “just see their drunk [sic] people all over the place, you [Aboriginal youth] start thinking, ‘That’s what we are. We’re just drunk people.’” Janet’s statements illustrate assumptions and stereotypes she has regarding Aboriginal peoples and what Aboriginal youth are exposed to. While Janet’s intentions may be well-meaning, the underlying assumptions are hurtful (and potentially harmful) as they perpetuate the same stereotypes she condemns. Teachers’ biases can be communicated through grades, assessments, and placement recommendations, but may also be indirectly implied through more subtle forms of language and behavioural cues directed towards that student (Brophy, 1983; Brophy & Good, 1974; Good & Nichols, 2001; Reyna, 2000; Weiner, 1995).
d) “Regular” vs. “Special” attribution

Record cards of non-Aboriginal, non-ESL student did not elicit as much commentary as those of Aboriginal or ESL students. On the rare occasion teachers referred to non-Aboriginal, non–ESL students, adjectives such as “normal,” “regular,” or “average” were used to describe students. One teacher referred to a female, non-ESL, non-Aboriginal student as being a “plain, old, regular student” in comparison her Aboriginal peer. In an educational system where the majority of teachers are White and middle class despite an increasingly diverse student body (Casteel, 2001; Schick, 2000a), White, middle class students may be at an advantage since they are more likely to be perceived by their teachers as the “norm” and familiar with the normative behaviours and values perpetuated by schools and expected by many of their teachers.

Figlio (2005) discovered that a cue as small as a student’s name could negatively influence a student’s score on standardized tests. His study revealed that students perceived as having “unique” or “unusual” names—frequently associated with non-White or lower-socio-economic families—received lower test scores than those with anglicized names perceived by teachers as “typical.” Echoing the findings of the Figlio experiment, this study revealed that while the anglicized names on the student record cards elicited no comments from all 21 teachers interviewed, names associated with Aboriginal and ESL students provoked commentary. Teachers were more likely to seek assistance in pronouncing names, comment upon the uniqueness of names, or speculate upon the student’s origin. Teachers’ statements revealed how small cues could result in bias placement recommendations that could lead to denied opportunities for certain groups of students.

Conclusions About Methodology

Of the 21 teachers interviewed, 11 teachers expressed discomfort at basing their recommendations on record cards alone. These teachers either explicitly stated that grades alone were not enough to determine accurate student placement or noted that anecdotal comments made by previous teachers would be more useful for decision-making. Teachers relayed that anecdotal responses would provide greater insight into students’ behaviour which was useful for determining: a) how well a student behaved in class; b) the maturity level of a student; c) the ability of the student to interact with their peers; d) student attendance; and e) opinions previous teachers had regarding the student’s potential to achieve. Thus, a positive remark by a student’s former teacher regarding the student’s academic capability might trigger what is referred to as the “halo effect” where a person is “influenced by the value of an already known, but objectively irrelevant attribute” (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995, p. 9). In this case, a student whose grades may be better suited for “regular classroom” placement may be moved to an advanced class if anecdotal comments by the previous teacher indicate a student’s potential to achieve at a higher level. Similarly, negative anecdotal comments may work against a student if a teacher placed a high value on a former teacher’s negative judgements. Merton (1948) speculated that if enough teachers expressed lowered expectations of certain groups of students, these perceptions could contribute to rising inequalities in education.

In the present study, teachers were more inclined to discuss the usefulness of anecdotal comments to assess the performance of ESL and Aboriginal students than their non-ESL, non-Aboriginal peers. These reactions illustrated the lower expectations that some teachers had of Aboriginal and ESL students. Comments suggesting a student be “monitored” could potentially be given more weight than actual achievement grades, which could result in more ESL and Aboriginal students being placed in remedial classes and fulfilling Merton’s prophecy.
Some teachers spoke of grades as having “alternative meanings.” These teachers felt that while grades may represent a student’s actual achievement, they could also be indicative of external factors such as the student’s effort in class, their interaction with peers or their ability to follow instructions. How much weight these external factors would have upon a student’s actual grade was dependent upon the teacher making the assessment. Some teachers regarded grades as “punitive” in nature because they believed grades could be used as reward or punishment for a student’s behaviour. For these teachers, anecdotal comments were seen as useful because it was believed that written assessments (as opposed to letter grades) would give teachers a more accurate impression of what the student was being assessed upon and therefore would be more transparent. Yet, when asked what student placement should be based upon, if not letter grades, teachers included the same behavioural traits letter grades were earlier criticized for either rewarding or punishing.

In conclusion, while it may be feasible that the grades displayed on a student’s record card reflect factors other than a student’s actual achievement, the same could be said of anecdotal comments. Teachers who declared that assessment based on grades alone was limiting because grades did not include aspects such as a student’s family background, work ethic, or leadership potential were often the same teachers who argued that grades were limiting precisely because of their potential to be based upon factors outside of a students’ academic ability. These teachers were simultaneously critical of grades for both considering and not considering factors outside the realm of academic ability.

Conclusions About Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices

All teachers interviewed had a desire to do well for their students. Even teachers who made overtly biased recommendations did so with the best of intentions. But good intentions do not grant university access (Pidgeon, 2008) or occupational success. While teachers may feel sympathy towards students perceived as having difficulties at home or being from a lower economic class standing, research demonstrates that stigma associated with families presumed to be of lower economic status, separated, divorced, and/or single parent families may also be projected onto the student’s perceived ability to achieve educational success (Dunne & Gazely, 2008; Feiler & Webster, 1999; Georgiou, 2008).

In a study of teachers’ predictions of young children’s literacy success or failure, Feiler and Webster (1999) observed that teachers were more likely to base decisions about students on limited social and behavioural cues such as who the student’s parents were or the socio-economic status of the family rather than on a rational, systematic basis. These findings suggest that teachers’ who presume students from less affluent neighborhoods lead more difficult lives or presume a student’s home life must be unbearable may be more inclined to make assessment decisions based on misattributions rather than on the student’s actual ability. While some teachers may willing to offer assistance to students they perceive as victims of adverse life circumstances, the same students may also be subject to stereotypical associations that leave the teacher either consciously or subconsciously questioning the student’s potential to achieve.

So what to do about it? Research indicates that teachers are unlikely to change their behaviour unless they recognize there is a need for behavioural change to be made (Cabello & Burstein, 1995; Moodley, 1999). Many teachers enter the profession because they envision that they can make a positive change. When teachers’ sensibilities and beliefs are “challenged,” as they may feel in some anti-racist and social justice programs, they may be inclined to retreat from or reject the ideas of the class altogether (Earick, 2009; Schick & St. Denis, 2005). In their article Examining teachers' beliefs about teaching in culturally diverse classrooms, Cabello and
Burstein (1995) observed that teachers were likely to reject new information or training if it conflicted with their conceptual framework. The authors found that while many teachers’ programs often focus on trying to alter teachers’ and students’ belief systems, beliefs were more likely to change as a result of their personal experience. They found that teachers were more apt to change their attitudes and behaviour if they had been given the opportunity to implement a procedure that they later found useful (p. 286). Cabello and Burstein’s observations highlight the importance of experiential knowledge when addressing difference in the classroom. Without practical experience, Cabello and Burstein suggest teachers “have little to reflect upon” (p. 286), whereas teachers who are able to identify a reason for changing their behaviour as well as for being able see the positive influence their behaviour modification has upon their learners may be more inclined to modify their behaviour accordingly.

Teachers who fundamentally do not believe there is a necessity for change may be unwilling to put newly acquired knowledge into practice. Their discomfort with the ideas raised in classes may be disregarded unless it can be demonstrated that the need for change is real. Studies such as this one provide teachers with direct insight into how the stereotypes and biases we all hold directly influence the way we interact and the way we potentially evaluate our students. Having this information may provide teachers with a greater incentive to want to learn about their stereotypes and biases. In her research on racially equitable teaching, Earick (2006) asserts:

Keeping and discussing critical racial incidents in our educational settings focuses teachers on what they are doing rather than what they perceive they are doing and becomes the self-reflective component to RET (racially equitable teaching). Once authentic scholars, administrators, and practitioners provide us with racially authentic research, pedagogy, and methods, and alliances are formed to identify and mentor teachers in the use of racially authentic materials, teachers can self-reflect personally and collectively through the use of critical incidents based on race. (p. 123)

Teachers who consistently apply both the macro-theories of critical race and Whiteness with the micro-theories of attribution, stigma, and stereotyping to their classroom practice and see for themselves the positive effect these theories can have over their student placement recommendations may be more convinced of the intrinsic value the combined theories have to offer since even mildly disconfirming evidence may lead people to readjust their initial expectations.

Conclusions About Policies for Professional Development

This study’s findings indicate that teachers’ student placement decisions can be influenced by arbitrary factors such as a student’s race, ethnicity, family background, socio-economic status, and English-speaking ability. Findings also demonstrate that teachers are not always aware of the biases they hold or the influence they have upon learners.

After having attended the Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement Program in Los Angeles, educational researchers Good & Nichols (2001) observed that what teachers reported as useful was having the opportunity to see other teachers achieving positive results with students perceived as being ‘low-achieving’ (p. 123). Teachers reported that having the opportunity to see teachers obtaining higher-quality responses from students originally perceived as low-achievers reaffirmed their commitment.

The creation of a national database of schools from all regions of Canada could provide
teachers with an on-line network of support by providing access to successful school initiatives, new resources, project outcomes, research and readings, and video clips that showcase principals, teachers, and schools who have experienced success in the areas of student motivation, community partnership development, and/or raising student outcomes (as defined by academic achievement, participation, and/or community involvement). This may work as a way to inspire consistent re-evaluation and motivation within the profession. The database could also provide a forum in which collaborative work among teachers, researchers, and community leaders within districts could be facilitated and annual conferences and workshops about these issues could be promoted. By enabling teachers to become active participants in the process of identifying solutions to address problems within the school, teachers may be more apt to take an interest in the various policies and procedures introduced into the educational system and less likely to view new strategies as a challenge to their competence as teachers.

Research Limitations and Next Steps

One lesson learned from this study was the risk involved in making generalizations. This is true about generalizations made from this study. This study consisted of in-service teachers from an urban centre in Western Canada. More research will need to be conducted throughout various regions across Canada to determine if similar studies would garner similar results. Other limitations were the scope of information that was included within the student record cards and the data collected. Status variables such as student income or geographical location were not included in this study but may also influence teacher decisions. Ideally, future studies will investigate the relationship between these factors and teachers’ judgment.

Finally, the purpose of this study was to determine how teachers, irrespective of their background, justified the recommendations they made regarding students of different race, gender, and ethnicity. Out of consideration for participant confidentiality, identifying features such as the participants’ racial or ethnic background was neither stated nor requested. Further studies might consider whether teachers’ decisions regarding students vary across race, ethnicity, or gender lines. Future research might also consider whether variance exists between teachers with experience working on-reserve or in schools with a large population of Aboriginal students and those teachers who do not.

Conclusion

Gillborn (2006) suggests that strategies to combat discrimination in the classroom need to move “away from endless debates about intent by insisting upon a focus on the outcomes of actions and processes” (p. 8). For teachers, this may mean allocating more time for reflection and reasoning regarding the decisions made about their assessments of their students. Awareness of how combined theories of stereotyping and attribution operate may help teachers to examine their decisions and their reasons for those decisions. Teachers familiar with the combined theories of stereotyping and attribution may: a) better understand the ways discrimination may manifest in the classroom and, thus, be less likely to discriminate; b) carefully consider the attributions made about students’ successes or failures; c) understand how personal beliefs or values may lead to the denial of student opportunities; and d) recognize and challenge their own stereotypical perceptions and those of others.
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Appendix

Table 1.

*Teachers’ current grade level(s) and number of years taught.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>GRADE TAUGHT</th>
<th># OF YRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>16 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Grade 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>25 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>18 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Special Education 8-12</td>
<td>3.5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>Grades 8-10</td>
<td>35 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Grade 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Grade 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>24 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>16 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Grade 2 &amp; 6</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>16 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronique</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>18 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

*Grade levels of fictional student record cards.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Aboriginal Students</th>
<th>ESL Students</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lowest Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minnie Skwistwugh</td>
<td>Sharmeen Aziz</td>
<td>Tracey E. Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>James D. Manuell</td>
<td>Kyun-Yin (S) Poon</td>
<td>Brooks J. Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Middle Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Jean Billie</td>
<td>Nisha A. Advani</td>
<td>Jenna S. Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>John Koitleamugh</td>
<td>Abdul Farooq</td>
<td>Christopher A. Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Middle Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Irene Battiste</td>
<td>Tao Li</td>
<td>Melissa J. Doyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Thomas Mraiteskel</td>
<td>Nabil Hasan</td>
<td>Jamie M. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Rosalind Wallace</td>
<td>Young-Ja Park</td>
<td>Michael Remmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Hubie Jack</td>
<td>Hiromasa (M) Morika</td>
<td>Tammy L. Field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Teachers’ student record card placements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ names</th>
<th>Low/Middle Achievement</th>
<th>High/Middle Achievement</th>
<th>High A Achievement</th>
<th>Supplemental Program</th>
<th>Regular Program</th>
<th>Rapid Advance Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Darren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel (AM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnie Stivishburg (AF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyun-Yin (Stanley)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poon (ESLM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharmeen Aziz (ESLF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holeman (AM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Bille (AF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdulfarosq (ESLM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisha Arjan Advani (ESLF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mrateskei (AM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Battiste (FA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabil Hassan (ESLM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tao Li (ESLF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Mathew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Janette Doyle (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubie Jack (AM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalind Wallace (FA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiromasa (Murry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marika (ESLM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young-Ja Park (ESLF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Lyn Field (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Supplemental Program = S Regular Program = R Rapid Advance Program = A
Figure 1. Female, Aboriginal student record card (low-range).

![Student Record Card](image)

**Permanent Record - Intermediate Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name: Skwistwugh</th>
<th>Minnie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Family Name)</td>
<td>(Given Name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy)</td>
<td>11/04/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>Female: X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as Second Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Education</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Record</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediate achievement:**
- A = Excellent; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; U = Unsatisfactory
Figure 2. Female, ESL student record card (low range).

![Permanent Record - Intermediate Grades](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as Second Language</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Record</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intermediate achievement:

A = Excellent; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; U = Unsatisfactory
Figure 3. Female, non-Aboriginal, non-ESL student record card (low range).