Check for updates

Research Article

American Sociological Association

Sociology of Education
2022, Vol. 95(4) 302–319
© American Sociological Association 2022
DOI: 10.1177/00380407221119746
journals.sagepub.com/home/soe

SAGE

Stereotype Promise: Racialized Teacher Appraisals of Asian American Academic Achievement

Keitaro Okura[1]

Abstract

Asian American students are frequently stereotyped to be hardworking and academically talented. To what extent are teacher appraisals of Asian students influenced by such racial stereotypes? This article investigates this question through a quantitative analysis of high school students from the Educational Longitudinal Study. I find that even when controlling for a wide range of student and family characteristics, including standardized test scores, and comparing students within the same school, high school teachers express more favorable appraisals of Asian students relative to academically comparable White students along three dimensions. First, teachers report more positive assessments of Asian students' attentiveness and performance in their classrooms. Second, they hold higher expectations for Asian students' future educational attainment, typically expecting a college degree or more. Third, they are more likely to recommend Asian students for Advanced Placement and honors courses, signaling one concrete action by which teachers may act as gatekeepers to further reify Asian students' academic success. Importantly, I find that math teachers remain more likely to engage in such behaviors net of their own subjective evaluations of student attitudes and behaviors, lending suggestive evidence to the claim that Asian youth benefit from racialized teacher expectations. The results more broadly suggest that differential teacher appraisals are a source of educational inequality across racial groups in the United States.

Keywords

teacher appraisals, racial stereotypes, Asian Americans, academic achievement, educational expectations, educational inequality

Scholars have long argued that schools play a key role in reproducing, if not engendering, racial inequality in the United States. Examples of ''school effects'' linked to educational disparities include tracking and curriculum differentiation (Irizarry 2021; Lucas, Molina, and Towey 2020), student body composition (Reardon and Owens 2014), classroom sizes (Funkhouser 2009), school expenditures (Rauscher and Shen 2022; Wenglinsky 1997), and peer effects (Crosnoe and Muller 2014).[1] An important component of this research on school effects focuses on the role of teachers—and their divergent expectations for students—in exacerbating inequalities in schooling outcomes. This line of research follows Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), who found that exogenously manipulated teacher expectations for students had significant effects on students' academic outcomes. Subsequent studies have built on this provocative finding by arguing that racial achievement gaps can partially be accounted for by teachers holding lower expectations for minority

[1]Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA

Corresponding Author:
Keitaro Okura, Yale University, 493 College St, New Haven, CT 06520, USA.
Email: Keitaro.okura@yale.edu

students (Gershenson, Holt, and Papageorge 2016; Ross and Jackson 1991).

Prior research has examined racialized teacher perceptions as they affect Black and Hispanic youth, yet few studies have considered the other end of the spectrum: Teachers may hold *positive* academic appraisals for Asian American students net of their actual performance. This could occur because Asian Americans are often typecast as a ''model minority'' and widely presumed to be academically gifted, studious, and disciplined (Chou and Feagin 2010; Lee 2009). Such assumptions, in turn, could enhance Asian students' educational achievement and eventual attainment. This hypothesis, known as the ''stereotype promise'' theory, contends that positive assumptions about the academic performance of Asian Americans may lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of reified high educational achievement (Lee and Zhou 2015; Ochoa 2013; Shih et al. 2002).

Empirical examinations of this question have yielded valuable insights, but they suffer two key limitations. First, they often draw on qualitative data on a limited sample of Asian Americans who live in specific locations (e.g., southern California), raising questions about the generalizability of their findings. Second, they rely, at least in part, on reports from Asian students about how *they think* their teachers racially profile them, making it unclear what their teachers actually think or whether teacher perceptions are simply accurate. This article overcomes these limitations by utilizing a nationally representative dataset that includes detailed information on high school students, including evaluations from their math and English teachers. I argue that the Asian advantage in teacher appraisals that persists net of a range of relevant characteristics may be attributed to the influence of widespread racial stereotypes.

I draw on the Educational Longitudinal Study (ELS) of 2002 to examine whether 10th-grade math and English teachers express favorable appraisals of Asian youth. I control for a wide range of student and family characteristics, such as standardized test scores and socioeconomic status, and compare students within schools utilizing fixed effects. I find evidence that teachers may contribute to stereotype promise along three dimensions. First, high school teachers are more likely to report favorable *assessments* of Asian students by describing them as highly attentive and proficient students in their classroom relative to academically comparable White students. Second, teachers hold greater long-term educational *expectations* (e.g., obtaining a college degree or more) for Asian students, suggesting they attribute more academic potential and determination to Asian students than to White students. Third, teachers are more likely to *recommend* Asian students for Advanced Placement (AP) or honors courses. This not only reflects teachers' purported attitudes toward students, but it offers a concrete instance of differential teacher behavior from which racial disparities may emerge. I further find that high school math teachers remain more likely to recommend Asian students for honors courses even when accounting for their *own* subjective evaluations of students, lending powerful evidence to the argument that Asian students benefit from stereotyped academic presumptions that exist net of their ''objective'' academic ability and pro-school characteristics.

Prior studies on race and teacher expectations almost exclusively focus on negative racial biases and the lower educational outcomes of Black and Hispanic youth; the studies that seek to explain Asian students' academic achievement primarily point toward their home environment. This article addresses the gap in the dual narratives by proposing that the school environment, specifically through racialized teacher appraisals, may help generate the Asian advantage in academics.

HOW TEACHER EXPECTATIONS SHAPE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

How do schools shape inequities in racial outcomes? Many studies have focused on the potential role of teachers, who are central players in the educational system (Cobb 2017). This insight goes back to a classic experimental study in which Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) told elementary school teachers that certain students were ''intellectual bloomers'' based on their test results and would show great improvements in comparison to their classmates. In reality, these ''bloomers'' were randomly selected and differed only in the expectations the researchers told the teachers to have for them. Nevertheless, when the students were tested again, those designated as ''bloomers'' showed statistically significant gains in their test performance over those in the control group. Rosenthal and Jacobson thus argued that teacher expectations for their students can have

powerful effects on students' subsequent academic outcomes.

Studies investigating the relationship between teacher expectations and student outcomes have since proliferated. In their review of the literature, Timmermans, Rubie-Davies, and Rjosk (2018) observe that although teachers are generally accurate in their expectations for their students, teacher bias does favor students from more affluent families, and teachers have lower expectations for special needs students (Cameron and Cook 2013; Jussim and Harber 2005). A subset of these teacher expectation studies focus on how teachers are influenced by racial biases toward minority, particularly Black, youth that negatively affect their assessments (Bergh et al. 2010; Copur-Gencturk et al. 2020; Ferguson 2003; Minor 2014). For instance, one study utilizing a survey experiment found that teachers graded student writing samples lower when associated with a Black relative to a White student (Quinn 2020). Many studies relying on observational data report similar findings, with teacher expectations generally disadvantaging Black and, to a lesser extent, Hispanic youth relative to White and Asian students (Hughes, Gleason, and Zhang 2005; McKown and Weinstein 2008). In a similar vein, racialized teacher expectations can also have indirect effects on academic performance. For instance, Okonofua and Eberhardt (2015) report that teachers are more likely to view Black than White students as exhibiting patterns of misbehavior and are more likely to assign harsher punishments to Black students for the same infractions. Disparate school discipline can lead to disparities in academic outcomes, for example, if Black students are more likely to be suspended for the same misbehaviors and thus miss valuable class time (Morris and Perry 2016; Welch and Payne 2010; Wildeman et al. 2017).

Research shows that teacher expectations can operate as self-fulfilling prophecies (Rubie-Davies et al. 2014). For instance, teachers typically convey their expectations for students they hold in high regard by calling on them more frequently to answer questions, offering more challenging resources, being more likely to praise them, and interacting with them more frequently while doing the opposite for students for whom they have low expectations (Brophy and Good 1970). Students, in turn, may recognize their teachers' high (or low) expectations through such differential treatment and react accordingly: Students may become more (or less) engaged with their schoolwork, which helps reify the original expectation.

ASIAN AMERICAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Asian American students provide an intriguing point of comparison in this literature on racialized teacher assessments because of their exceptional academic success in the United States. In comparison to other racial and ethnic groups (including White youth), Asian youth obtain better grades, achieve higher standardized test scores, and complete more advanced courses (Fejgin 1995; Mau 1997; Sanchirico 1991; Zhou and Bankston 1994); they are also more likely to finish high school, attend college, and enroll in elite educational institutions (Kao and Thompson 2003; Tran, Guo, and Huang 2020).

Yet to explain this phenomenon of Asian American academic achievement, scholars have rarely considered the role of the school environment (Goyette and Xie 1999); instead, prior work points to the pro-school characteristics of Asian students. For instance, scholars have argued that Asian students academically outperform White students simply because they exert more academic effort (Hsin and Xie 2014). Studies have also documented how Asian American students engage in behaviors that strongly predict better school outcomes: They spend more time doing homework, attend more educational lessons outside of school, and spend fewer hours watching television or playing video games (Chen and Stevenson 1995; Dandy and Nettelbeck 2002; Peng and Wright 1994).

Such dispositions of Asian students are often traced back to their home (specifically parental) influences. For instance, Asian parents provide more educational investments at home even when accounting for disparities in socioeconomic backgrounds (Kao 1995; Sun 1998). Asian parents are also more likely to enroll their children in supplementary schooling, including SAT/ACT preparation courses, which help boost their academic achievement and test scores (Byun and Park 2011). Moreover, Asian parents convey high educational expectations for their children by emphasizing the importance of excelling in schoolwork to realize future occupational goals. Past literature provides robust evidence of a strong relationship

between parental expectations and student outcomes and shows that these relationships differ between racial groups (Kao and Thompson 2003; Yamamoto and Holloway 2010). Asian youth, in turn, may respond to their parents' expectations by mirroring high expectations for themselves. Indeed, Asian American families often have rigid academic expectations for their children, such as obtaining perfect grades, graduating high school as a valedictorian, and gaining admission into an elite university (Lee and Zhou 2015). These studies provide compelling evidence that the family environment plays a key role in Asian students' high academic achievement.

STEREOTYPE PROMISE

What remains relatively unexplored is how the school environment may simultaneously play a role in enhancing Asian youths' academic outcomes. This article inverts the logic of prior research on racialized teacher expectations: Rather than consider how teachers may hold negative racial biases and stereotypes regarding Black and Hispanic youth, I examine whether teachers hold positive racial stereotypes of Asian students as diligent, highly accomplished, and with significant potential for future academic progression and attainment.

These positive stereotypes, even if untrue or exaggerated, could help reify Asian students' high academic achievement, much like negative racial stereotypes can contribute to the lower academic performance of Black Americans (Steele and Aronson 1995). In an illustrative ethnographic study of a high school in southern California, Ochoa (2013) reported that teachers and administrators propagated biological and cultural ideologies that placed Asian Americans as smart and hardworking in contrast to Hispanic students. She argued that Asian students' privileged academic position in this racialized school system granted them unequal access to school resources, distinct peer groups, and leniency in the policing of student (mis)behavior.

In a similar vein, Lee and Zhou (2015) argue that the widespread assumptions of Asian academic predisposition and talent create a self-fulfilling prophecy in which Asian students' actual achievements are enhanced. They point to interviews with Chinese and Vietnamese Americans living in Los Angeles who believed their teachers' stereotypes of Asian students positively affected the grades they received, the extra help they were offered with their coursework, and their likelihood of being placed into gifted programs and competitive academic tracks. Moreover, respondents believed these racialized teacher expectations pressured them to work harder, which may have further boosted their actual academic achievement.

These studies offer nuanced insights into the ways racialized assumptions and ideologies permeate the U.S. schooling system, but it remains unclear to what extent these findings are generalizable beyond the specific context of southern California. This prior work also relies on reports from Asian students, making it uncertain whether such judgments align with teachers' *actual* beliefs and actions. Moreover, it is possible that teacher attitudes are based on *accurate* perceptions of student academic competence and ability and that Asian students do not benefit from systematic racial bias. This article addresses these limitations by drawing on a nationally representative dataset of high school students in the United States that contains rich data collected from students, their parents, and their teachers.

Drawing on these data, I examine whether Asian students are advantaged in their appraisals from math and English teachers relative to comparable White students. I consider a wide range of covariates to account for the possibility that teachers express higher opinions of Asian students simply because they *are* objectively better students. However, I hypothesize that Asian students' advantage in teacher appraisals will remain robust to theoretically informed traits because prior work does not account for the possibility of racialized teacher expectations. That is, math and English high school teachers may express favorable perceptions of Asian students in part because they are influenced by commonly held racial stereotypes.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Data

This study draws on data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002, a survey of a nationally representative cohort of approximately 16,000 students beginning in their sophomore year of high school and covering the transition into postsecondary education and the labor force. The ELS is the

second most recent high school cohort study conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics. The ELS is unique in collecting detailed survey data about not only students and their parents but also their math and English teachers.[2]

The ELS used a stratified, two-stage random sample design; 750 schools were randomly selected first, and 10th-grade students were then randomly selected within each school. Each student is matched to their math and English teacher, but the data do not contain unique teacher identifiers. ELS also administered standardized math and reading tests for all students in the baseline year, which provide a norm-referenced measurement of achievement that yields a more objective assessment of student ability relative to measures like GPA.

Dependent Variables

I focus on four key measures of student appraisals derived from the teacher survey: (1) level of student attentiveness in the classroom, (2) whether a student has ''fallen behind'' or is performing adequately in their schoolwork, (3) the teacher's long-term educational expectations for the student, and (4) whether the teacher recommended a student for advanced or honors courses. I conceptualize the first two variables as capturing teacher *assessments* of students' academic diligence and performance in the classroom environment. The third variable captures teacher *expectations* regarding students' future academic attainment. The honors *recommendation* query is valuable because it allows me to examine not only teachers' alleged attitudes but also a concrete form of differential behavior. All four of these student assessment survey questions were asked of both math and English teachers.[3]

Classroom attentiveness. Teachers were asked to rate the students in their classroom as being attentive ''all of the time'' (29 percent), ''most of the time'' (46 percent), ''some of the time'' (19 percent), ''rarely'' (5 percent), or ''never'' (1 percent). For my analyses, I created a dummy variable to contrast students in the ''all of the time'' category with the other groups merged.[4]

Adequate performance. Teachers were also asked to assess whether a student had ''fallen behind in schoolwork.'' Both math and English teachers answered ''no'' for about two-thirds of the students (i.e., they believed the student was at least ''performing adequately'') and answered in the affirmative for the remaining one-third of students. I use this binary variable (1 = performing adequately, 0 = fallen behind) to capture teacher assessments of student academic performance in the current classroom context.

College expectations. The survey also asked teachers to conjecture how much educational attainment they expected their students to achieve in the future. I recategorize this variable into a dummy category indicating either 1 = expecting a college degree or more or 0 = expecting less than a college degree. Both math and English teachers indicated expectations for more than a bachelor's degree for roughly 55 percent of their students and less than a bachelor's degree for the remaining 45 percent. I opt for a binary rather than a continuous measure in my analyses because college attainment is a widely recognized, meaningful threshold for educational achievement.[5]

Honors recommendation. Teachers indicated if they had recommended students for AP courses or academic honors. In my analytic sample, math teachers recommended about a sixth of their students for honors, and English teachers recommended roughly a fifth of their students. I use this variable (1 = recommended, 0 = not recommended) to help capture a valuable *behavioral* (rather than simply attitudinal) measure of teacher appraisal.

Independent Variables

Student characteristics. I control for a range of variables that may confound the relationship between student race and teacher assessments. These threats to inference can be theoretically grouped into three categories: student, family, and school characteristics. Student-level attributes, such as academic achievement and the amount of effort invested in schooling, may help explain racial differences in teacher appraisals. To address this issue, I control for students' math and reading standardized test performance as administered by the ELS. These scores provide an estimate of student achievement relative to the population as a whole (Spring 2002 10th graders).

I also account for a range of other student characteristics that could plausibly influence teacher perceptions of student performance, such as the number of hours students reported spending on homework, watching television, and playing video games, as well as students' native language, immigrant-generation status, whether they enjoyed attending school, and students' ratings of how much they value education and the importance of finding steady employment. I also factor in student demographic traits (i.e., age, race, and sex).

Family characteristics. I include a composite measure of students' family socioeconomic status derived from five equally weighted, standardized components: father's education, mother's education, family income, father's occupation, and mother's occupation. I also add measures of parental expectations and aspirations for their children's educational attainment, and I account for concrete parental behaviors that could plausibly be related to teacher assessments: whether they belonged to a parent-teacher organization, how often they discussed report cards with their children, and whether they gave advice regarding selecting courses and discussed plans for college entrance exams.[6]

School characteristics. I account for school-level differences by utilizing school fixed effects in the final models. I can thus account for potential variations across schools that may relate to teacher assessments, such as rigor of coursework, teacher quality, and the socioeconomic and racial composition of the student body. Importantly, this allows me to examine the relationship between student race and teacher appraisals among students in the same school.

Analytic Strategy

The final sample is restricted to students who self-identified as non-Hispanic White (9,030), Asian (1,590), Black or African American (2,170), or Hispanic without race specified (1,090). This yields an overall sample size of 13,870.[7] Although I focus here on teacher perceptions of Asian students, I include assessments of Black and Hispanic students to examine whether prior findings are supported with the ELS data. Consistency in the expected results—specifically an Asian advantage and Black/Hispanic disadvantage relative to White students—would lend credibility to the present study and its data.

To avoid bias associated with listwise deletion, I use a multiple imputation strategy with chained equations to account for missing data (Rubin 1976). Unlike other imputation strategies, such as taking the mean or median of existing data points to substitute missing data, multiple imputation allows me to utilize the distribution of the observed data to estimate multiple possible values for each missing data point. In the regression analyses, I imputed 10 datasets and calculated the estimates and standard errors by pooling together the results. I do not impute missing values of dependent variables (von Hippel 2007). Comparing imputed and nonimputed means in Table 1 indicates that covariates are largely unchanged by imputation. Importantly, regression analyses based on listwise deletion (available in the online supplement) yield findings that are substantively similar in coefficients, albeit less powered due to the loss of sample size.

I estimate linear probability models (LPMs) to evaluate each of the four binary dependent variables of interest. The coefficients in LPMs are interpreted as changes in probability. I use LPMs over logistic regression because probabilities are more intuitive to describe and compare than odds ratios. Substituting the models presented with logistic regression presents consistent findings. These results are also available in the online supplement.

For each of the four outcome variables of interest, I estimate five models. I begin with a simple model that regresses each teacher appraisal by student age, race, and sex. I then build on this model sequentially to investigate how each theoretically informed vector of covariates may influence the focal relationship of interest. The second model adds a key control variable: standardized math and reading test scores. The third model accounts for student characteristics. The fourth model controls for parent and family characteristics. Finally, the fifth model incorporates school fixed effects. This analytic model can be simply written as

$$Y = \beta_1 Race + \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \boldsymbol{X} + \alpha_j + \epsilon,$$

where Y represents the teacher appraisal measures for individual students. The main parameter of interest is β_1, which captures the association between racial minority status (Asian, Black, and Hispanic) and high school teacher appraisals

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics by Students' Race (Imputed and Nonimputed, Weighted).

	n	White (9,030)	Asian (1,590)	Black (2,170)	Hispanic (1,080)
(M) Always attentive	10,840	.30 (.30)	.42 (.42)	.17 (.17)	.22 (.22)
(M) Adequate performance	10,900	.68 (.68)	.72 (.72)	.52 (.52)	.54 (.54)
(M) College expectation	10,320	.56 (.56)	.72 (.72)	.34 (.34)	.36 (.36)
(M) Honors recommend	9,790	.18 (.18)	.32 (.32)	.09 (.09)	.10 (.10)
(E) Always attentive	10,270	.27 (.27)	.39 (.39)	.18 (.08)	.23 (.23)
(E) Adequate performance	10,370	.67 (.67)	.75 (.75)	.52 (.52)	.52 (.52)
(E) College expectation	9,860	.57 (.57)	.73 (.73)	.37 (.37)	.36 (.36)
(E) Honors recommend	9,220	.25 (.25)	.31 (.31)	.11 (.11)	.11 (.11)
Age	13,870 (12,040)	15.64 (15.64)	15.56 (15.56)	15.79 (15.79)	15.71 (.03)
Female	13,870 (12,100)	.50 (.50)	.48 (.48)	.49 (.01)	.51 (.02)
Math test score	13,870 (12,100)	52.74 (52.84)	54.00 (54.04)	43.85 (43.72)	44.90 (.33)
Reading test score	13,870 (12,100)	52.66 (52.75)	50.62 (50.65)	44.84 (44.70)	44.80 (.33)
Homework	13,870 (11,670)	10.34 (10.33)	12.10 (11.99)	8.59 (8.64)	9.36 (9.40)
Television	13,870 (11,200)	6.68 (6.65)	6.81 (6.82)	8.32 (8.37)	7.66 (7.61)
Computer/video games	13,870 (11,990)	2.77 (2.75)	2.81 (2.77)	3.57 (3.59)	3.14 (3.17)
Generation	13,870 (10,660)	2.92 (2.92)	1.72 (1.65)	2.83 (2.84)	2.02 (2.02)
Non-native speaker	13,870 (11,830)	.03 (.03)	.66 (.64)	.06 (.05)	.61 (.60)
Values education	13,870 (11,590)	2.79 (2.79)	2.85 (2.86)	2.88 (2.88)	2.85 (2.84)
Values work	13,870 (11,540)	2.84 (2.84)	2.79 (2.79)	2.83 (2.83)	2.77 (2.78)
Likes school	13,870 (11,690)	2.08 (2.08)	2.16 (2.15)	2.20 (2.20)	2.21 (2.21)
Student expectations	13,870 (10,760)	4.27 (4.33)	4.55 (4.59)	4.19 (4.22)	4.01 (4.03)
Family socioeconomic status	13,870 (12,100)	.16 (.16)	.02 (.03)	–.25 (–.26)	–.55 (–.54)
Parental expectations	13,870 (9,850)	3.98 (4.02)	4.59 (4.72)	4.14 (4.22)	4.21 (4.22)
Parental aspirations	13,870 (10,520)	4.35 (4.38)	4.82 (4.84)	4.67 (4.72)	4.49 (4.44)
Parent-teacher organization	13,870 (9,830)	.27 (.28)	.22 (.23)	.21 (.22)	.12 (.12)
Discuss report card	13,870 (9,940)	3.85 (3.86)	3.54 (3.55)	3.83 (3.82)	3.77 (3.78)
Advice course	13,870(9,960)	2.42 (2.42)	2.21 (2.19)	2.45 (2.46)	2.31 (2.31)
Advice college	13,870 (9,910)	2.07 (2.08)	2.15 (2.17)	2.26 (2.29)	2.04 (2.01)

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.

Note: Descriptive means are derived from the 10 imputed datasets. Nonimputed means and sample sizes are provided in the parentheses. The eight dependent variables were not imputed. For the nonimputed independent variables, I calculated descriptive means after retaining respondents who had a valid response value for at least one of the math (M) and English (E) teacher appraisals (i.e., excluding respondents who were missing all eight dependent measures).

relative to the baseline White category. I expect to find positive associations between the Asian coefficient and each of the teacher appraisal measures. Conversely, I expect to find negative associations between Black and Hispanic racial status and the teacher appraisal outcomes, which, although not the main focus of this article, would be consistent with prior studies on racialized teacher biases.

$\boldsymbol{X}$ represents a vector of control variables for the aforementioned set of student and family characteristics that may also be related to the main outcomes of interest. Parameter β_2 thus represents regression coefficients capturing how changes in the control variables are associated with teacher appraisals. Finally, α_j captures the school fixed effects. All the models utilize school-level clustering of standard errors because students attending the same school are not independent from one other.

I explore heterogeneity in results with subgroup analyses by ethnicity as available in the ELS: Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, South Asian, and South-East Asian. The results are generally consistent across all Asian ethnic subgroups, albeit less so for students with Japanese backgrounds, who also had the smallest sample size. I am unable to further analyze student outcomes of Asian ethnic groups within the ''South Asian'' (Asian Indian, Bangladeshi, and Sri Lankan) and ''South-East Asian'' (Vietnamese,

Cambodian/Kampuchean, Thai, and Burmese) categories because the ELS does not disaggregate this information.

RESULTS

Descriptive Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the math and English teacher appraisal variables and other covariates across racial groups. Asian students enjoy significant advantages in teacher appraisals across all four dependent measures of interest. For instance, math teachers assessed 42 percent of Asian students in their class to be always attentive, compared to only 30 percent of White students, 17 percent of Black students, and 22 percent of Hispanic students. The disparities are narrower but still consistent for perceptions of performing adequately in coursework. Math teachers expected nearly three-quarters (72 percent) of Asian students to obtain a college degree or more, compared to 56 percent of White students and 34 percent and 36 percent of Black and Hispanic students, respectively. The racial disparity is also pronounced for teacher recommendations: Math teachers were nearly 80 percent more likely to recommend Asian students for honors courses relative to White students (32 percent vs. 18 percent) and more than 3 times as likely over Black and Hispanic students (9 percent and 10 percent, respectively). English teachers' appraisals of students follow the same patterns, with Asian students maintaining a clear advantage over White students across all four measures of teacher appraisals.

Turning to the other variables in the model, Asian students maintain key academic advantages across several student characteristics. Most notably, Asian students reported spending an average of 12.1 hours on homework every week, compared to 10.3 hours for White students, 8.6 hours for Black students, and 9.4 hours for Hispanic students. Asian students also maintained an advantage in standardized math scores, scoring 54 compared to 52.7 for White students, 43.9 for Black students, and 44.9 for Hispanic students. For the standardized reading test, Asian students scored lower than White students (50.6 vs. 52.7). This disparity is likely because a significant portion of Asian students are nonnative English speakers: 66 percent reported that English was not their native language, compared to just 3 percent among White students. Yet *despite* scoring significantly lower on the reading exam and being far more likely to be a nonnative English speaker, Asian students, on average, still received higher evaluations across all four English teacher appraisal measures, including recommendation for honors courses.

Regarding parental and family characteristics, Asian students in the sample had higher socioeconomic backgrounds than Black and Hispanic students but were still considerably less privileged relative to White students. This gap, however, may be partially compensated for by significantly higher parental educational expectations and aspirations. Consistent with prior research, parents of racial minorities, especially Asian parents but also Black and Hispanic parents, had significantly higher educational expectations and aspirations for their children relative to White parents (Kao and Thompson 2003). Minority parents, however, were less likely than White parents to participate in parent-teacher organizations. This is likely due to a mix of social, economic, and cultural (e.g., language) barriers to participation. Other measures of parental engagement paint a more mixed picture. Asian parents spent less time talking to their children about their report cards and course selection relative to White parents, but they spent more time talking to them about college entrance exams.

Student Classroom Attentiveness and Performance

I now turn to the main regression models. Table 2 shows teacher assessments of students as always attentive in the classroom. Model 1 shows that math teachers are 11 percentage points more likely to view Asian students as always attentive relative to White students, controlling for demographics. This Asian advantage remains unchanged in Model 2, when accounting for math and reading standardized test scores, but it declines to 7 percentage points once I factor in a range of student characteristics, such as the number of hours students spend on homework. In Model 4, which incorporates various parent and family characteristics, including socioeconomic status, the Asian advantage persists at 7 percentage points. Finally, Model 5 includes school fixed effects. Math teachers are 10 percentage points more likely to perceive Asian students as

Table 2. Racial Differences in Math Teachers' Assessment of Classroom Attentiveness.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.11 (.02)***	.11 (.02)***	.07 (.02)***	.07 (.02)**	.10 (.02)***
Black	−.13 (.01)***	−.03 (.01)	−.05 (.01)***	−.06 (.01)***	−.05 (.02)**
Hispanic	−.07 (.02)***	.02 (.02)	−.01 (.02)	−.02 (.02)	−.02 (.02)
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed-effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 10,840. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
**$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table 3. Racial Differences in English Teachers' Assessment of Classroom Attentiveness.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.13 (.02)***	.14 (.02)***	.12 (.02)***	.11 (.02)***	.11 (.02)***
Black	−.09 (.01)***	.00 (.01)	−.02 (.01)	−.04 (.01)*	−.04 (.02)*
Hispanic	−.05 (.02)***	.03 (.02)	.01 (.02)	.00 (.02)	−.02 (.02)
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 10,270. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
*$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

always attentive students than comparable White students. This relationship is statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level.[8]

English teachers' assessments exhibit a similar pattern (see Table 3). Model 1 indicates that English teachers are 13 percentage points more likely to view Asian students as always attentive relative to White students, controlling only for demographics. Accounting for standardized test scores, student and parent measures, and school fixed effects does not meaningfully alter this distinct Asian advantage. In Model 5, English teachers are 11 percentage points more likely to perceive Asian students as always attentive.

Tables 4 and 5 explore another form of teacher assessment: whether math and English teachers perceive their students as performing adequately in their schoolwork. A positive coefficient for Asian racial status signals that teachers view Asian students as more likely to adequately keep up with coursework relative to White students. Model 5 of Tables 4 and 5 shows that math and English teachers are 4 and 5 percentage points more likely to regard Asian students as adequately performing in class after accounting for key characteristics and comparing students within schools.

These results suggest high school teachers report more positive appraisals of Asian students' attentiveness in the classroom relative to comparable White students. Controlling for various student and family characteristics sometimes decreased the margin of this advantage, but the Asian advantage remained resilient, perhaps in part because of racial presumptions that positively bias teacher

Table 4. Racial Differences in Math Teachers' Assessment of Adequate Performance.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.04 (.02)*	.03 (.02)*	−.01 (.02)	−.01 (.02)	.04 (.02)*
Black	−.15 (.02)***	−.03 (.02)*	−.06 (.02)***	−.08 (.02)***	−.07 (.02)***
Hispanic	−.16 (.02)***	−.05 (.02)*	−.08 (.02)***	−.09 (.02)***	−.06 (.02)*
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 10,900. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
*$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table 5. Racial Differences in English Teachers' Assessment of Adequate Performance.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.06 (.02)***	.06 (.02)***	.05 (.02)*	.04 (.02)	.05 (.02)*
Black	−.14 (.02)***	−.02 (.02)	−.05 (.01)**	−.06 (.02)***	−.06 (.02)**
Hispanic	−.14 (.02)***	−.04 (.02)	−.05 (.02)*	−.06 (.02)**	−.08 (.02)**
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed-effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 10,370. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

assessments of Asian students in the classroom environment (Lee and Zhou 2015; Ochoa 2013).

College Expectations

In Tables 6 and 7, I examine racial differences in math and English teachers' expectations of a college degree or more for their students. This measure is valuable because it captures teachers' prospective assessments of students' long-term academic potential. Model 1 shows that Asian students have a substantial advantage over their White peers in math and English teachers' college expectations for them. This advantage narrows as I factor in standardized test scores and student, parent, and school fixed effects, but Model 5 shows that math and English teachers are more likely to expect Asian students to attend college relative to White students (by 6 and 9 percentage points, respectively).

Although not the focus of this article, it is worth noting that teacher assessments of Black and Hispanic students generally point in the opposite direction. For instance, Model 5 of Tables 2 to 5 show that both math and English teachers are significantly less likely to perceive Black students as always attentive in the classroom and to regard them as *not* adequately performing. Teacher assessments of Hispanic students are not always statistically significant but point in the negative direction. Model 5 in Tables 6 and 7 points to significantly lower college expectations for Black and Hispanic students. These findings are consistent with prior studies that report teachers express lower academic assessments of minority,

Table 6. Racial Differences in Math Teachers' Expectations for College Attainment.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.13 (.02)***	.13 (.02)***	.05 (.02)**	.05 (.02)*	.06 (.02)***
Black	−.22 (.02)***	.02 (.01)	−.01 (.01)	−.03 (.02)	−.06 (.02)**
Hispanic	−.19 (.02)***	.02 (.02)	−.03 (.02)	−.03 (.02)	−.07 (.02)**
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 10,320. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table 7. Racial Differences in English Teachers' Expectations for College Attainment.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.15 (.02)***	.16 (.02)***	.11 (.02)***	.11 (.02)***	.09 (.02)***
Black	−.17 (.02)***	.04 (.02)*	.01 (.02)	.00 (.02)	−.05 (.02)**
Hispanic	−.19 (.02)***	.00 (.02)	−.03 (.02)	−.02 (.02)	−.09 (.02)***
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 9,860. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

particularly Black, youth in the United States (Copur-Gencturk et al. 2020; Ferguson 2003).

Recommendation for Honors Courses

The results thus far indicate that high school teachers have significantly more favorable assessments of Asian students in the classroom and that they are more likely to expect them to graduate from college. Do teachers act on these positive perceptions in ways that may enhance students' subsequent academic performance? I test for this hypothesis using a survey question that asked teachers whether they had recommended a student for AP or academic honors courses.

Model 1 of Tables 8 and 9 reveals that both math and English teachers are significantly more likely to recommend Asian students for honors courses than White students. Controlling for standardized test scores and various student, family, and school characteristics does not change this pattern. Model 5 shows that math and English teachers are more likely to recommend Asian students for advanced coursework than White students by 8 and 6 percentage points, respectively. This outcome variable is particularly important because it demonstrates that teachers do not simply maintain favorable *attitudes* toward Asian students but may also engage in *behaviors* that could boost subsequent academic outcomes (Long, Conger, and Iatarola 2012; Oakes 2005).

Table 8. Racial Differences in Math Teachers' Recommendation for Honors Courses.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.13 (.02)***	.12 (.02)***	.07 (.02)***	.07 (.02)***	.08 (.02)***
Black	−.09 (.01)***	.07 (.01)***	.06 (.01)***	.05 (.01)***	.02 (.01)
Hispanic	−.08 (.01)***	.06 (.01)***	.01 (.02)	.01 (.02)	−.00 (.02)
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 9,790. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table 9. Racial Differences in English Teachers' Recommendation for Honors Courses.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (reference = White)	.06 (.02)**	.09 (.02)***	.05 (.02)*	.04 (.02)	.06 (.02)*
Black	−.13 (.01)***	.02 (.01)	.00 (.01)	.02 (.01)	−.05 (.01)**
Hispanic	−.14 (.01)***	−.01 (.02)	−.03 (.02)*	−.04 (.02)*	−.06 (.02)***
Additional controls					
Demographics	x	x	x	x	x
Standardized test scores		x	x	x	x
Student characteristics			x	x	x
Family characteristics				x	x
School fixed effects					x

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: N = 9,220. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Consistent with previously observed patterns, math teachers are less likely to recommend Hispanic students for honors courses compared to White students. In Model 5, the coefficient for Black students is positive but not significant. English teachers hold more uniformly negative opinions of Black and Hispanic students. For instance, in Model 1 of Table 9, English teachers are 13 and 14 percentage points less likely to recommend Black and Hispanic students, respectively, for honors courses. Accounting for family characteristics and school fixed effects explains a large portion of this disadvantage, but it persists at significant levels in Model 5.

One critique of these models is that although they contain a wide range of covariates that help explain the relationship between race and teacher assessments, teachers may pick up subtle student characteristics that are unobserved in the data and confound the analysis. To address such concerns, I supplement the analyses by reestimating the model predicting honors recommendation and include the three other teacher appraisal measures (always attentive, performing adequately, and college expectation) as additional covariates. Such evaluations may help capture the hard-to-measure, unobserved student characteristics that inspire teachers to recommend Asian students for honors courses more often than their White counterparts with similar test scores and backgrounds.

Table 10 reveals that higher teacher appraisals in student attentiveness and college expectations

Table 10. Racial Differences in Teachers' Recommendation for Honors Courses Net of Teachers' Student Evaluations.

	Math Teachers	English Teachers
Asian (reference = White)	.07 (.02)**	.02 (.02)
Black	.03 (.02)**	−.03 (.01)*
Hispanic	.00 (.02)	−.00 (.02)
Teacher appraisals		
Attentiveness	.13 (.01)***	.17 (.02)***
Performance	.04 (.01)***	.03 (.01)**
Expectation	.10 (.01)***	.16 (.01)***
Additional controls		
Demographics	x	x
Standardized test scores	x	x
Student characteristics	x	x
Family characteristics	x	x
School fixed effects	x	x
N	8,980	8,320

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study 2002.
Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. This table includes three teacher appraisal measures as control variables to help predict honors recommendation.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

are substantively and positively associated with the likelihood of honors recommendation. For instance, students whom math teachers describe as always attentive are 13 percentage points more likely to be recommended for honors courses. However, even when accounting for these additional student evaluation measures, math teachers remain 7 percentage points more likely to recommend Asian students over White students for advanced coursework ($p < .01$).[9]

For English teachers, there is still a positive point estimate on the Asian coefficient, although it is no longer statistically different from White students. The finding that math teachers remain more likely to recommend Asian students for honors courses *net of their own subjective student evaluations* provides suggestive evidence that Asian students are favorably treated by teachers above and beyond their ''objective'' academic ability and pro-school characteristics.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the proposition that high school math and English teachers' appraisals of their students may be influenced by commonly espoused racial stereotypes in the United States. My analyses focus on Asian Americans, a racial minority group that has historically been associated with high academic performance. In the analytic models, I account for a wide range of student and family characteristics and school fixed-effects, and I find evidence for this hypothesis along three dimensions. First, high school math and English teachers are more likely to express positive *assessments* of Asian students as measured by their perceived attentiveness in the classroom relative to academically comparable White students. Second, I find that math and English teachers' *expectations* for a college degree or more favor Asian over White students. Finally, I find that teachers are more likely to *recommend* Asian students for AP and academic honors courses. Results for Black and Hispanic students compared to White students were generally reversed, as hypothesized and consistent with prior literature.

The finding that high school math and English teachers are more likely to recommend Asian students relative to White students for honors courses is significant because it captures a concrete *behavioral* difference in the way teachers treat students of different races. This is consequential because studies have shown that enrolling in advanced

courses is associated with key educational outcomes (Lucas et al. 2020). Indeed, if Asian students are uniquely advantaged in receiving a teacher recommendation for honors courses despite demonstrating similar academic ability, they will also likely be encouraged to take such advanced courses, which may aid their subsequent academic outcomes. In the long run, this suggests a greater likelihood of attending a four-year college, which in turn is associated with higher income and occupational outcomes. In other words, teachers may play a gatekeeping role that widens racial disparities not only in high school academic achievement but also in long-term socioeconomic attainment.

This study's findings are suggestive of a stereotype promise phenomenon. I argue that math and English high school teachers report more positive appraisals of Asian students than academically comparable White students because they are influenced by widespread societal stereotypes that typecast Asian students as academically hardworking and talented. I therefore contend that the high academic achievement of Asian American students may at least be partially attributed to teachers who help reify these stereotypes into reality. These findings also have broader implications for contemporary debates regarding schooling and inequality. For instance, plaintiffs in the ongoing lawsuit *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard* argue that meritorious Asian American students are discriminated against in the undergraduate college admissions process, whereas underrepresented minority groups like Black and Hispanic Americans are unjustly rewarded. However, my findings suggest that simplistic portrayals of ''fairness'' and ''deservedness'' may be misleading if they do not account for a more complete picture of how racial stereotypes and structural biases operate in the broader societal context.

My findings contribute to the academic literature in two broader areas of research. Scholars interested in the power and consequence of teacher expectations have long argued that racialized assumptions of minority youths' low academic performance may contribute to the racial achievement gap (Bergh et al. 2010; Minor 2014). However, these studies rarely consider whether these findings hold for Asian Americans, a distinct racial minority group stereotyped with high academic achievement. On the other hand, scholars interested in Asian Americans and their schooling outcomes have primarily focused on how aspects of their home environment explain their academic advantage (Goyette and Xie 1999; Hsin and Xie 2014). The few studies that examine the link between schooling and Asian academic achievement are limited in their generalizability (Lee and Zhou 2015; Ochoa 2013). This article addresses these gaps in the literature by drawing on a nationally representative dataset and finding quantitative evidence that the school environment may indeed systematically engender Asian Americans' high academic achievement.

This study has three substantive limitations. First, I am unable to assess the precise *content* of stereotype beliefs. For example, I found that both math and English teachers were more likely to expect Asian students to obtain a college degree or more relative to comparable White students. Why? As hypothesized here, teachers might be influenced by widespread stereotypes about the supposed innate academic potential or predisposition of Asian students. Equally possible (and concurrently so) is that teachers believe in stereotypes regarding Asian families, for instance, the ''tiger mom'' typecast of Asian parents as overbearing and demanding when it comes to their children's educational attainment. For example, teachers might have higher college expectations for Asian students not because they think Asian youth are inherently more academically capable or driven, but rather because they believe Asian parents expect more from their children. My analyses do not distinguish between these various dimensions of Asian stereotype content; however, either or both explanations would be consistent with the underlying theory of interest insofar as racialized teacher assessments of students reflect broadly recognized racial stereotypes.

A second important limitation is that I do not directly test whether these racialized teacher appraisals have a causal effect on Asian students' *actual* academic outcomes. It is certainly possible that teachers could be favorably biased toward Asian students and yet have no significant or meaningful effect on these students' realized educational attainment. However, my finding that teachers are more likely to recommend Asian students for honors courses, controlling for academic ability and other student and family characteristics, strongly suggests that teachers play a role in reifying Asian students' high academic achievement.

Finally, I cannot rule out the presence of unobserved heterogeneity. However, the finding that math teachers were more likely to recommend

Asian students for advanced coursework net of their own perceptions of students' classroom attitudes and behaviors lends powerful evidence to the proposition that Asian students benefit from positive academic presumptions net of objective student academic ability and pro-school characteristics.

Despite these constraints, this study makes an important contribution to understanding how the school environment may play an important role in engendering racial achievement gaps. I find strong evidence that high school teacher assessments of student performance and capability are racialized in ways consistent with broader societal stereotypes about racial groups: Asian students benefit from the presumption of high academic achievement, and the opposite holds true for Black and Hispanic students. Given that situations defined as real are real in their consequences, these findings suggest schools and teachers are implicated in the active construction of racial inequality, rather than simply replicating existing racial disparities.

Future research could expand on this study in several ways. First, a more in-depth exploration of how heterogeneity in the Asian American population intersects with racialized teacher appraisals would address an unfortunate shortcoming of this article. And although the ELS arguably remains the best quantitative survey for examining the research question at hand, the data are now two decades old. Future studies should collect more recent data of teacher assessments and schooling outcomes to assess whether the findings reported here continue to hold as the population of Asian Americans in the United States grows substantially. Finally, this article focuses on just one concrete mechanism by which teachers could promote racial disparities in educational outcomes (i.e., recommendation for honors courses). However, there are likely multiple pathways via which racial biases manifest in schooling. For example, teachers may be more inclined to provide Asian students with more attention and support in the classroom and offer more resources regarding college applications. These actions may have consequences not simply for student academic achievement as measured by test scores and graduation rates but also more broadly in terms of socioeconomic outcomes.

Appendix A. Racial Differences in Math Teachers' Recommendation for Honors Courses (Table 8 Full Regression Output).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Asian (ref. White)	0.13 (0.02)***	0.12 (0.02)***	0.07 (0.02)***	0.07 (0.02)***	0.08 (0.02)***
Black	−0.09 (0.01)***	0.07 (0.01)***	0.06 (0.01)***	0.05 (0.01)***	0.02 (0.02)
Hispanic	−0.08 (0.02)***	0.06 (0.02)***	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	−0.00 (0.02)
Additional controls					
Age	−0.04 (0.01)***	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Female	0.03 (0.01)***	0.06 (0.01)***	0.04 (0.01)***	0.04 (0.01)***	0.03 (0.01)***
Math Test Score		0.02 (0.00)***	0.01 (0.00)***	0.01 (0.00)***	0.02 (0.00)***
Reading Test Score		0.00 (0.00)***	0.00 (0.00)**	0.00 (0.00)*	0.00 (0.00)*
Homework			0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)**
Television			–0.00 (0.00)	–0.00 (0.00)	–0.00 (0.00)
Computer/Video Games			0.00 (0.00)*	–0.00 (0.00)*	−0.00 (0.00)*
Generation			−0.01 (0.01)	–0.00 (0.01)	–0.00 (0.01)
Non-Native Speaker			0.03 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	0.04 (0.02)*
Value Education			0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Value Work			–0.02 (0.01)*	−0.02 (0.01)	−0.1 (0.01)
Likes School			0.03 (0.01)***	0.03 (0.01)***	0.02 (0.01)***
Student Expectation			0.02 (0.00)***	0.01 (0.00)	0.01 (0.00)
Family SES				0.02 (0.01)*	0.03 (0.01)***
Parental Expectation				0.03 (0.01)***	0.02 (0.01)***
Parental Aspiration				−0.01 (0.00)*	−0.01 (0.00)*
Parent-Teacher Org				0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Discuss Report Card				−0.01 (0.01)	−0.01 (0.01)
Advice Course				−0.02 (0.01)*	−0.02 (0.01)*
Advice College				0.02 (0.01)***	0.02 (0.01)**

Source: Educational Longitudinal Study (ELS) 2002.
Note: N = 9,794. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. This table reproduces Table 8 with coefficients shown for each independent variable. The full output results for Tables 3 to 10 are available by request.
*$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to Rourke O'Brien for his steadfast support and encouragement throughout the various stages of this project. I am also grateful to Grace Kao, who provided helpful feedback to prior drafts of this article and facilitated access to the National Center for Education Statistics data used in this study. I likewise extend my thanks to Van Tran, Emma Zang, Chris Cotton, the three anonymous reviewers, and the editors for their many thoughtful and constructive suggestions.

RESEARCH ETHICS

This study draws on restricted-use data from the Educational Longitudinal Study (2002), collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This study was conducted in accordance with NCES policies and guidelines.

ORCID iD

Keitaro Okura https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9061-7490

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Supplemental material for this article is available online.

NOTES

1. Conversely, some scholars have argued that schools have a compensatory (equalizing) effect, at least when considering a counterfactual world in which no schools exist (Raudenbush and Eschmann 2015). However, this observation is not incompatible with the argument that schools exacerbate racial and class inequalities relative to a world in which all children attend identical (equal) schools.
2. In contrast, the more recent National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) cohort (i.e., the High School Longitudinal Study of 2009) cannot be used to investigate this article's questions due to a critical survey design omission: Teachers were not asked to evaluate individual students. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Studies survey younger cohorts of students and do not contain teacher assessment queries related to college expectations or an indication of whether the teacher personally recommended a student for advanced/AP (or gifted) courses. I thus utilize the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 dataset because, despite its age, it remains the best nationally representative survey data available to examine the question at hand.
3. The findings reported in this study are robust to alternative teacher appraisals in the dataset, such as teacher perceptions of whether a student ''works hard'' or whether the teacher ''spoke to parents about a student's poor performance.''
4. Estimating this dependent outcome on a continuous scale (1 to 5) does not yield substantively different results.
5. Utilizing a continuous measure (1 to 7) of this dependent outcome does not alter the findings reported here.
6. Supplementary models reveal that the main results are robust to the exclusion or inclusion of many additional covariates. For instance, parental expectations and student expectations are strongly correlated, but removing one of the two variables does not lead to disparate findings. Likewise, the inclusion of a battery of additional measures that could theoretically be relevant (e.g., how often a student is absent from school or late to class, whether the student received private tutoring for SAT/ACT preparation, or the degree to which parents helped with homework or enforced night curfews) does not alter the main results reported here. In the online supplement, I report results in which 30+ additional parent engagement measures were added into the model.
7. In accordance with policy set by the NCES, the sample sizes reported here are rounded to the nearest 10.
8. In the main regression tables, I display only the race coefficients and suppress the full range of control variables to facilitate easier interpretation. In Appendix A, I provide an example table that displays coefficients for all of the control variables across the models. These coefficients broadly point in the expected direction (e.g., math and reading standardized test scores, number of hours spent on homework, whether the student likes school, and parental expectations are positively associated with teacher appraisals).
9. Interestingly, math teachers are now significantly more likely to recommend Black students for honors courses relative to White students, yet English teachers behave in the opposite manner. However, results from logistic regression (rather than linear probability model) that include these teacher appraisal measures show that Asian, but not Black, students are significantly advantaged in math teacher recommendations. Supplementary analyses further reveal that the significant Black student advantage in teacher recommendation in linear probability models is sensitive to the inclusion of additional parent engagement measures, whereas the Asian student advantage is not.

REFERENCES

Bergh, Linda van den, Eddie Denessen, Lisette Hornstra, Marinus Voeten, and Rob. W. Holland. 2010. ''The Implicit Prejudiced Attitudes of Teachers: Relations

to Teacher Expectations and the Ethnic Achievement Gap.'' *American Educational Research Journal* 47(2):497–527.

Brophy, Jere E., and Thomas L. Good. 1970. ''Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data.'' *Journal of Educational Psychology* 61(5):365–74.

Byun, Soo-yong, and Hyunjoon Park. 2011. ''The Academic Success of East Asian American Youth: The Role of Shadow Education.'' *Sociology of Education* 85(1):40–60.

Cameron, David L., and Bryan G. Cook. 2013. ''General Education Teachers' Goals and Expectations for their Included Students with Mild and Severe Disabilities.'' *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities* 48(1):18–30.

Chen, Chuangsheng, and Harold W. Stevenson. 1995. ''Motivation and Mathematics Achievement: A Comparative-Study of Asian-American, Caucasian-American, and East-Asian High-School-Students.'' *Child Development* 66(4):1215–34.

Chou, Rosalind S., and Joe R. Feagin. 2010. *Myth of the Model Minority: Asian Americans Facing Racism*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Cobb, Jessica S. 2017. ''Inequality Frames: How Teachers Inhabit Color-Blind Ideology.'' *Sociology of Education* 90(4):315–32.

Copur-Gencturk, Yasemin, Joseph R. Cimpian, Sarah Theule Lubienski, and Ian Thacker. 2020. ''Teachers' Bias Against the Mathematical Ability of Female, Black, and Hispanic Students.'' *Educational Researcher* 49(1):30–43.

Crosnoe, Robert, and Chandra Mueller. 2014. ''Family Socioeconomic Status, Peers, and the Path to College.'' *Social Problems* 61(4):602–24.

Dandy, Justine, and Ted Nettelbeck. 2002. ''A Cross-Cultural Study of Parents' Academic Standards and Educational Aspirations for Their Children.'' *Educational Psychology* 22(5):621–27.

Fejgin, Naomi. 1995. ''Factors Contributing to the Academic Excellence of American Jewish and Asian students.'' *Sociology of Education* 68(1):18–30.

Ferguson, Ronald F. 2003. ''Teachers' Perceptions and Expectations and the Black-White Test Score Gap.'' *Urban Education* 38(4):460–507.

Funkhouser, Edward. 2009. ''The Effect of Kindergarten Classroom Size Reduction on Second Grade Student Achievement: Evidence from California.'' *Economics of Education Review* 28(3):403–14.

Gershenson, Seth, Stephen B. Holt, and Nicholas W. Papageorge. 2016. ''Who Believes in Me? The Effect of Student-Teacher Demographic Match on Teacher Expectations.'' *Economics of Education Review* 52:209–24.

Goyette, Kimberly, and Yu Xie. 1999. ''Educational Expectations of Asian American Youths: Determinants and Ethnic Differences.'' *Sociology of Education* 72(1):22–36.

Hsin, Amy, and Yu Xie. 2014. ''Explaining Asian Americans' Academic Advantage Over Whites.'' *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111(23):8416–21.

Hughes, Jan N., Katie A. Gleason, and Duan Zhang. 2005. ''Relationship Influences on Teachers' Perceptions of Academic Competence in Academically At-Risk Minority and Majority First Grade Students.'' *Journal of Social Psychology* 43(4):303–20.

Irizarry, Yasmiyn. 2021. ''On Track or Derailed? Race, Advanced Math, and the Transition to High School.'' *Socius: Sociological Research for the Dynamic World* 7. doi:10.1177/2378023120980293.

Jussim, Lee, and Kent D. Harber. 2005. ''Teacher Expectations and Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Knowns and Unknowns, Resolved and Unresolved Controversies.'' *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 9(2):131–55.

Kao, Grace. 1995. ''Asian Americans as Model Minorities? A Look at Their Academic Performance.'' *American Journal of Education* 103(2):121–59.

Kao, Grace, and Jennifer Thompson. 2003. ''Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment.'' *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 417–42.

Lee, Stacey J. 2009. *Unraveling the ''Model Minority'' Stereotype: Listening to Asian American Youth*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Lee, Jennifer, and Min Zhou. 2015. *The Asian American Achievement Paradox*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Long, Mark C., Dylan Conger, and Patrice Iatarola. 2012. ''Effects of High School Course-Taking on Secondary and Postsecondary Success.'' *American Educational Research Journal* 49(2):285–322.

Lucas, Samuel R., Santiago J. Molina, and John M. Towey. 2020. ''Race/Ethnicity Over Fifty Years of Structural Differentiation in K–12 Schooling: Period-Specific and Life-Course Perspectives.'' *Annual Review of Sociology* 46:355–78.

Mau, Wei-Cheng. 1997. ''Parental Influences on the High School Students' Academic Achievement: A Comparison of Asian Immigrants, Asian Americans, and White Americans.'' *Psychology in Schools* 34(3):267–77.

McKown, Clark, and Rhona S. Weinstein. 2008. ''Teacher Expectations, Classroom Context, and the Achievement Gap.'' *Journal of School Psychology* 46(3):235–61.

Minor, Elizabeth. 2014. ''Racial Differences in Teacher Perceptions of Student Ability.'' *Teacher College Record* 116(10):1–22.

Morris, Edward W., and Brea L. Perry. 2016. ''The Punishment Gap: School Suspension and Racial Disparities in Achievement.'' *Social Problems* 63(1):68–86.

Oakes, Jeannie. 2005. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ochoa, Gilda L. 2013. *Academic Profiling: Latinos, Asian Americans, and the Achievement Gap*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Okonofua, Jason A., and Jennifer L. Eberhardt. 2015. ''Two Strikes: Race and the Disciplining of Young Students.'' *Psychological Science* 26(5):617–24.

Peng, Samuel S., and DeeAnn Wright. 1994. ''Explanation of Academic Achievement of Asian American Students.'' *The Journal of Educational Research* 87(6):346–52.

Quinn, David M. 2020. ''Experimental Evidence on Teachers' Racial Bias in Student Evaluation: The Role of Grading Scales.'' *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 42(3):375–92.

Raudenbush, Stephen W., and Robert D. Eschmann. 2015. ''Does Schooling Increase or Reduce Social Inequality?'' *Annual Review of Sociology* 41: 443–70.

Rauscher, Emily, and Yifan Shen. 2022. ''Variation in the Relationship between School Spending and Achievement: Progressive Spending Is Efficient.'' *American Journal of Sociology* 128(1):189–223.

Reardon, Sean F., and Ann Owens. 2014. ''60 Years After *Brown*: Trends and Consequences of School Segregation.'' *Annual Review of Sociology* 40: 199–218.

Rosenthal, R., and L. Jacobson. 1968. *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ross, Sandra I., and Jeffrey M. Jackson. 1991. ''Teachers' Expectations for Black Males' and Black Females' Academic Achievement.'' *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 17(1):78–82.

Rubie-Davies, Christine M., Rhona S. Weinstein, Francis L. Huang, Anne Gregory, Philip A. Cowan, and Carolyn P. Cowan. 2014. ''Successive Teacher Expectation Effects Across the Early School Years.'' *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 35(3):181–91

Rubin, Donald B. 1976. ''Inference and Missing Data.'' *Biometrika* 63:581–92.

Sanchirico, Andrew. 1991. ''The Importance of Small-Business Ownership in Chinese American Educational Achievement.'' *Sociology of Education* 64(4):293–304.

Shih, Margaret, Nalini Ambady, Jennifer A. Richeson, and Kentaro Fujita. 2002. ''Stereotype Performance Boosts: The Impact of Self-Relevance and the Manner of Stereotype Activation.'' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83(3):638–47.

Steele, Claude M., and Joshua Aronson. 1995. ''Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans.'' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69(5):797–811.

Sun, Yongmin. 1998. ''The Academic Success of East-Asian American Students – An Investment Model. *Social Science Research* 27(4):432–56.

Timmermans, Anneke C., Christine M. Rubie-Davies, and Camilla Rjosk. 2018. ''Pygmalion's 50th anniversary: The State of the Art in Teacher Expectation Research.'' *Educational Research and Evaluation* 24(3):91–98.

Tran, Van C., Fei Guo, and Tiffany J. Huang. 2020. ''The Integration Paradox: Asian Immigrants in Australia and the United States.'' *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 690(1):36–60.

von Hippel, Paul T. 2007. ''Regression with Missing Ys: An Improved Strategy for Analyzing Multiply Imputed Data.'' *Sociological Methodology* 37(1): 83–117.

Welch, Kelly, and Allison A. Payne. 2010. ''Racial Threat and Punitive School Discipline.'' *Social Problems* 57(1):25–48.

Wenglinsky, Harold H. 1997. ''How Money Matters: Models of the Effect of School District Spending on Academic Achievement.'' *Sociology of Education* 70(3):221–37.

Wildeman, Christopher, Kris Scardamalia, Elizabeth G. Walsh, Rourke L. O'Brien, and Bridget Brew. 2017. ''Parental Incarceration and Teachers' Expectations of Students.'' *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 3. doi:10.1177/2378023117726610.

Yamamoto, Yoko, and Susan D. Holloway. 2010. ''Parental Expectations and Children's Academic Performance in Sociocultural Context.'' *Educational Psychology Review* 22(3):189–214.

Zhou, Min, and Carl L. Bankston III. 1994. ''Social Capital and the Adaptation of the Second Generation: The Case of Vietnamese Youth in New Orleans.'' *International Migration Review* 28(4):821–45.

Author Biography

Keitaro Okura is a doctoral candidate in sociology at Yale University. His research interests are in immigration, race/ethnicity, education, population health, and social stratification. He is currently working on a paper that explores the boundaries of American national belonging using survey experiments.