A dozen years after the Pygmalion hypothesis was discovered, a study was conducted to investigate its generality in different domains. The study involved 464 children, divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group was led to expect higher intellectual gains from their teachers, while the control group was not given such expectations.

The results showed that the children in the experimental group performed significantly better, achieving higher test scores and improved behavioral outcomes. The magnitude of the effect was determined using the binomial-effect-size display (BESD), with effect sizes ranging from $r = 0.63$ to $r = 0.09$. The overall effect size was $r = 0.30$.

To further explore the generality of the Pygmalion effect, the study included 345 effects across 30 domains and 26 types of studies. The analysis revealed that the effect size varied across domains, with some domains showing a stronger effect than others.

The findings suggest that the Pygmalion effect is not limited to the classroom but can have broader implications in various domains. The study also highlights the importance of teacher expectations in influencing student outcomes, emphasizing the need for further research to understand the mechanisms behind this phenomenon.

In conclusion, the Pygmalion effect demonstrates that interpersonal expectancy can significantly impact educational and behavioral outcomes. Understanding the underlying mechanisms and developing strategies to harness these effects may have important implications for educational practices and interventions.
Table 1. Interpersonal expectancy effects in eight research domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean effect size</th>
<th>Example of type of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory interviews</td>
<td>0.14 0.07</td>
<td>Effects of sensory restriction on reports of hallucinatory experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction time</td>
<td>0.17 0.08</td>
<td>Latency of word associations to certain stimulus words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and ability</td>
<td>0.54 0.26</td>
<td>IQ test scores, verbal conditioning (learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person perception</td>
<td>0.85 0.70</td>
<td>Perception of other people's success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The effect sizes shown are based on weighted mean. 

The 10-arrow model, designed to clarify the study of interpersonal expectancy effects, posits 10 links between five groups of variables: (a) distal independent (moderator) variables (e.g., stable attributes of the expecter and expectee), (b) proximal independent variables (the expectancies), (c) mediating variables, (d) proximal dependent variables (e.g., short-term outcome measures such as IQ scores), and (e) distal dependent variables (long-term outcome variables). A useful feature of this model is that its 10 arrows represent the types of relationships that can be examined in research on expectancy effects (see Fig. 1).

The arrows in the model are described in detail elsewhere, so I discuss here only the two links relevant to the topic of mediation: the B-C and C-D arrows. B-C relationships describe the effect of the expectancy on the expecter's behavior. These are the relationships most often investigated in research on mediation. Equally important to understanding mediation, however, are the C-D relationships between the expecter's behavior and outcome variables. Research bearing on the B-C link tells which behaviors are induced by a given expectancy, but research bearing on the C-D link shows that these behaviors affect the expectee so as to create a self-fulfilling prophecy. As is evident, the two types of relationships address different questions, making the distinction between them important.
Table 3. Four factors in the mediation of teacher expectancy effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Summary of the evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central factors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Climate (affect)</td>
<td>Teachers appear to create a warmer socio-emotional climate for their “special” students. This warmth appears to be at least partially communicated by nonverbal cues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Input (effort)</td>
<td>Teachers appear to teach more material and more difficult material to their “special” students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional factors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Output</td>
<td>Teachers appear to give their “special” students greater opportunities for responding. These opportunities are offered both verbally and nonverbally (e.g., giving a student more time to answer a question).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feedback</td>
<td>Teachers appear to give their “special” students more informative feedback, both verbal and nonverbal, as to how these students have been performing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the first 30 or so published studies relevant to mediation, a four-factor “theory” of the mediation of teacher expectancy effects was proposed. Table 3 summarizes these four factors, and Table 4 gives the average magnitude of the role of each factor separately for the B–C and C–D links. Although all four factors had significant effects, the magnitudes of the effects for the climate and input factors were especially impressive. Teachers appear to teach more and to teach it more warmly to students for whom they have more favorable expectations.

From these results, one cannot infer that selecting warmer teachers who present more material will result in children learning more. One also cannot infer from these results that training teachers to be warmer and to present more material will lead to improved learning. The results do suggest, however, that conducting the research required to determine the benefits of selection and training for climate (or affect) and input (or effort) may well yield substantial benefits both for science and for society.

11. The distinction between B–C and C–D critical.
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