Effect of students' attractiveness and tidiness on the development of student-teachers' expectations of their intellectuality

Abdullah Alhajri
Department of C&I
Kuwait University
Postal Address: Sabah Al-Salem,
B.5, Avenue5, House 12.
The state of Kuwait

Abstract

The present study examined students' facial attractiveness and school uniform tidiness effects on developing the student-teachers' expectations of their academic performances.

The researcher administered a questionnaire of 10 items on a sample that consisted of 135 student-teachers at the college of education in Kuwait University after exposing them to pictures of four school students with diversified traits of attractiveness and school uniform tidiness.

The results showed that all the student-teachers' sample tends to form expectations about diverse classroom students based on their level of attractiveness and school uniform tidiness. There were no differences in these expectations between student-teachers of different GPAs. Still, such differences existed between student-teachers' groups of fields of specialization. Several recommendations were then directed & brought to the Ministry of Education and teacher preparation program personnel's attention.

***Keywords**:* teacher expectations, student facial attractiveness effects, student uniform tidiness effects, student intellect.

Introduction

Teachers' expectations appear to exist in every classroom and significantly affect the learners, causing some negative, harmful damage to students' performances. Woodcock (2013). It occurs not only in the school classrooms but in every aspect of anybody's life. The primary issue is that it is an unintended phenomenon and occurs; that is, it happens with us without sensing it. That means that we unknowingly make different expectations. Unintended teachers' perceptions and expectations carry more harmful effects on the students. Good, T. and Prophy, J. (1978). These expectations, then, will reflect upon our students leading to underestimating and sometimes overestimating their performances, especially their achievement and grades. Brattesani and Weinstein (1984).

These expectations do not happen in a vacuum. Many factors stand behind them, causing them to form among classroom teachers.Among the lengthy list of these factors are the ones that are related to the teacher himself. Some teachers' attributes and stereotypes, for example, may lead to such formation of such expectations. Teacher-student race mismatch, as well as gender mismatch, sometimes can play such a role. Bergh (2010). Besides the teacher-related factors, there are the factors that are related to the learners. These student-related factors are students' social background, economic background, ethnic background, gender, and attractiveness. McCombs and Gay (1987).

Attending this phenomenon must be of more researchers' concern since it can affect the students and their performances. Students' attractiveness affects the formation of teachers' expectations, and it is an issue itself that deserves such attention. The present research is based on that argument and on enlightening the Kuwaiti educators to the best possible means of dealing with this phenomenon for classroom students' benefits.

Statement of the problem:

Many research works have shown that classroom teachers form diverse expectations around their students. It has also shown that these expectations falsely reflect on the students' achievements and performances. Some of this research body has pointed to many factors that lead to such teacher expectations' formation. Among these factors are the ones that relate to student's attributes. These attributes include the student's physical and facial attractiveness, which reflect negatively on what teachers expect from him and get transformed into adverse effects on his achievement.

Since no research covered Kuwaiti schools, the current research priority is to examine such effects of students' attractiveness and tidiness on forming such teachers' expectations and reach the relevant suggestions.

Purpose of the study

Based on the previous research findings that claimed that student's attractiveness cause teachers to form false expectations regarding their students' general performance, the present study investigates this phenomenon's existence in Kuwaiti schools.

Research questions:

The student's attractiveness and its effects on what teachers expect is the main focus of this present research. Then, based on that background, this research investigates the power of such student attractiveness on the teachers' expectations aiming to answer its questions which are stated as follows:

1- Do student-teachers in the college of education at Kuwait university form any classroom expectations regarding students' intellectuality based on their different facial attractiveness and school uniform tidiness?

2- Does the student teacher's GPA affect such expectations?

3- Does the student teacher's field of specialization affect such expectations?

Review of related literature

Much research investigated teacher expectations, and "many empirical studies have documented…. the existence of expectancy effects". (Friedrich et al., 2014, p.1) Rosenthal and Robin (1978) reported that "not less than 40 percent of those studies found significant support for the existence of teacher expectation effects." (Cited in Cooper,1983, P.3)

(Denessen et. el, 2014, P. 6) claim that many indicators confirm that teaching practices are based on biased perceptions of students' needs.Gentrup al. (2020) state that teachers form inaccurate expectations, reflecting on students' achievements, cognitive abilities, and motivation. These expectations, according to Parks et al. (2010), hinder students' academic performance.

Arganbright (1983) considers teachers' expectations as a normal phenomenon. We all originate and live in a frame of expectations, and expectations develop based on classroom interactions; and Good and Brophy (1978) state that this phenomenon passes through five steps until it affects students' achievements.

As indicated by Brattesani and Weinstein (1984), the issue of teachers' expectations is that these expectations can boost remarkable differences between students' achievements. Woodcock (2013) noted they could lead to future failures. Patriarca and Kragt (1986) assert that teacher expectation is not the issue in itself as much as the students' unfair treatment, especially their grades, caused. In contrast, Bognar (1983) disagrees and suggests that teacher expectations do not influence all humans, and he ascribes their formation to teachers' attributes rather than to the students'. Cooper's study (1984) supports this ascription and suggests that teachers' understanding of students' affections leads to lesser expectation formation.

Arganbright (1983), Dusek and Josef (1983), Cooper and Tom (1984), Tom and Cooper (1984), Rolison and Medway (1985), Bergh (2010), Education Commission of the states (2012),and Timmermans et al. (2016) refer to such factors as students' sex, economic class, ethnicity, attractiveness, previous performance, and grades, exchanged information, motives, and lesson content as leading to the formation of these expectations. Gentrup et al. (2020) referred to the factor of student's socioeconomics, and Gershenson et al. (2016) refer to the race mismatch factor affecting white teachers' lower expectations of black students' educational attainment. Ethnicity is another factor that plays a role in harming students' achievement. Vogler et al.'s (2019) research found that white students scored significantly higher on the test than Hispanic students. Hispanic students scored significantly higher on the test than Black students regardless of the instructional time configuration used.

Akifyeva (2018) considers ethnicity a critical factor affecting teachers' expectations, and Rubie-Davis et al. (2012) indicated that such expectations relate to low achievement levels by some ethnic groups. Cecil (1988) referred to student's dialect when he found that black students' expectations were more positive when they used whites' dialect than those who did not.

The students' attractiveness seems to cause teachers' expectations to exist. Salvia et al. (1977) and Ritts et al. (1992) report that facial and physical attractiveness has been shown to have powerfully biasing effects, and in McCombs and Gay's (1987) study, the student's apparel caused teachers' expectations to alter their economic and social class guessing.

The researchers also claimed in this study that the student's color expectations, in particular, were irreversible. Attractive faces are recognized when seen and are often viewed advantageously in professional, social, and romantic relationships. Kanavakis et al. (2021). McCombs and Gay (1987) and Talmas et al. (2016) suggest controlling the influences of attractiveness to deal with the issue.

Muntoni and Retelsdorf (2018) have examined the relations between students' gender, teachers' gender stereotypes and noted that teachers with strong stereotypes favoring girls expected girls to have higher reading ability and achievement than boys. Bonefeld et al. (2021) Teachers apply gender stereotypes in their judgments on student's ability. They perceived female students' ability as lower than male students' ability, ethnicity, and information on it influenced judgments. In Ayaz, A., and Ozdemer, N.'s (2021) research, rural area students were negatively positioned, so they called for social justice advocacy and suggested fostering teachers and improving the system.

Bratessani and Weinstein's study (1984) emphasizes that the student plays a role in affirming the teacher's expectation and then causing their achievement to conform to them mostly when he leans and produces a negative view of himself. Moreover, Jonson's study (1983) invites teachers to enhance the student's self-expectancy to reduce teachers' negative expectations. Rubie-Davis (2009) assures that "where teachers believe that their students can achieve goals …. their students are likely to …improve their achievement." (Rubie-Davis, 2009, P. 695); and Gentrup et al.(2020) suggest reducing the biasing influences of students' backgrounds.

Other research examined the effect of teacher-related variables, such as Ahmed's (2010) study, which did find a significant effect of teacher's gender. Still, it indicated a significant difference between more experienced and less experienced. Timmermans et al.'s (2018) research indicated no statistically significant differences in teachers' expectations based on gender background, years of teaching experience, and the grade level currently taught. The Barrigaa study (2019) showed that teachers' high economic class have positive expectations. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) noticed that when the sample teachers were fancied with their students' achievement as a high one, these students' grades surpassed their actual abilities.

Many researchers have suggested ways to deal with this issue and its adverse effects. Arganbright's (1983) study invited educational authorities to attend to how it affects students' achievements. Ideka (2121) called these authorities to regularly organize training, seminars, conferences, and workshops to deal with the hindering factors of effective teaching. Brophy (1983) and Patriarca and Kragt (1986) call teachers to get others' feedback on the different expectations they may form. Cecil (1988) suggested that teachers hold more positive expectations to prevent its adverse effect. Cooper and Tom (1984) call the teacher to avoid forming false expectations and evaluate his expectations periodically. In contrast, Brophy (1983) and Guskey (1982) warned that teachers' denial of individual differences might deter negative ones because they will fail to choose appropriate teaching methods that can prevent the formation of such expectations.

This literature review shows the profound researchers' interest in the subject and defines factors that lead teachers to form such expectations. It also elaborates on its severity represented in the misestimating of students' actual performance and achievement.

Study methodology & procedures

Design of the study

This research adopts the descriptive approach to collect data and describe students' sample teacher expectations of various attributes of facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness. It involves administering a questionnaire designed to collect data and an instrument for analyzing the responses. This is the design that is most appropriate for this study.

Sample of the study

The present study's sample consisted of 135 student-teachers enrolled in practical student-teaching training courses. Of those student teachers of five various fields of specialization, one hundred twenty-three were females, and only twelve were males (table1).

Table 1*:* Sample of the study.

Field of specialization	Males	Females	Total
Islamic studies	0	31	31
Arabic Language	1	21	22
Field of specialization	Males	Females	Total
English language	0	21	21
Social studies	10	39	49
Science & math	1	11	12
Total	12	123	135

Study's instrumentation and procedures

The quantitative procedure in this study involved a ten-item questionnaire developed by the researcher. The items were related to the student-teachers' expectations of school students' intellectuality. Four photo pictures representing various facial attractiveness and tidiness of four school students were exposed to the sample before responding to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire's items were related to the sample's expectations of the school students' intellect, such as: *gaining important future job posts, motivation to achieve and excel, achieving distinctively, winning school prizes or awards, high brilliance, low brilliance, high-school completion, college high education completion, accomplishing higher education (Ph.D. degree), and speed grasping of new experiences*. (see the appendix)

The facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness characteristics of each school student are described as follows:

1st. Student: represented with an attractive facial figure and tidy uniform,

2nd. Student: represented with an attractive facial figure and untidy uniform,

3rd. Student: represented with an unattractive facial figure and tidy uniform,

4th. Student: represented with an unattractive facial figure and untidy uniform.

The questionnaire required bibliographic information related to the respondent's GPA and specialization, and respondents were requested to give their opinion on the ten questionnaire items regarding their expectations of each of the four school students represented in every photo picture on the following five-degree Likert scale:

5	4	3	2	1
Very high	High	Moderate	Low	Very low

Statistical analysis

For data analysis purposes, the following statistical tests were applied using SPSS statistic tools to calculate:

1- Mean values of the sample's student-teachers' responses related to their expectations of each of the four school students calculated on every item of the questionnaire (Table 2),

2- T-test values to compare the means of the sample student-teachers' responses related to each of the four modeled school students on each of the ten items to point to the statistical differences in the opinions of the sample and examine if school student's diverse characteristics affect student-teachers' expectations (Table 2),

3- T-tests values to compare means of the responses of student-teachers of higher GPA's (2.67 and more) and student-teachers of lower GPA's (less than 2.67) on each of the ten items to examine the statistical differences between the student-teachers based on their GPAs (Table 3),

4- F-test values to compare specialization fields' effect on student teachers' expectations regarding each of the four school students on each of the ten items to examine if there is an effect of that variable on differentiating these expectations. (Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7)

Study results and findings

According to the research three questions, the present research results and findings are represented here in tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Table 2 relates to the first question, "Do student-teachers in the college of education at Kuwait university form any expectations about classroom students of different facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness?" This table refers to the mean averages of the sample's student-teachers' expectations and the significance level of the differences in these expectations between each of the four school students of varying attributes.

These results assert the power of school student distinctiveness in facial attractiveness and tidiness on the student-teachers' expectations. The more peculiar characteristics the school student has, the higher expectations he gets from his student-teacher. The T values have shown significant differences between the student-teachers' expectations of the 1st student and the rest at level 5%. At level 1%, between 2nd student and the 4th. There were no significant differences between the student-teacher's expectations of the 2nd and 3rd school students on most items.

Table2 Mean averages and significance levels of sample student teachers' expectations of all sample school students on all ten items.

#	Text	Students-teacher's averages				Sig. 1st& 2nd	Sig. 1st& 3rd	Sig. 1st& 4th	Sig. 3rd & 2nd	Sig. 4th & 2nd	Sig. 4th& 3rd
		1st	2nd	3rd	4th						
1	Gaining job posts	4.01	3.06	3.04	2.28	**	**	**	--	**	**
2	motivation to achieve/ excel	4.03	2.75	3.05	2.24	**	**	**	*	**	**
3	Achieving distinctively	4.15	2.76	3.04	2.31	**	**	**	--	**	**
4	winning awards	4.08	2.70	2.85	2.16	**	**	**	--	**	**
5	high brilliance	3.88	3.43	3.07	2.56	**	**	**	**	**	**
6	low brilliance	1.56	2.15	2.33	2.87	**	**	**	--	**	**
#	Text	Student-teacher's averages				Sig. 1st& 2nd	Sig. 1st& 3rd	Sig. 1st& 4th	Sig. 3rd& 2nd	Sig. 4th& 2nd	Sig. 4th& 3rd
		1st	2nd	3rd	4th						
7	high-school completion	4.39	3.09	3.43	2.79	**	**	**	*	*	**
8	college completion	4.25	2.79	3.15	2.35	**	**	**	*	**	**
9	accomplishing Ph.D.	3.32	2.13	2.51	1.77	**	**	**	*	**	**
10	speed grasping of experiences	3.99	3.17	2.96	2.51	**	**	**	--	**	**

(*) 0.05 significance level. (**) 0.01 significance level. (--) No statistical significance.

Table 3 relates to the second question**,**" Does the student teacher's GPA have any effect on his formation of such expectation?". This table refers to the significant differences between expectations of different GPA student-teachers' expectations regarding each school student. The T values indicate no significant differences at any level between the two groups of student-teachers' GPA in their expectations of these school students. An exception is a significant difference between the two groups' expectations regarding the 1st school student's "low brilliance." The T value showed a significant difference between the means at 1% level.

That implies that the GPA variable does not cause differences in the student-teacher expectations and that all student-teachers of low and high GPAs have similar expectations.

Table 3 T values of the differences between the means and their significances on the sample expectations towards the students (Based on GPA's)

#	Text	1st student			2nd student			3rd student			4th student		
		M 1	M 2	Sig	M 1	M 2	Sig	M 1	M 2	Sig	M 1	M 2	Sig
1	gaining jobs	3.88	4.07	--	2.98	3.10	--	3.15	3.00	--	2.39	2.23	--
2	motivation to achieve/ excel	4.07	4.01	--	2.68	2.78	--	3.07	3.04	--	2.29	2.22	--
3	Achieving distinctively	4.17	4.14	--	2.61	2.83	--	2.95	3.07	--	2.27	2.33	--
#	Text	1st student			2nd student			3rd student			4th student		
		M1	M2	Sig	M1	M2	Sig	M1	M2	Sig	M1	M2	Sig
4	winning awards	4.05	4.10	--	2.59	2.74	--	2.90	2.83	--	2.17	2.16	--
5	high brilliance	3.83	3.90	--	3.46	3.41	--	3.15	3.03	--	2.37	2.49	--
6	low brilliance	1.37	1.65	**	2.00	2.21	--	2.24	2.36	--	2.66	2.97	--
7	high-school completion	4.34	4.41	--	3.98	3.14	--	3.29	3.94	--	2.88	2.74	--
8	college completion	4.17	4.29	--	2.76	2.81	--	3.05	3.19	--	2.51	2.28	--
9	accomplishing Ph.D.	3.20	3.37	--	2.05	2.17	--	2.44	2.54	--	1.83	1.74	--
10	grasping of experiences	4.05	3.96	--	3.07	3.22	--	2.98	2.95	--	2.68	2.44	--

(*) 0.05 significance level. (**) 0.01 significance level. (--) No statistical significance.

Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 relate to the third question, "Does the student teacher's field of specialization have any effect on his formation of such expectations?" Each of these tables is related to each of the various specialization fields' student-teachers' expectations of each school student separately considered. The groups of the field of specialization with which the present study is concerned were: The Islamic, Arabic, English, Social Studies, and Science & math groups.

The F value in table 4 indicates no significant differences at any level between teachers' expectations of various fields of specialization on the 1st school student on any of the ten items. The F value in table 5 indicates significant differences at level 5% between teachers' expectations of various fields of specialization on the 2nd school student two the items related to "gaining job posts' and "college completion."

As for 3rd school student, table 6 shows significant differences at level 1% on the item related to "high brilliance" and level 5% on the items related to student-teachers' expectations of this school student's "achieving distinctively" and "low brilliance" items. Table 7 shows significant differences at level 5% on these expectations regarding 4th school student's "gaining job posts," "winning school awards," and "accomplishing a Ph.D. degree."

Table 4 Statistical significance of differences between various specialization fields (For 1st sample school student).

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S. studies		Sci. math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1	Gaining jobs	1.97	.84	1.91	.81	1.76	.70	2.14	.89	1.92	.51	.93	--
2	motivation to achieve/ excel	2.90	1.25	3.63	.90	3.57	.87	3.16	.96	3.25	.87	2.35	--
3	Achieving distinctively	2.87	1.34	3.55	1.01	3.52	1.17	3.18	.91	3.33	1.15	1.74	--
4	winning school awards	1.90	.94	2.05	.84	1.81	1.08	1.92	.86	1.92	.89	.19	--
5	high brilliance	2.12	.88	2.14	.83	2.14	.79	2.06	.77	2.25	.62	.15	--
6	low brilliance	4.55	.62	4.41	.73	1.43	.87	4.39	.61	4.17	.39	1.01	--
7	high-school completion	1.77	.88	1.45	.51	1.43	.68	1.61	.70	1.75	.75	1.10	--
8	college completion	2.84	1.24	3.82	.73	3.38	1.02	3.04	1.10	3.42	.99	3.30	--
9	accomplishing Ph.D.	2.55	1.29	2.55	.86	2.71	1.27	2.76	.92	2.92	.67	.43	--
10	grasping of experiences	2.16	.86	2.00	.82	1.95	.92	1.96	.73	2.00	.73	.35	--

(*) 0.05 significances level. (**) 0.01 significances level. (---) No statistical significance.

Table 5 Statistical significance of differences between various specialization fields (For 2nd sample school student).

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S. studies		Sci. & math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1	Gaining jobs	2.48	1.15	3.41	.85	3.05	.80	2.98	.90	2.92	.90	3.26	*
2	motivation to achieve/ excel	2.90	1.25	3.64	.90	3.57	.87	3.16	.96	3.25	.87	2.35	--
3	Achieving distinctively	2.87	1.34	3.55	1.01	3.52	1.17	3.18	.91	3.33	1.15	1.71	--
#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S. Studies		Sci. Math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
4	winning awards	2.97	1.33	3.59	1.10	3.33	1.49	3.33	1.14	3.50	1.17	.94	--
5	high brilliance	2.32	1.05	2.77	.75	2.29	.90	2.65	.88	3.00	1.21	2.01	--
6	low brilliance	4.16	.97	3.36	.90	4.10	.77	3.86	.84	3.50	.80	3.63	--
7	high-school completion	2.61	1.20	3.41	.91	3.10	.83	2.76	.95	3.08	1.24	2.53	--
8	college completion	2.84	1.24	3.82	.73	3.38	1.02	3.04	1.10	3.42	1.00	3.30	*
9	accomplishing Ph.D.	3.48	1.23	4.32	.84	4.10	.89	3.82	1.18	3.83	1.34	2.04	--

10	speed grasping of experiences	2.68	1.17	3.14	.83	2.86	1.11	2.71	.96	3.00	.85	.94	--

(*) 0.05 significances level. (**) 0.01 significances level. (--) No statistical significance.

Table 6 Represents the statistical significance of differences between various specialization fields (For 3rd sample school student).

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S. studies		Sci. & math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1	Gaining jobs	3.10	1.37	3.50	.80	2.33	1.35	2.98	1.25	2.58	1.08	2.83	--
2	motivation to achieve/ excel	2.81	1.56	3.32	1.04	2.52	1.29	3.08	1.13	2.83	.72	1.40	--
3	Achieving distinctively	2.77	1.31	3.45	.60	2.38	1.24	3.12	1.13	2.92	1.00	2.97	*
4	winning awards	2.94	1.39	3.55	.91	2.57	1.40	3.37	1.07	3.08	1.08	2.54	--
5	high brilliance	2.74	1.32	3.45	.80	2.29	1.06	3.04	1.00	3.17	.94	3.83	**
6	low brilliance	3.81	1.08	3.18	.66	4.19	.98	3.57	1.00	3.75	.75	3.33	*
7	high-school completion	2.61	1.23	2.91	.87	2.00	1.10	2.65	1.05	2.65	1.00	2.14	--
8	college completion	2.74	1.37	3.50	.96	2.24	1.30	2.86	1.02	2.86	1.35	3.23	--
9	accomplishing Ph.D.	3.19	1.51	4.00	1.07	3.00	1.55	3.69	1.10	3.69	1.50	2.30	--
#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S. studies		Sci. & math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
10	grasping of experiences	2.94	1.31	3.45	.80	2.57	1.21	3.18	1.09	3.18	.58	2.14	--

(*) 0.05 significance level. (**) 0.01 significance level. (--) No statistical significance.

Table 7 Statistical significance of differences between various specialization fields (For 4th sample school student).

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S.studies		Sci. & math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1	Gaining jobs	3.71	.94	3.64	1.00	4.33	.73	3.57	.96	3.42	.90	3.00	*
2	motivation to achieve/ excel	3.84	.97	3.77	1.07	4.24	.70	3.57	1.04	3.42	.90	2.16	--
3	Achieving distinctively	3.87	1.06	3.45	1.10	4.29	.72	3.51	.98	3.33	.78	3.41	--
4	winning awards	4.07	1.03	3.55	1.22	4.43	.68	3.57	1.12	3.83	.83	3.31	*
5	high brilliance	3.55	.99	3.41	1.05	3.76	.77	3.24	.85	3.42	.90	1.32	--
6	low brilliance	3.16	1.13	3.14	1.08	3.10	1.00	3.14	1.13	3.00	1.04	.06	--
7	high-school completion	3.35	.88	3.18	1.14	3.62	.92	3.02	1.09	3.00	.60	1.64	--

8	college completion	3.71	.97	3.64	1.26	4.10	.89	3.41	1.04	3.75	.62	1.77	--
9	accomplishing Ph.D.	4.19	.98	4.27	.98	4.81	.40	3.92	1.22	4.50	.15	3.26	*
10	speed grasping of new experiences	3.65	.95	3.32	1.04	4.05	.92	3.27	1.06	3.33	.89	2.69	--

(*) 0.05 significances level. (**) 0.01 significances level. (--) No statistical significance.

Discussion of the results

The data presented in table 2 showed what confirms the effects of students' characteristics of facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness on student-teachers' expectations. The differences between the student-teacher expectations of the 1st school student with both facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness and their expectations of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th students were very significant. The results assert the power of school student distinctiveness in facial attractiveness and tidiness on the student-teacher expectations. This result asserts what other studies arrived at in schools of different geographical environments and concluded that teachers tend to form various students' expectations based on their characteristics. It coincides with what Dusek and Joseph (1083) have pointed to regarding the student's attractiveness and social status effects on the probability of being expected from him by his teachers.

The data also shows that the diversity of school students' characteristics of facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness seem to cause diverse student-teacher expectations. The more the school student has peculiar characteristics, the higher expectations he gets from his student-teachers. These results support the previous findings of many research works, which indicated that teachers do form different expectations about their diverse classroom students. The results coincide with the McCombs and Gay (1987), Denessen (2014), and Gentrup et al. (2020) findings.

What more affirms the effect the attractiveness and tidiness have on student-teacher expectations are the table's data regarding the differences between student-teachers' expectations which favored the 2nd student, who is attractive, and their expectations regarding the 4th student, who is neither attractive nor tidy.

The table's data also has shown that these expectations did not differ between 2nd and 3rd school students on most of the items. That suggests that student-teachers carry similar perceptions towards 2nd school student with attractiveness but less tidiness and the 3rd unattractiveness school student with tidiness. Most of the differences were on the items that are related to the academic performances. They did not exist regarding expectations related to "gaining job post." The job posting is not accorded in Kuwait based on school achievements, but instead on social favoritism, which interprets these expectations' similarity.

Table 2 shows that student-teachers have higher expectations of the 3rd student on all items than the 4th. The 3rd student's tidiness seems to have compensated for his unattractiveness when the student-teacher expectations were formed. In comparison, the unattractiveness and untidiness of the 4th caused lower student-teacher expectations around him.

The results, then, answer the study's central question and affirms that this phenomenon exists among Kuwaiti student-teachers. These student-teachers form differentiated expectations about school students based on their various facial attractiveness and school uniform tidiness. It has shown the mounting effect of school students' distinctive characteristics.

Previous research findings meet with the results of the present study. These are the research work that pointed out the student's socio-economic status, background, and attractiveness, and many factors causing the formation of teachers' expectations. Among these are the studies of Bergh (2010), the Education Commission of the States (2012), Timmermans et al. (2016), and Gentrup (2020).

The results in Table 3 are related to the study's 2nd question. It shows that the student-teachers' GPA variable did not affect the student-teachers' expectations of any of the four school students. There were no differences in the expectations of both groups of GPA student-teachers concerning their school students on most of the items investigated in the present study. The only difference observed is between these two groups on the 1st school student. These concerns "enjoying low brilliance," which indicates that the high GPA student-teacher group is more confident than the low GPA student-teacher group that this school student will show low brilliance. That implies that the GPA variable

does not cause differences in the student-teacher expectations and that all student-teachers of low and high GPAs have similar expectations. (see table 3).

Nicely(2007) found no significant statistical relationship between GPA and job performance, but this did not include investigating such a relation with teacher expectations. That suggests conducting such investigation by future research work.

The results in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 relate to the variable of specialization field effect on each school student's student-teachers' expectations consecutively. The fields of specialization concerned are The Islamic, Arabic, English, Social Studies, and Science & math groups.

The teacher's field of specialization is known to affect his performance in the profession. Attia (2017) indicated that teacher subject-matter knowledge elevates his comfort level, enriches his teaching experience, and improves his students' learning and academic achievement. The results, nevertheless, indicate that this variable does not lead to worth-noting differences between the student-teachers' expectations of every school student. Minimal differences existed. Even when they existed, they were mainly between two of the five groups of student-teacher fields of specialization, namely the Islamic and the Arabic Language groups of student-teachers.

There were no differences between these groups regarding the 1st student on any of the study items. Furthermore, there were slight differences regarding the 2nd school student on only two items where the Arabic Language group differed on "gaining distinguished future job posts" and "college education completion." The 3rd school student was expected by the Arabic Language group to "enjoy high brilliance,"probably for his tidiness. The English Language group differed from other groups in its expectation of the 4th school student's "gaining distinguished future job posts."

In the conclusion of this discussion, we can assume that these results argue that the student's distinctive facial attractiveness and tidiness cause the student-teachers of all fields of specialization to have similar expectations. All teachers would form such high expectations towards that classroom student of distinguished facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness regardless of their specializations. Previous research such as Arganbright (1983), Dusek and Josef (1983), and Rolison and Medway (1985) support these findings of the present research.

The results make one wonder if that case is with student-teachers who have little experience but not with the in-service schoolteachers of long experience in Kuwait's schools. That needs to be examined in future research. Such research should examine the factor of years of practical teaching experience and determine their effects on such teachers in various specializations expectations. Previous studies such as Ahmed's (2010) study indicated a significant difference between more experienced and less experienced. In contrast, Timmermans et al.'s (2018) research indicated no statistically significant differences in teachers' expectations based on teaching experience years.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The present study answered its three main research questions:

1st question was related to whether the College of Education's student-teachers at Kuwait University form classroom expectations based on students' facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness.

The 2nd question was related to whether the GPA variable affects this process.

The 3rd question was related to whether the field of specialization variable affects this process.

The teachers' expectations appeared in this study to exist in Kuwait's schools in the same manner they did in other research studies. This study substantiates that student-teachers, in general, do form such expectations around their classroom students. It appears that this phenomenon can be found in all classrooms regardless of their regions. These results confirm the conclusion of Arganbright's study (1983), which states that teacher expectations are a common phenomenon and that we, all, grow in a frame of expectations.

The study has shown that school students' extreme characteristics of attractiveness and tidiness cause them to receive more positive judgments consistently. There is an immense influence of facial attractiveness and students' tidiness on human judgments, specifically in classrooms.

Teachers' expectations have a significant effect on the educational process and the learners. These expectations hinder students' academic performance Parks et al. (2010), and the teachers form false expectations that can reflect on students' achievements. Gentrup (2020) There is a necessity for the teacher-preparation programs to take over the burden of training their students to comprehend and acquire the ultimate skills of dealing with these expectations appropriately.

Brophy (1983), Jonson (1983), and Rubie-Davis (2009) called for advising the teachers to believe in their students' abilities since that can improve their achievement and lessens the expectation's harmful effects.

The school student's attractiveness and tidiness play a spectacular role in forming these expectations. This matter must be taken seriously and bring the teachers' attention not to let student characteristics affect their expectations.

The formation process occurs with all student-teachers regardless of their GPAs or specialization fields. These variables did not alter the types of formation of expectations. These expectations are formed by all groups of student teachers regardless of their differences in such variables.

Anyhow, the factors that cause the forming of such teacher expectations may not be limited to students' attractiveness and tidiness. Previous studies have pointed to many other ones such as student background, gender, social status, and many other factors. Muntoni and Retelsdorf (2018). The present study involved two of these factors, that is, facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness. Thus, the researcher suggests considering the following recommendations:

- The researcher suggests that further research is conducted on teacher expectations to examine this phenomenon's effects on the classroom student's achievement in Kuwait's schools.
- Teacher preparation programs in Kuwait's higher education institutions must include specialized courses in its curricula that pay its student-teachers' attention to this issue. That should apply to the practical training period as well.
- In-service workshops must be organized for the present schoolteachers for the same purposes.
- Moreover, personnel in various schools must exert every effort possible to eliminate its occurrence with those teachers. Feedbacks, in this regard, of course, should be offered by field specialists in the form of in-service training workshops.

References

Ayaz, A., & KaracanÖzdemir, N. (2021). A case study of a Turkish vocational high school, and the challenges for teachers. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 1-20.

Ahmad, E. (2010). "Effect of teacher expectations of the academic achievement of their students on both academic competency and teacher-enhancing behavior among middle school students." *Journal of the faculty of Education in Mansoura*, (In Arabic) 2: (1): 1-55.

Akifyeva, R. and Alieva, A. (2018) "The influence of student ethnicity on teacher expectations and teacher perceptions of warmth and competence." *Psychology in Russia*: State of the Art, 11(1): 105-124.

Arganbright, J. (1983). "Teacher expectations- A critical factor for student achievement." *NASSP Bulletin*, 93-95.

Attia, N. (2017). *Teachers' perception on the relationship between subject-specialized teaching and students' achievement in elementary classrooms*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). The University of Toronto. http://hdl.handle.net/1807/76925

Barrigaa, C., et.al (2019). "Factors that bias teacher expectations: Findings from Chile." *Revista Latino americana de Psicología*, 51(3):171-180.

Bognar, C. (1983). "Teacher expectations and student characteristics." *Canadian Journal of Education*, 8(1), 47-56.

Bonefeld, M., Kleen, H., & Glock, S. (2021). The effect of the interplay of gender and ethnicity on teachers' judgments: Does the school subject matter?. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 1-21.

Brattesani, K. Weinstien, R., and Berkley, H. (1984). "student perceptions of differential teacher treatment as moderators of teacher expectations effects." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(2):236-247.

Brophy, J. (1983). "Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(5), 631-661.

Cecil, N. (1988). "Black dialect and academic success: A study of teacher expectations." *Reading Improvement*, 25, 34-38.

Cooper, H. (1983). "*A historical overview of teacher expectation effects*." Eric Document # ED239176.

Cooper, H., and Tom, D. (1984). "Teacher expectation research: A review with implications for classroom instruction." *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(1), 77-89.

Denessen, E. J. P. G., & Douglas, A. S. (2015). Teacher expectations and within-classroom differentiation. *The Routledge international handbook of social psychology of the classroom*, 296-303.

Dusek, J. and Josef, G. (1983). "The bases of teacher expectations": A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(3): 327-346.

ECS (Education Commission of the states). (2012) "Teacher expectations of students: A self-fulfilling prophecy?" *The progress of education reforms,*13 (6): 2-7.

Gentrup, S., Lorenz, G., Kristen, C., & Kogan, I. (2020). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the classroom: Teacher expectations, teacher feedback, and student achievement. *Learning and Instruction*, *66*, 101296

Gershenson, S., Holt, S., and Papageororge, W. (2016). "Who believes in me? The effect of the student-teacher demographic match on teacher expectations." *Economics of Education Review*, 52: 209-224.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1978). "*Looking into classrooms*." New Harper & Row.

Guskey, T. (1982). "The effects of change in instructional effectiveness on the relationships of teacher expectations & student achievement." *Journal of Educational Research*, July/ August 75(6), 345-349.

Haynes, N. & Johnson, S. (1983). "Self and teacher expectancy effects on the academic performance of college students enrolled in an academic reinforcement program." *American Educational Research Journal*, 20 (4), 511-516.

Idika, E. O. (2020). Students' and teachers' factors hindering effective teaching and learning of economics in secondary schools in the Nsukka local government area of Enugu State. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*.

Kanavakis, G., Halazonetis, D., Katsaros, C., &Gkantidis, N. (2021). Facial shape affects self-perceived facial attractiveness. *Plos one*, *16*(2), e0245557.

McCombs, R. & Gay, J. (1987). "Effects of race, class, and I.Q. information on the judgment of Parochial Grade School teachers." *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 128(5), 647-652.

Malmberg, L. and Martin, A. (2019). "Teachers' expectations help students to work harder but can also reduce enjoyment and confidence." *The Conversation: Academic rigour, journalistic flair*.Teachers' expectations help students to work harder, but can also reduce enjoyment and confidence – new research (theconversation.com)

Muntoni, F. &Retelsdorf, J. (2018). "Gender-specific teacher expectations in reading: The role of teachers' gender stereotypes." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 54: 212-220.

Nicely, T. (2007). *The Relationship of College GPA and Job Performance for Teaching Faculty at Blue Ridge Community College*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Old Dominion University

Parks, F. R., & Kennedy, J. H. (2007). The impact of race, physical attractiveness, and gender on education majors' and teachers' perceptions of student competence. *Journal of Black Studies*, *37*(6), 936-943.

Patriarca, L. and Kragt, D. (1986)." Teacher expectations and student achievement: The Ghost of Christmas Future." *Curriculum Review*, 48-50.

Ritts, V., Patterson, M. L., & Tubbs, M. E. (1992). Expectations, impressions, and judgments of physically attractive students: A review. *Review of educational research*, *62*(4), 413-426.

Rolison, M. & Midway, F. (1985). "Teacher expectations and attributions for student achievement: Effects of label, performance, pattern, and special education intervention." *American educational research journal*, 22(4), 561-573.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). "*Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development.*" N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Rubie-Davies, C., Peterson, E., Flint, A., & Garrett, L. (2012). "Ethnicity and teacher expectations in New Zealand." *New Zealand Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 256 – 261.

Rubie-Davies, C. (2009). Teacher expectations and labeling. In *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (pp. 695-707). Springer, Boston, MA.

Salvia, J., Algozzine, R., &Sheare, J. (1977). Attractiveness and school achievement. *Journal of School Psychology*, *15*(1), 60-67.

Talamas, S. N., Mavor, K. I., & Perrett, D. I. (2016). Blinded by beauty: Attractiveness bias and accurate perceptions of academic performance. *PloS one*, *11*(2), e0148284.

Timmermans, A. C., de Boer, H., & van der Werf, M. P. (2016). An investigation of the relationship between teachers' expectations and teachers' perceptions of student attributes. *Social psychology of education*, *19*(2), 217-240.

Timmermans, A. C., & Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2018). Do teachers differ in the level of expectations or in the extent to which they differentiate in expectations? Relations between teacher-level expectations, teacher background and beliefs, and subsequent student performance. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *24*(3-5), 241-263.

Tom, D., Cooper, H., & McGraw, M. (1984). "Influences of student background and teacher authoritarianism on teacher expectations." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(2), 259-265.

Vogler, K., Schramm-Pate, S., & Allan, A. (2019). Relationship of Instructional Time Configuration, Gender and Race on Seventh Grade Social Studies Performance. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, *10*(4), 1-25.

Woodcock, S. (2013). "Trainee Teachers' Attitudes Towards Students with Specific Learning Disabilities" *Australian Journal of Education*, 38: (8), 14-29.

Appendix

The field study questionnaire

Dear Student-Teacher,

Attached is a questionnaire that aims at identifying the expectations that you, as student-teacher teaching in Kuwaiti schools, hold towards diverse school students.

Your cooperation in responding to this questionnaire's items can help reach the best recommendations and suggestions needed to improve the educational process.

We kindly ask that you carefully read the statements contained in it and express your opinion, with an (X), on each of these statements after completing the bibliographic information on the first page of this questionnaire.

In advance, please accept the most profound appreciation for your valuable cooperation, which, undoubtedly, will have the most significant benefits to this research work.

Best regards,

The researcher

BibliographicInformation

1) **GPA:**

Less than 2.67 ( )
2.67 &over ( )

2) **Field of Specialty:**

(A) Islamic Studies ( )
(B) Arabic Language ( )
(C) English Language ( )
(D) Social Studies ( )
(E) Science &Arithmetic ( )

A field study questionnaire on:

Effect of Students' Attractiveness and Tidiness on the Development of Student-teachers' Expectations of their Intellectuality

Important Instructions:

Before responding to items on the following questionnaire, behold the attached four photo pictures which represent diverseschool students and then begin to respond using an (X) near the most appropriate scale to you on each item of the questionnaire, which follows in a way that expresses what you think would conform to the chance and potentiality of each one of the students, represented on those photos, tofulfill any of the following:

1- Gaining distinguished future job posts:

a) 1st student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

2- Show more Motivation to achieve and excel:

a) 1st student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

3- Attainment of high levels of academic achievement:

a) 1st student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:
( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

4- Winning school awards:

a) 1st student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

5- Enjoying High brilliance:

a) 1st student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

6- Enjoying Low brilliance:

a) 1st student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

7- High-school completion:

a) 1st student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

8- College education completion:

a) 1st student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

9-Accomplishing a Ph.D. degree:

a) 1st student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

10- Speed grasping of new experiences:

a) 1st student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

b) 2nd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

c) 3rd student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )

d) 4th student:

( )Very High ( ) High ( ) Moderate Low ( ) Very low ( )