

Students' characteristics influence on the expectations of student-teachers regarding learners' behaviors, attitudes, and ambitions : A comparison study between Social Studies and other subject areas

*Dr. Abdullah J. Alhajri

*Dr. Abdulaziz K. Alshammari

Abstract

Objectives: The purpose of this study was to compare the influence of students' characteristics on social studies student teachers' expectations of students' behavioral, attitudinal, or ambitious performances and other student teachers.

Methodology: A descriptive quantitative approach consisted of administering a questionnaire on a sample of 135 student teachers of various specializations and GPAs at Kuwait University. Data analysis compared the mean of the sample respondents.

Results: The results showed that student teachers of different GPAs and fields of specialization tend to form different expectations about diverse classroom students based on some of their characteristics. However, no differences in these expectations based on the student teachers' GPAs and fields of specialization existed.

Conclusion: Recommendations were brought to the Kuwaiti Ministry of Education and the teacher preparation program in Kuwaiti universities. The influence of these student characteristics on achievement is suggested to be researched by further studies.

Keywords: *teachers' expectations, student characteristics, students' behaviors.*

خصائص التلاميذ وأثرها على تكوين التوقعات لدى الطلبة المعلمين الخاصة بسلوكيات واتجاهات وطموحات المتعلمين؛ دراسة مقارنة بين الدراسات الاجتماعية والتخصصات الأخرى
د. عبد الله الهاجري، د. عبد العزيز الشمري

المستخلص

الأهداف: مقارنة مدى تأثير خصائص المتعلمين على توقعات الطلبة المعلمين الخاصة بالأداء السلوكي أو الاتجاهات أو طموح هؤلاء المتعلمين وذلك ما بين تخصص الدراسات الاجتماعية وغيرها.

المنهجية: استخدم الباحث المنهج الوصفي الكمي من خلال استبانة معدة لهذا الغرض وعينت من 135 من الطلبة المعلمين بكلية التربية بجامعة الكويت بمراعاة مختلف تخصصاتهم ومعدلاتهم الدراسية كمتغيرات للدراسة. **نتائج الدراسة:** أظهرت النتائج أن الطلاب-المعلمين من مختلف المعدلات ومجالات التخصص يقومون بتشكيل توقعات مختلفة حول الطلاب على أساس مستوى جاذبيتهم وترتيب الهندام ولم توجد أية فروق في هذه التوقعات بين الطلبة-المعلمين من مختلف التخصصات والمعدلات الدراسية.

الخلاصة: قدمت الدراسة توصياتها إلى وزارة التربية والتعليم الكويتية وبرامج إعداد المعلمين بالجامعات الكويتية. وختم الباحث دراسته بالدعوة لإجراء مزيد من البحث لدراسة تأثير هذه الخصائص الطلابية على التحصيل العلمي في المادة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: *توقعات المعلمين، خصائص التلميذ، سلوكيات التلميذ.*

Introduction

The overall physical appearance of any person seems, as research suggests, to be related to the treatment he or she receives from others. For

◆Associate Professor, C&I, Kuwait University (Social Studies)

◆Assistant Professor, C&I, Kuwait University (Social Studies)

example, sometimes, a person might not get his demands met by others because of his unappealing physical appearance or be treated fairly. Moreover, as in the example of the fat "Joan," in Hanifah, Rockman's (2020) research, the person might get bullied by friends "in a very unpleasant way" (Hanifah, Rockman, 2020, p. 136).

The persons' physical appearance, including facial attractiveness and any other physical appearance aspect, affects other people's impressions. However, a vast body of research on this topic asserted that. They provided shreds of evidence that it leads to such impressions, or as what that body of research calls it, "expectations." For example, Batres (2020) demonstrated, from her review of a body of research, that it takes only a few of exposure to people's faces to make our judgments of them (Batres, 2020, p. 1). Lerner & Lerner (2021) reported that Physical attractiveness was positively related to positive peer relations and teachers' appraisals of academic ability and adjustment.

Teacher classroom behavior is one of the subjects considered by many research studies that examined these behaviors and their influences on their students' performance & achievement; among these behaviors that harm students' achievements and performances is "Teachers' Expectations," which was formed unintentionally by the teachers but still significantly affected their students' misevaluation performances. The subject, then, seems to have attracted the interest of many researchers. In this regard, Hernandez and Peters (2015) stated that "a large literature has established a significant return to appearance across several areas" and added that "the literature also indicates that appearance is related to student's academic outcomes, particularly grades" (Hernandez and Peters, 2015, p. 3). Furthermore, in their research study, Hanifah & Rokhman (2015) noticed from their results that as the student's attractiveness increases, so does the difference in performance (Hanifah & Rokhman, 2015, p. 15).

Research related to this subject started to overgrow and proved that teachers form such expectations. Beginning with the study conducted by Rosenthal & Jacobson (1968), several studies provided strong evidence that teachers' expectations can significantly affect student achievement. Cooper (1983) points out that, up to 1978, about 112 studies investigated teacher expectations and supported its existence and influences. In its beginning, it was termed as the "Self-fulfilling prophecy" (Farhan, Al-Kinani, and Rizk, 2020, p. 389).

These expectations can lead to the unfair treatment of the person we form our expectations. Unfortunately, as has been indicated by many researchers,

these expectations do form with many teachers, and this can happen unintentionally, causing impairment to the learning process of many of our school students. According to Verhoeven, Poorthuis, & Volman (2019), many researchers reported the "unintentional" role that teachers' expectations play in the development of adolescents' identities" (Verhoeven, Poorthuis, & Volman, 2019, p. 45).

Teachers' expectations are associated with what the teacher thinks of the student's ability or inability to achieve and succeed (Woodcock & Faith, 2021). Therefore, they can determine the level of interaction between the teacher and the learner. Different students are dealt with differently when interacting with the teachers according to their expectations (Denessen, 2014, Kususanto, 2012, Falsario, 2014 and Jeon, 2017).

Therefore, this issue becomes of considerable significance, primarily regarding its influences on our classroom students' academic achievement and general aspects of his performance. That significance becomes horrendous when teachers form such expectations around their students according to their attractiveness that might have undesired impacts. Gregory & Roberts (2017) believe that teacher expectations might influence students' self-perceptions and performance and that the "students might perceive and emotionally react to low or high teacher expectations, which could benefit or damage the quality of their work and could cause their behavior to conform to what they believe teachers expect of them." They add that "teacher expectations cause student outcomes to converge on what were initially incorrect expectations" (Gregory & Roberts, 2017, p. 7). Glock, Krolak-Schwerdt, & Hörstermann (2016) support the idea of teachers' expectations' influences on students' behavior. They claim that, in their study, the student teachers carried differential behavioral expectations for high and SES (Social Economic Status), and they explain that by claiming "the teacher's attitude towards the social behavior of high SES students primarily contribute to the judgment of low SES; that is, these judgments are related to the differential behavioral expectations for high and low SES students, especially when they have more positive attitudes toward high SES students" (Glock, Krolak-Schwerdt, & Hörstermann, 2016, p. 15).

It was declared in much previous research that these teacher expectations develop according to many factors and these factors are ones that are related to specific characteristics of the students. Among these characteristics

are the student's physical appearance, including his facial attractiveness and tidiness. Craig (2020) has shown that attractive individuals receive incentives for their beauty. Incentives can come in the forms of higher pay, positive trait attribution, and career success (Craig, 2020, p. 22).

They can be related to physical appearance and attractiveness. For example, Tu, Gilbert, & Bono (2021) once reported that attractive individuals are perceived as exhibiting a more effective nonverbal presence (Tu, Gilbert, & Bono, 2021, p. 18). Furthermore, they are believed to be more successful in all aspects of their lives (N'Gbala, Tsang & Crandall, 2007, p. 9). This claim is found in many studies, amongst which are those of Salvia, Algozzine & Sheare (1977), McCombs and Gay (1987), Ritts, Patterson, & Tubbs (1992); Alhajri (2021 A); Lerner & Lerner (2021); and Kanavakis, Halazonetis, Katsaros & Gkantidis (2021).

As Hanifah & Rokhman (2020) report, "a physically attractive child is viewed more positively than the physically unattractive one" (Hanifah & Rokhman, 2020, p. 136). Palmer & Peterson (2021) refer to what they term as the "Halo effect" as the factor leading individuals to attribute positive traits, such as intelligence, to others based upon the presence of physical attractiveness (Palmer & Peterson, 2021, p. 552).

Nevertheless, not all researchers agree that attractiveness alone can cause the formation of such expectations of others, specifically the school students. Tu, Gilbert & Bono's (2021) research, for example, demonstrates that natural bias does not fully account for attractive individuals' success pointing to the notion of the individual students' "self-presentation as a factor that can compensate for his unattractiveness (Tu, Gilbert & Bono, 2021, p. 21). However, Krawczyk (2018) also denies such an influence on the formation of teachers' expectations and substantiates that the student's quality of work, rather than his attributes of attractiveness (or gender), determines his success.

Marx (1999) annotates an urgent need to increase teachers' awareness of these facts to develop their expertise in dealing correctly with these expectations to provide the needed learning conditions for students' achievements regardless of their characteristics. (Marx, 1999, p. 249).

The influence on the student's behaviors, attitudes, and ambitions might also exist. Some teachers' expectations based on the student's physical and facial attractiveness might cause stereotyping and shape their behaviors, attitudes, and ambitions. The present study mainly concerns itself with this topic. Since not much research involved Kuwaiti school environments, this researcher's motive was to

conduct a similar study on a diverse geographical school environment to investigate these expectations' existence in it.

Definition of research concept:

The term or concept of "Teacher Expectations " has been defined by most researchers who have researched the subject. Thus, Copper and Tom (1984) group these definitions into three categories:

1st category: Studies that have seen it as "Teachers' predictions and estimations" of their students' present achievement levels. In this study, teachers described their students' expectations without indicating any predictions about their future performances.

2nd category: Studies that relate this definition to "teachers' estimation" of the level of progress or development that the student would attain in his/ her academic performance within a defined range of time. These studies use the term to identify these expectations' influences on student performance.

3rd category: Studies that look at this definition as "The degree at which teachers base their estimates of their student performances at present." This degree is measured by comparing teachers' expectations or valuations of students' performances through Standardized Tests or other performance measures. These studies aim to uncover differences between teachers' estimates and the actual students' achievements through these measurement tests.

The present research examines if teachers in Kuwaiti schools form such expectations towards their students' behavioral, attitudinal, and ambitious performances according to their students' facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness.

The significance of the study

Many studies have proven the influence of the student's attractiveness on forming teacher expectations. Some, such as Rubie-Davis, Peterson, Flint, and Garrett (2012), asserted the importance of " exploring teacher expectations" (Rubei-Davis, Peterson, Flint, and Garrett., 2012, p. 256). Furthermore, some of this research claimed that these teacher expectations could even shape and affect the students' behaviors, attitudes, and ambitions. Thus, these students' behaviors and attitudes seem to be affected by their teacher's expectations. Batruch & van de Werfhorst (2018), as an example, allege that "teachers' perception of students' school behavior and attitudes are related to teachers' expectations for students (Geven, Batruch & van de Werfhorst, 2018, p. 4).

However, several such studies were conducted in diverse classrooms and school environments other than Kuwait. Then it goes without saying that there is a great need to conduct such explorations on the Kuwaiti schools. These explorations can benefit teachers' programs, especially when the results confirm the previously proved. Additionally, these results should greatly benefit the in-service schoolteachers and the students' learning process.

The present researcher felt a need to study this issue in Kuwaiti classrooms to arrive at the necessary recommendations based on its findings.

Purpose of the study

Harrison & Waller (2018) suggest that there is a strong relationship between expectations and "young people's aspirations and socioeconomic status," they are "shaped by the adults surrounding them," and "parents and teachers "exert a strong influence on which possible selves appear probable to young people" (Harrison & Waller, 2018, p. 9).

The present study aims to determine if student-teachers at Kuwait university's college of education form classroom expectations about their students' behavioral, attitudinal, and ambitious performances based on their students' characteristics. Furthermore, it investigates if the social studies student-teachers differ from others in this formation. The student teachers' GPA is also considered. This determination, if prevailed, should help in reaching worthy and beneficial suggestions and recommendations.

Research questions

The present study pursues to answer the following research questions:

- 1- Based on the school students' characteristics, do student-teachers in the college of education at Kuwait universities form any classroom expectations regarding these school students' behavioral, attitudinal, and ambitious school performances?
- 2- Does the GPA of the student-teacher have any influence on the formation of such expectations?
- 3- Do social studies student teachers differ from their counterparts of other fields of specialization in forming such expectations?

Review of Related Literature

Teacher expectations are related to those teachers' perceptions that affect students' performance conform to them. For example, Farhan, Al-Kinani, and Rizk, 2020 stated that what leads to the student's higher or lower performance

and academic achievement is what we expect from him (Farhan, Al-Kinani, and Rizk, 2020, p. 389).

Arganbright (1983) considers teachers' expectations a natural phenomenon. He claims that "we all originate and live in a frame of expectations, and expectations develop based on classroom interactions. Likewise, McCroskey & Daly (1976) assert that the teacher expectations are generated by our apprehensive communication behavior and point to its severe influences on many children in the schools (McCroskey & Daly, 1976, p. 71).

On the other hand, Bognar (1983) and Woodcock & Faith (2021) disagree and suggest that teacher expectations do not influence all humans. Tom and Cooper's study (1984) supports this ascription and suggests that teachers' understanding of students' affections leads to lesser expectation formation. Whereas Jussim (1994), Sweatt (2000), and Gentrup (2020), on their part, go further than that when they deny entirely such influences of teacher expectations and achievement and claim that they are inaccurate.

In 1968 Rosenthal and Jacobson provided strong evidence that teachers' expectations can significantly affect student achievement. (Cooper 1983) cited Rosenthal and Robin (1978) as reporting support for the existence of such influence in at least 40% of these studies (Cited in Cooper, 1983, P.3).

Several studies have affirmed the existence of teacher expectations and their influences on school students. Some of these studies, such as that of Woodcock & Faith (2021), associate them with what the teacher thinks of the student's ability or inability to achieve and succeed. Brattesani and Weinstein (1984); N'Gbala, Tsang & Crandall (2007); Kususanto's (2012); Jimenez (2013), on their part, claim that they can increase the student's perceived attributions, thus, boosting remarkable differences between students' achievements. Others like Brattesani and Weinstein (1984) accuse the students of causing these expectations' existence, followed by conforming their performances to them. Denessen & Douglas (2014, P. 6) claim that many indicators confirm that teaching practices are based on biased perceptions of students' needs. Patriarca and Kragt (1986), Woodcock (2013), Parks & Kennedy (2007), and Gentrup, Lorenz, Kristen & Kogan (2020) claim that they harm and hinder students' achievement or lead to future failures.

Falsario (2014), Denessen (2014), and Jeon (2017) claim that different students are dealt with differently when interacting with the teachers according to

their expectations. Therefore, a teacher with negative expectations cannot interact positively (Abu Daly, 2014). That led Malik (2010), Loughlin (2011), Lotfy (2012), Woodson (2013), Hannah (2013), Sowell (2013), Falsario (2014), Jeon (2017), and Gronostay (2020) to assert that the classroom must be made a better place for enhancing students' interaction with the teacher. For that reason, Jinam (2016) asserts that the teacher's task of establishing such good interactive relations with all students is not easy (Jinam, 2016, p. 147). That led Jonson (1983) to suggest that teachers enhance the student's self-expectancy to reduce teachers' negative expectations. Likewise, Rubie-Davis (2009) supported and called the teachers to lift their beliefs in their students' abilities to achieve instead of letting these expectations cause such damage to their students (Rubie-Davis, 2009, P. 695).

Despite the conflicting results of studies, Van Den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, and Rob (2010); Turner (2015); Akifyeva (2018) and Barriga, Rodríguez, & Ferreira (2019) suggest that the teacher formation of expectations is generally based on student's characteristics of sex. Van Den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, and Rob (2010); Turner (2015); Akifyeva (2018), and Barriga, Rodríguez, & Ferreira (2019) suggest that the teacher formation of expectations is generally based on student's characteristics.

The influence of students' gender is referred to in many studies. For example, Muntoni and Retelsdorf (2018) noticed that teachers favored girls in their expectations, and in Bonefeld, Kleen & Glock's (2021) study, teachers perceived female students' lower levels than male students' ability. In addition, Arganbright's (1983), Dusek and Josef's (1983), Cooper and Tom's (1984), Tom and Cooper's (1984), Rolison and Medway's (1985), Van Den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, and Rob's (2010), Education Commission of the States's (2012), and Timmermans, de Boer, & van der Werf's (2016) studies are amongst these studies that pointed to such influences of students' gender. Furthermore, Krawczyk's (2018) study examined the influence of the variable of student sex. Female students, in this study, were treated relatively favorably than males, especially the attractive females who were awarded relatively higher grades. Finally, Muntoni & Retelsdorf (2018) examined the relations between students' gender, teachers' gender stereotypes, teacher expectations of students' reading ability, and students' reading achievement. The sample consisted of 54 teachers and 1358 fifth-grade students (49% girls; age at T1: 10.89 years). The main results have shown that teachers' higher expectations concerning the reading ability of girls explained the differences between boys' and girls' reading achievement; that is, teachers with

stronger stereotypes favoring girls expected girls to have higher reading ability than boys.

Rural area students were negatively perceived by their teachers in Ayaz and Ozdemer's (2021) research. Cecil (1988), Robertson, Smeets, Lubinski, & Benbow (2010), Rubie-Davies, Peterson, Flint & Garrett (2012), Teklu & Kumar (2013) Gershenson, Holt and Papageorge (2016), Akifyeva (2018), Vogler, Schramm-Pate & Allan (2019) Farfan, Holla, & Vakis (2021), (Al-Muzairi and Hanafi, 2019), and Gentrup, Lorenz, Kristen & Kogan (2020), relate this formation to student behaviors, low abilities, backgrounds and ethnicity, and color.

Some research went even further on this issue and has pointed out that the student's seat location can form teachers' expectations. For example, Szparagowski (2014) claims that this happens because teachers spend seventy percent of the time allocated for classroom teaching with students who sit in the front of the class. Of these studies are those of Marx (1999); Meeks, Knotts, James, Williams, Vassar, & Wren, 2013; Ngugi, and Thinguri, 2017; Parker, Hoopes, and Eggett, (2011); Rist, (1970); Tagliacolloab, Volpatoac, & Pereira (2010); Zomorodian, Parva, Ahrari, Tavana, Hemyari, Pakshir, Jafari, P. and Sahraian (2012); Ngware, Ciera, Musyoka, and Oketch (2013); Smith, Hoare & Lacey (2018); Will, Bischof & Kingstone, (2020); and alhajri, (2021 B). All claim that teachers form more positive expectations towards the students sitting closer to them.

Contrarily, studies of Marx, Urs, and Terry (1999), Tagliacolloab, Volpatoac, & Pereira (2010), Zomorodian, Parva, Ahrari, Tavana, Hemyari, Pakshir, Jafari and Sahraian (2012), Meeks, Knotts, James, Williams, Vassar, & Wren (2013), Woodson (2013), Smith, Hoare & Lacey (2018), and Phoong, Phoong, Moghawemi & Sulaiman (2019) oppose such location influence on student performance. They, instead, link it to practical learning experiences.

Regarding the influence of teacher characteristics, Watson, Rubie-Davis, Meissel, Peterson, Garrett & McDonald's (2015) study found that teacher gender was associated significantly with teacher expectations of student achievement with negative implications for students taught by male teachers. However, other research, such as Harris, Rosenthal, & Snodgrass's (1986), Timmermans & Rubie-Davies (2018), and Ahmed's (2010) studies, found no differences based on this variable.

Moreover, researchers attended to the influence of the variable of teachers' years of experience; here, we may also notice conflicting results. For

example, Fox (2015) and Ahmed (2020) claim that more experienced teachers have higher schooling expectations, whereas Barriga, Rodríguez, & Ferreira's (2019) findings showed no differences between the in-service and preservice teachers. On the other hand, the classroom size had such influence in the study of Yigit, Alpaslan, Cinemre, and Balcin (2017), whereas Sanders, Wright & Horn (1997) and Ngoboka & Schultz (2002) deny such classroom size influences.

According to an extensive body of studies, the student's physical appearance, facial attractiveness, and tidiness seem to cause teachers to form expectations. These studies have examined the influence of students' facial attractiveness on teacher expectations and showed different findings. For example, Monk Jr, Esposito, & Lee (2021) claim that "we have certain expectations of others' competence and future behaviors linked to their physical appearance" (Monk Jr, Esposito, & Lee, 2021, p. 202). Hernandez & Peters (2015) support this claim and assert that "appearance does produce more learning" (Hernandez & Peters, 2015, p. 18). Marwit, Marwit, & Walker, E. F. (1978) investigated the influence of the student's attractiveness and race on the formation of teachers' expectations of the severity of classroom misbehaviors. The sample consisted of 197 participants (60 student teachers and 137 practicing teachers). The study results showed that the student teachers' ratings of black students, but not the whites, significantly increased in severity. The practicing teachers' expectations, on the other hand, were affected by student attractiveness rather than race, with transgressions by attractive children of both races being rated more severely than transgressions by unattractive children. That led Kanavakis, Halazonetis, Katsaros & Gkantidis (2021), McCombs and Gay (1987), and Talamas, Mavor & Perrett (2016) to invite teachers to properly deal with the influences of attractiveness to reduce its influences.

Contrarily, Carragher, Thomas, & Nicholls (2021) do not relate such an influence to facial attractiveness, and Schneider (2021), who refers to what she calls "biases in teachers' grading practices," exaggerates and claims that student attractiveness may even influence the instructor's grading (Schneider, 2021, p. 45). The study of Craig (2020) brought some evidence from its results that attractiveness may not be as big of a predictor for one's likelihood of getting more benefits than the less attractive. Instead, he seems to point to the power of the person's abilities and skills in this regard. The researcher, here, refers to "the future predictors of hireability" (Craig, 2020, p. 23).

This body of research carried several suggestions of ways of adequately dealing with this phenomenon and its adverse influences. Marx (1999) invites the teachers to develop their expertise in dealing correctly with these expectations to provide the needed learning conditions for students' achievements regardless of their characteristics. Gregory & Roberts (2017), in suggesting strategies to reduce the influence of their expectation on shaping the behavior of their students, advise teachers to modify how they teach, evaluate, and advise them, and in the case of low expectations (Gregory & Roberts, 2017, p. 7).

Marx (1999), Arganbright (1983), Patriarca and Kragt (1986), Ideka (2121), and Cooper and Tom (1984) called for the teacher's periodical evaluation of his expectations, and Brophy (1983) and Guskey (1982) warned against their denial of these expectations. Gentrup, Lorenz, Kristen & Kogan (2020) suggest reducing the biasing influences of students' backgrounds. Korman (1967), Mansfield (1973), Rubie-Davies (2015), and Papageorge, Gershenson, & Kang (2020) called for lifting the students' self-esteem through forming positive teacher expectations about them. Whereas Malik's (2010), Loughlin's (2011), Lotfy's (2012), Woodson's (2013), Sowell's (2013), Hannah's (2013), Yigit, Alpaslan, Cinemre, and Balcin's (2017), Malmberg's (2019), and Gronostay's (2020) studies suggested improving the classroom environment for its vast advantages on the process of learning. On their part, Sanders, Wright & Horn (1997) and Ngoboka & Schultz (2002) deny such classroom size influences.

To sum up, this literature review shows the profound researchers' interest in the subject. Furthermore, it defines factors that lead teachers to form such expectations, specifically those related to the student's physical attributes of facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness. Finally, it concentrates on the severity of the misestimating of students' actual performance and achievement.

Study methodology & procedures

Study Design

The study adopts the quantitative, descriptive approach, which involves a researcher-designed ten-item questionnaire applied to a sample of Kuwait University student-teachers. It also involves using an analysis tool to reach the needed results of answering the study's main questions related to the influence of students' characteristics of facial attractiveness and uniform tidiness on the formation of student-teachers expectations.

Study's Instrumentation and procedures:

The procedure involved presenting four photo pictures of 4 school students and a questionnaire. The researcher asked the sample to respond to its items directly after viewing each image. Each has represented multiple facial attractiveness and school uniform elegance of each school student. Each school student described was 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 contained ten items related to the student teachers' sample's expectations of the school students represented in each photo. These expectations were related to each school student's behaviors, attitudes, and ambitions. They included school students': attitudes toward school, relationships with classmates, cooperation with teachers, committing to regulations, practicing disturbances, attentiveness to lessons, attaining goals, attaining social status, speedy task execution, and task execution accuracy. In addition, this questionnaire required bibliographic information related to the respondent's GPA and specialization. Finally, each respondent gave his opinion on the ten questionnaire items regarding each of the four school students represented in each photo picture on the following five-degree scale:

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

Sample of the research

The present study's original sample consisted of 178 student teachers enrolled in practical student teaching training courses. Of those student teachers of five fields of specialization, only 135 responded to the study instrument. One hundred twenty-three of them were females, and only twelve were males (table1).

Table1:

Represents a sample of the study.

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

Statistical analysis

For data analysis purposes, we applied the following statistical tests:

- 1- Average values of the sample's responses related to each of the four subjected school students calculated on each item of the questionnaire,
- 2- T-test values to compare the averages of the four modeled school students then calculated for each of the ten items to point to the statistical differences in the opinions of the sample's student teachers,
- 3- T-tests values to compare opinions, on each of the ten items of respondents of higher GPA's (more than 2.67) and respondents of lower GPA's (less than 2.67), an
- 4- F-test values to compare specialization fields' influence on student teachers' expectations.

Study Results

Following is an extensive presentation of the results reached by the present study:

Firstly: results related to research question #1:

"Based on the school students' characteristics, do student-teachers in the college of education at Kuwait universities form any classroom expectations regarding these school students' behavioral, attitudinal, and ambitious school performances?"

The results show that sample student teachers form diverse school students' expectations based on their various facial attractiveness and school uniform tidiness. (Table 2) shows T values of each of the questionnaire's ten items.

The results of the means of all school students show that the student teachers positively expect the 1st school student, who is attractive and tidy on all the statements included in the questionnaire. He is expected to be more distinctive

than the rest of the other school students of other characteristics. The very high significant level of difference of (0.01) asserts that. This school student's means ranged between 3.84 and 4.13 on all of these statements. The T values show statistically significant differences (at 1% levels) between the means of this student and the rest of the other three students. Facial attractiveness and distinguished uniform tidiness seem to lead to more positive expectations towards this school student.

There were no significant differences at neither level of 0.01 nor 0.05 between the 2nd and 3rd school students in the sample's expectations on most of these statements. That leads to the assumption that these school students' characteristics can have some identical degree of influence on student-teachers expectations.

At 1% and 5% levels, there were significant differences between the 4th student and both the 2nd and 3rd students. Both 2nd and 3rd students had more positive student-teacher expectations than the 4th.

There was another significant difference between 1st and 2nd students on most of the statements. That shows that the school student's facial attractiveness significantly affects student-teachers expectations more than the uniform tidiness. Excluded from that are the expectations on school students' "*relationships with classmates*" with no differences.

The nonsignificant difference between the means of ^{second} and ^{third} students on several statements indicates the absence of either of the two students' attractiveness or the uniform tidiness characteristics on forming different expectations by the student teachers. On the contrary, they appear to cause forming similar student-teacher expectations towards these two school students who are less advantaged in the characteristics of the other, and vice versa.

The student teachers' expectations of the 2nd student differed significantly at 1% from those of the 4th on most of the statements, and at a 5% level on the one related to "task execution accuracy." That indicates the vast influence of facial attractiveness on the formation of positive student teachers' expectations and shows that it exceeds the school student's tidiness. The significant differences between the 3rd and 4th students confirm that. Thus, the results here show that the sample student-teachers seem to be affected in forming their expectations by the lesser characteristics of the 4th student.

These results assert the same results reached on the previous items; the sample student teachers form different expectations about diverse sample school

students. It also asserts that the 1st student is always favored in these expectations. It also shows that the attractive student whose uniform is tidy would differ from the unattractive student whose uniform is tidy regarding the teacher's expectations. Noteworthy, the sample student-teachers make these expectations, especially towards school students whose uniforms are untidy, regardless of their distinct facial attractiveness. The researcher can then assume that sample student teachers form different expectations according to their students' distinct characteristics. The 1st student was always expected to be more fortuitous.

Table2:

Represents mean averages and significance levels of sample student teachers' expectations of all sample school students.

#	Statement	Students' means				Significance					
		1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	1 st & 2 nd	1 st & 3 rd	1 st & 4 th	3 rd & 2 nd	4 th & 2 nd	4 th & 3 rd
1	Attitudes toward school	4.04	3.21	3.01	2.22	**	**	**	—	**	**
2	Relationships with classmates	3.84	3.82	2.76	2.86	—	**	**	**	**	—
3	Cooperation with teachers	4.13	3.26	3.07	2.57	**	**	**	—	**	**
4	Commitment to behavior regulations	4.27	2.39	4.03	3.30	**	*	**	**	**	**
5	Tendency to disturb	1.89	3.84	1.90	2.36	**	—	**	**	**	**
6	Attentiveness to class lessons	4.09	2.57	3.30	2.62	**	**	**	**	—	**
7	Goal attainment	4.01	2.81	2.99	2.28	**	**	**	—	**	**
8	Social standing attainment	3.94	3.05	2.88	2.44	**	**	**	—	**	**
9	Tasks' speedy execution	4.03	3.31	3.00	2.54	**	**	**	*	**	**
10	Task execution accuracy	3.96	2.79	3.13	2.45	**	**	**	*	*	**

(*) 0.05 sig.

(**) 0.01 sig.

(—) No sig.

Secondly: results related to research question #2:

" Does the student teachers' GPA have any influence on the formation of such expectations?"

Table 3 represents T values of the differences between the means and their significances on their students' expectations (Based on GPAs).

The sample student teachers' GPA did not cause them to form different expectations about the sample classroom students with varying attributes on most of the questionnaire's statement items except the 9th item.

On item# 9, " *Swiftness on the execution of requested tasks,*" the difference was significant, at the 5% level, between the means of the two groups of GPAs. That was only about the 4th student. The high GPA student-teachers are more apt than the low student-teachers to expect this student to execute his classroom tasks more quickly.

No significant differences existed on any other statement items for any other school students. So, one cannot conclude that the student's GPA could significantly affect teachers' expectations towards students with different characteristics. Instead, one can assume that all student teachers tend to form expectations regardless of their GPAs. (See table 3)

Table 3:

Represents T values of the differences between the means and their significances on the sample expectations towards the students (Based on GPAs)

#	Statement	1 st student			2 nd student			3 rd student			4 th student		
		M1	M2	Dif	M1	M2	Dif	M1	M2	Dif	M1	M2	Dif
1	Attitudes toward school	3.88	4.12	—	3.22	3.20	—	3.15	2.95	—	2.32	2.18	—
2	Relationships with classmates	3.88	3.83	—	3.83	3.82	—	2.95	2.67	—	2.95	2.82	—
3	Cooperation with teachers	4.20	4.11	—	3.27	3.26	—	3.29	2.97	—	2.56	2.57	—
4	Commitment to behavior regulation	4.20	4.30	—	2.34	2.40	—	4.10	4.00	—	3.51	3.21	—
5	Tendency to disturbing behaviors	1.73	1.96	—	3.80	3.85	—	1.88	1.91	—	2.34	2.36	—
6	Attentiveness to class lessons	4.00	4.13	—	2.66	2.53	—	2.29	2.30	—	2.61	2.63	—

#	Statement	1 st student			2 nd student			3 rd student			4 th student		
		M1	M2	Dif	M1	M2	Dif	M1	M2	Dif	M1	M2	Dif
7	Goal attainment	4.02	4.00	—	2.68	2.89	—	3.02	2.98	—	2.34	2.56	—
8	Social standing attainment	3.95	3.94	—	2.88	3.13	—	2.83	2.90	—	2.54	2.40	—
9	Task speedy execution	4.07	4.01	—	3.34	3.30	—	2.98	3.01	—	2.83	2.41	*
10	Task execution accuracy	3.93	3.97	—	2.68	2.83	—	3.07	3.16	—	2.61	2.38	—

(*) 0.05 sig. level. (**) 0.01 sig. level. (—) No statistical significance.

Thirdly: results related to research question #3:

"Do social studies student teachers differ from their counterparts of other fields of specialization in forming such expectations?"

Table 4, through table 7, represent the results related to the F values of the statistical differences between the means of various fields of specialization concerning expectations of the sample student teachers for each of the study's sample four classroom students of different characteristics.

The sample's student teachers' specialization did not influence their expectations towards any of the four students to differ. That was true on most of the statements except in a very few statement items in the study. Thus, the researcher concludes that specialization can play a minor role in forming expectations for student teachers.

1- Student teachers expectations regarding the 1st student:

There were no significant differences between all student teachers' expectations of different specializations regarding the 1st student (Table-4).

Table 4:

Represents the statistical significance of differences between various specialization fields (For 1st school student).

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		Sstudies		Sci. & math		F
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	
1	School attitudes	2.26	.81	1.91	.87	1.86	.96	1.92	.79	1.75	.62	1.14
2	Classmates' relations	2.10	.91	2.50	.91	2.33	.86	1.94	.86	2.25	.62	1.92
3	Cooperating with teachers	2.34	1.33	3.32	1.21	2.81	1.12	2.67	1.18	2.83	.83	2.19
4	Regulation attendance	1.74	.93	1.77	.75	1.71	.78	1.65	.78	2.00	.74	.46
5	Tendency to disturb	4.16	.87	4.23	.81	4.05	1.20	4.14	.87	3.75	.87	.64

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S.studies		Sci.& math		F
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	
6	Lesson attention	2.10	.83	2.09	1.02	1.71	.90	1.84	.83	1.75	.62	1.08
7	Goal attainment	2.74	1.29	3.41	1.14	3.57	.98	3.08	.93	3.50	1.17	2.55
8	Social standing attainment	2.06	.96	1.86	.64	1.81	.81	2.18	.95	2.33	.78	1.24
9	Speedy task execution	2.00	.89	2.00	.82	1.90	1.00	1.98	.85	1.92	.51	.99
10	Task accuracy	2.26	1.06	2.00	.76	1.95	.92	1.96	.84	2.08	.51	.66

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

This result indicates that student-teachers expect this student to outpace his counterparts on all items. This school student has more fascial attractiveness and is tidier; this may have resulted in the teacher's indifference to all fields of specialization. This result confirms with studies of Arganbright' (1983), Cooper and Tom's (1984), Tom and Cooper (1984), Dusek and Josef (1983), Education Commission of the states (2012), Van Den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, and Rob (2010), and Rolison and Medway (1985) which pointed to such factors amongst which is student's attractiveness factor.

2- Student teachers expectations regarding the 2nd student:

Concerning the 2nd student, table 5 shows the same results as the 1st student, except for the difference on item#1, "Liking and holding positive attitudes towards school," and item# 6, "attentiveness to class lessons." Here, the student-teachers expectations differed according to their specialization field. At level 0.01 on this statement item# 1, there is a significant difference between student teachers of the Arabic Language and Islamic Studies groups. The F value suggests that the Arabic Language group (mean of 3.41) expects students to have positive attitudes toward school more than the Islamic Studies group (mean of 2.03). Furthermore, at level 0.01 on this statement item# 6, there is a significant difference between student teachers of the Arabic Language and Islamic Studies groups.

Also, the field of specialization's influence was noticed on item# 6, "attentiveness to class lessons," for the 2nd student at a 1% level. The F value (3.91) indicates a statistically significant difference between the Arabic Language group (3.91) and the Islamic Studies group (3.03).

Worth noting here is that the differences in student-teachers expectations regarding student# 2 were between these two groups only and not the others.

Table 5:

Represents the statistical significance of differences between various specialization fields (For 2nd school student).

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		Sstudies		Sci.math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1	School attitudes	2.03	1.14	3.41	.91	2.95	.86	2.92	1.11	2.83	1.03	6.29	**
2	Classmates' relations	1.81	.98	2.50	1.30	2.00	1.05	2.16	.96	2.92	1.31	2.99	—
3	Coping with teachers	2.35	1.33	3.32	1.21	2.81	1.12	2.67	1.18	2.83	.83	2.19	—
4	Regulation attendance	3.35	1.23	4.09	.68	3.86	.79	3.51	.92	3.42	1.00	2.55	—
5	Tendency to disturb	2.48	1.43	1.82	.91	1.71	.85	2.27	.91	2.33	.98	2.47	—
6	Lessons attentiveness	3.03	1.17	3.91	.75	3.76	.94	3.33	.83	3.42	.51	3.91	**
7	Goal attainment	2.74	1.29	3.41	1.14	3.57	.98	3.08	.93	3.50	1.17	2.55	—
8	Social standing att.	2.52	1.00	3.27	1.08	3.19	1.08	2.92	.91	3.17	1.11	2.48	—
9	Task speedy execute	2.35	1.28	3.18	.91	2.43	1.08	2.71	1.08	3.00	.85	2.42	—
10	Task accuracy	2.77	1.26	3.55	.86	3.52	.87	3.24	1.15	3.08	.79	2.34	—

(*) 0.05 sig level. (**) 0.01 sig level. (—) No statistical significance.

3- Student teachers expectations regarding the 3rd student:

Student teachers' expectations regarding this student# 3 did not differ according to the fields of study taught. There was no significant F value that indicates any significant difference, which shows agreements between all subjects' student teachers regarding what they expect from that student. His unattractiveness did not cause student-teachers expectations to differ.

Table 6:

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

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		Sstudies		Sci. & math		F	Sig.
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1	School attitudes	3.16	1.46	3.55	.96	2.43	1.25	2.98	1.13	2.58	1.08	2.81	—
2	Classmate relations	3.35	1.19	3.41	.96	2.86	1.20	3.33	1.03	3.00	.85	1.12	—
3	Coping with teachers	2.87	1.43	3.27	.98	2.43	1.21	3.06	1.13	2.83	1.03	1.58	—
4	Regulation attendance	2.26	1.39	2.00	1.15	1.48	.81	2.02	1.20	1.83	.94	1.47	—
5	disturbing behaviors	4.00	1.21	4.00	1.41	4.57	.87	3.96	1.10	4.25	.45	1.30	—
6	lesson attention	2.58	1.52	3.23	1.19	2.29	1.19	2.78	1.21	2.50	1.00	1.70	—
7	Attaining goals	2.90	1.37	3.41	.91	2.38	1.36	3.14	.98	2.83	.83	1.98	—
8	Attaining social standing	2.94	1.39	3.64	1.00	2.76	1.37	3.22	1.23	3.22	1.11	1.78	—
9	Task speedy execution	2.84	1.34	3.41	.85	2.57	1.29	3.22	1.03	3.22	.90	2.77	—
10	Task accuracy	2.84	1.42	3.27	1.03	2.29	1.19	3.02	1.27	3.02	1.00	2.10	—

(*) 0.05 sig level

(**) 0.01 sig level.

(—) No statistical significance.

4- Student teachers expectations regarding the 4th student:

Again, student-teachers expectations regarding this student#4 were not influenced by the fields of specialization. All F values showed no significant differences between the means of the five groups on any statement item (table 7).

Table 7:

Represents the statistical significance of differences between various specialization fields (For 4th school student).

#	Text	Islamic		Arabic		English		S.studies		Sci. math		F	Sig
		M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	D		
1	School attitudes	3.81	1.01	3.95	1.05	4.05	.74	3.61	1.10	3.58	1.00	.98	—
2	Classmates' relations	3.26	1.09	2.68	.89	3.33	.80	3.22	1.14	3.00	1.04	1.49	—
3	Cooperation with teachers	3.48	1.12	3.55	.86	3.81	.75	3.27	1.10	3.08	.67	1.58	—
4	commitment to regulations	2.65	1.52	2.50	1.06	2.95	1.20	2.67	1.20	2.83	1.11	.41	—
5	Behave disturbingly	3.87	1.28	3.68	.87	3.52	1.12	3.63	1.24	3.25	1.06	.71	—
6	Attentiveness to lessons	3.29	1.04	3.27	1.12	3.90	.83	3.27	1.15	3.33	.65	1.61	—
7	Goal attainment	3.84	1.10	3.45	1.01	4.29	.72	3.57	1.02	3.50	1.00	2.61	—
8	Social standing attainment	3.58	.76	3.55	.96	3.90	.62	3.41	1.02	3.50	.52	1.23	—
9	Speedy task execution	3.42	1.03	3.27	.98	3.81	.81	3.49	1.06	3.17	.94	1.12	—
10	Task accuracy	3.52	1.03	3.45	.96	3.90	.62	3.45	1.16	3.58	1.00	.82	—

(*) 0.05 sig level. (**) 0.01 sig level. (—) no statistical significance.

In conclusion, the influence of the student teacher's field of specialization did not present many differences in expectations between student-teachers regarding all school students on most of the statement items. There was an exemption with only the 2nd student. Moreover, it was noted to influence student-teachers' expectations to differ on only 2 of the items. Mainly, that difference was noted between the Arabic and Islamic groups of fields of specialization.

Discussion of the results

The present study results bring up to the surface a critical educational issue that requires the attention of all of those involved with our students' educational process. Student teachers in this study appeared to form false perceptions and expectations of the learners that may harm school students' classroom performances, including achievements and goal attainment.

Social studies student teachers did not appear to differ from their counterparts; they also tended to form such harmful expectations. From the present study results, social studies student-teachers who are in the outskirts of beginning teaching in their near future are affected by their students' characteristics to form positive and negative expectations.

The sample of the social studies student-teachers in the study, regardless of their academic GPA, positively expected more from the most attractive and tidy students. This result supported the findings of many of the previous studies that affirmed the existence of the teacher expectation phenomenon and confirmed that teachers do form such expectations. For example, Brattesani and Weinstein's (1984) and Gentrup, Lorenz, Kristen & Kogan's (2020) research studies stated that teachers tend to form false expectations. It also supported Lerner & Lerner's (2021) claim that physical attractiveness is between characteristics and educational, social, and personality developments.

The results have shown such an influence of students' characteristics on such formation of teachers' expectations. They support, as such, the claim of Monk Jr, Esposito, & Lee (2021) that "we have certain expectations of others' competence and future behaviors linked to their physical appearance" (Monk Jr, Esposito, & Lee, 2021, p. 202). Several other studies, such as those of Kanavakis, Halazonetis, Katsaros, & Gkantidis (2021), Arganbright (1983), Cooper and Tom (1984), Tom and Cooper (1984), Dusek and Josef (1983), Emily (2012), Van Den Bergh, Denessen, Hornstra, Voeten, and Rob (2010), and Rolison and Medway (1985) coincide with our findings. They also conform to the findings of Salvia, Algozzine & Sheare (1977), Ritts, Patterson, & Tubbs (1992), McCombs and Gay (1987), and Alhajri (2021 A). However, these results contradict the results of Arganbright (1983), which does not agree that the influence of students' characteristics can form these expectations and, somewhat, refer them to the influence of the classroom interactions. They also disagree with Jussim (1994), Sweatt (2000), and Gentrup, Lorenz, Kristen & Kogan (2020), who deny such formation of teachers' expectations as well as their influence on students' achievements.

Forming teachers' expectations only becomes a problem when they affect students' achievements and classroom performances, and this cannot and should not be neglected. For example, Parks & Kennedy (2007), Kususanto (2012), and Woodcock (2013); previously brought that point up when they claimed that these expectations could hinder the students' academic performances. Therefore,

they deserve the careful attention of the teachers and stakeholders involved. Otherwise, students' future will become at stake.

Hence, serious efforts must be extended to prevent such teacher formation of false expectations that would harm the students' performances in schools as a first step. Secondly, train and educate teachers on the necessary steps to warrant students' best achievements. Such researchers who previously shouted out such calls were Rubie-Davis (2015), Papageorge, Gershenson, & Kang (2020), and Alhajri (2021 A). The present study results lead the researcher to support this vital invitation and direct it to the Ministry of Education's decision-makers.

Recommendations

The present study gave answers to its three main research questions, and it substantiates that social studies student teachers, like others, form such expectations around their classroom students' behaviors, attitudes, and ambitions, depending on these characteristics. Furthermore, it shows that the formation process occurs, mainly with all student-teacher regardless of their GPAs or fields of specialization.

Thus, the researcher suggests the following recommendations:

- 1- Social studies teachers must make every effort to avoid forming unwanted negative expectations through their continuous monitoring and evaluation of these expectations.
- 2- Social studies teacher preparation programs in Kuwait must pay further attention to this issue and bring it, in turn, to the attention of their trainees in these programs, which should involve the inclusion of specialized courses in the curricula that work on that issue and attend to it.
- 3- These programs should train social studies student teachers to deal with this issue in their classrooms when they begin teaching careers. The practical training period should involve good attendance to prevent forming such expectations or dealing with them.
- 4- Another need is to bring the same attention and practice the exact strategies to aid present the in-service social studies teachers working in the same field.
- 5- Moreover, personnel in various schools must exert every effort possible to eliminate its occurrence with those teachers. Feedback, in this regard, of course, should be offered by field specialists in the form of in-service training workshops.

- 6- Finally, the researcher suggests that further research be conducted on social studies teacher expectations to examine this phenomenon's influences on Kuwait's classroom student achievement.

References

1. أبو دلي، عادل سعدالله (2014). توقعات المعلم عن المتعلمين: مفهومها وأهميتها وتأثيرها على التحصيل الدراسي. *دراسات تربوية ونفسية*. جامعة الزقازيق - كلية التربية. (83): 317-349.
2. أحمد، إبراهيم إبراهيم (2010). أثر توقعات المعلم للإنجاز الأكاديمي على إدراك كل من الكفاءة الأكاديمية وسلوك التعزيز من المعلم لدى تلاميذ المرحلة الإعدادية. *مجلة كلية التربية بالمنصورة*. 2 (1): 1-55.
3. المزيرعي، يزيد عبد العزيز، وحنفي، علي عبد رب النبي. (2019). توقعات المعلمين نحو تطبيق التعليم الشامل للتلاميذ الصم وضعاف السمع في مدارس التعليم العام بمدينة الرياض. *المجلة العربية لعلوم الإعاقة والموهبة*. المؤسسة العربية للتربية والعلوم والآداب. (9): 399-430.
4. فرحان، عبد المحسن مليحان، الكنانى، ممدوح عبد المنعم، ومحمد، محمد عبد السميع (2020). دقة توقعات المعلمين بتحصيل طلابهم وعلاقتها بمدح وتشجيع المعلم لطلابه بالمرحلة الثانوية بدولة الكويت. *الجمعية المصرية للقراءة والمعرفة*. جامعة عين شمس - كلية التربية. (227): 383-415.
5. Abu Daly, A. (2014). Teacher expectations about students: their concept, importance, and impact on academic achievement. (In Arabic). *Educational and psychological studies: Zagazig University -College of Education*. (83): 317-349.
6. Ahmed, 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 at Mansoura*, (In Arabic). 2: (1): 1-55.
7. 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.
8. Alhajri, A. (2021). Effect of students' attractiveness and tidiness on the development of student-teachers' expectations of their intellectuality. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. 11, (4): 26-39.
9. Alhajri, A. J. (2021). Kuwaiti social studies teachers' expectations for the futures of students ordinarily sit near the teacher. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*. 12 (2), 233-259.

10. Al-Muzairi ,Y. and Hanafi, A. (2019). Teachers' expectations towards implementing comprehensive education for deaf and hard of hearing students in public education schools in Riyadh (In Arabic) *Arab Journal of Disability and talent: the Arab Foundation for Education, Science, and Arts*. (9), 399-430.
11. Arganbright, J. (1983). "Teacher expectations- A critical factor for student achievement." *NASSP Bulletin*, 93-95.
12. Barriga, C. A., Rodríguez, C., & Ferreira, R. A. (2019). "Factors that bias teacher expectations: Findings from Chile." *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 51(3):171-180.
13. Batres, C. (2020). PSA001 Secondary Analysis: Examining the "attractiveness halo effect."
14. Bognar, C. (1983). "Teacher expectations and student characteristics." *Canadian Journal of Education*, 8(1), 47-56.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. Brophy, J. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75: (5), 631-661.
18. Cecil, N. (1988). "Black dialect and academic success: A study of teacher expectations." *Reading Improvement*, 25, 34-38.
19. Cooper, H. (1983). "A historical overview of teacher expectation effects." Eric Document # ED239176.
20. Cooper, H., and Tom, D. (1984). Teacher expectation research: A review with implications for classroom instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85: (1), 77-89.
21. Craig, S. R. (2020). *Attractiveness and resume quality on perceived hireability* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Stout).
22. 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.
23. Dusek, J. and Josef, G. (1983). "The bases of teacher expectations": A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(3): 327-346.

24. ECS (Education Commission of the states). (2012) "Teacher expectations of students: A self-fulfilling prophecy?" *The progress of education reforms*,13 (6): 2-7.
25. Farfan Bertran, M. G., Holla, A., & Vakis, R. (2021). Poor Expectations. *Open Knowledge Repository*. 1-45. [World Bank Document](#).
26. Farhan, A., Al-Kinani, M. and Rizk, M. (2020). Accuracy of teachers' expectations of their students' achievement and its relationship to teacher praise and encouragement for his students at the secondary stage in Kuwait. (In Arabic). *Reading and Knowledge Journal: Ain Shams University - College of Education - Egyptian Society for Reading and Knowledge*. (227): 383-415.
27. Fox, L. (2015). Seeing potential: The effects of student-teacher demographic congruence on teacher expectations and recommendations. *AERA Open*, 2(1), 2332858415623758.
28. 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.
29. Gershenson, S., Holt, S., and Papageorge, W. (2016). "Who believes in me? The effect of the student-teacher demographic match on teacher expectations." *Economics of Education Review*, 52: 209-224.
30. Geven, S., Batruch, A., & van de Werfhorst, H. (2018). Inequality in teacher judgments, expectations, and track recommendations: A review study. *Amsterdam, The Netherlands: University of Amsterdam*.
31. Glock, S., Krolak-Schwerdt, S., & Hörstermann, T. (2016). The higher the SES, the better? Implicit and explicit attitudes influence preservice teachers' judgments of students. *Stereotypes and Stereotyping*, 1.
32. Gregory, A., & Roberts, G. (2017). Teacher beliefs and the overrepresentation of Black students in classroom discipline. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(3), 187-194.
33. Gronostay, D. (2020). Are classroom discussions on Controversial Political issues in civic education Lessons Cognitively Challenging? A closer look at Discussions with Assigned positions. *Studia Paedagogica*. 24 (4), 85-100.
34. 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.
35. Hanifah, U., & Rokhman, M. A. (2020). Joan's Neurotic Trends and Idealized Image in Margaret Atwood's Lady Oracle. *Lexicon*, 7(1).

36. Hannah, R. (2013). The effect of classroom environment on student learning. *Honors Theses, 2*. Western Michigan University.
37. Harris, M. J., Rosenthal, R., & Snodgrass, S. E. (1986). The effects of teacher expectations, gender, and behavior on pupil academic performance and self-concept. *The Journal of Educational Research, 79*(3), 173-179.
38. Harrison, N., & Waller, R. (2018). Challenging discourses of aspiration: The role of expectations and attainment in access to higher education. *British Educational Research Journal, 44*(5), 914-938.
39. Hernandez, J and Peters, C. (2015). Student appearance and academic performance. *Metropolitan State University of Denver*. 1-30.
40. Jeon, C. (2017). "Classroom environment and academic performance." (Master's Thesis). Ramon Magsaysay Memorial College. General Santos City.
41. Jinam, E. (2016). "The Essentials of Classroom Management." (In Arabic). *Al-ustath, 1* (218), 147-156.
42. Kanavakis, G., Halazonetis, D., Katsaros, C., & Gkantidis, N. (2021). Facial shape affects self-perceived facial attractiveness. *PloS one, 16*(2), e0245557.
43. Korman, A. K. (1967). Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between self-perceived abilities and vocational choice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 51*(1), 65.
44. Krawczyk, M. (2018). Do gender and physical attractiveness affect college grades? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(1), 151-161.
45. Lerner, R. M., & Lerner, J. V. (2021). Effects of Age, Sex, and Physical Attractiveness on Child–Peer Relations, Academic Performance, and Elementary School Adjustment. In *Individuals as Producers of Their Own Development* (pp. 42-50). Routledge.
46. Lotfy, N. (2012). "Seating arrangements and cooperative learning activities: Students' on-task / Off-task participation in EFL classrooms." (Master's Thesis). Digital archive and research repository, The American University in Cairo.
47. 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.
48. McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1976). TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS OF THE COMMUNICATION APPREHENSIVE CHILD IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. *Human communication research, 3*(1), 67-72.

49. Malik, S. (2010). Impact of Altering Seating Arrangement in Classroom on Student Learning behaviour. *Teaching and learning with technology*. 1-47. https://www.academia.edu/9883230/Impact_of_Altering_Seating_Arrangement_in_Classroom_on_Student_Learning_and_Behaviour. (Retrieved January 31, 2021).
50. 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 work harder and reduce enjoyment and confidence – new research \(theconversation.com\)](https://theconversation.com/teachers-expectations-help-students-work-harder-and-reduce-enjoyment-and-confidence-new-research-127111).
51. Mansfield, R. (1973). Self-esteem, self-perceived abilities, and vocational choice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 3(4), 433-441.
52. Marwit, K. L., Marwit, S. J., & Walker, E. F. (1978). Effects of student race and physical attractiveness on teachers' judgments of transgressions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(6), 911.
53. Marx, A., Urs, F., and Terry, H. (1999). "Effects of classroom seating arrangement on children's question-asking." *Learning Environments Research*. 2 (3), 249-263.
54. Meeks, MD, Knotts, TL, James, KD, Williams, F., Vassar, JA, & Wren, AO (2013). The impact of seating location and seating type on student performance. *Education Sciences*, 3 (4), 375-386.
55. Monk Jr, E. P., Esposito, M. H., & Lee, H. (2021). Beholding inequality: race, gender, and returns to physical attractiveness in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 127(1), 194-241.
56. Muntoni, F. & Retelsdorf, J. (2018). "Gender-specific teacher expectations in reading: The role of teachers' gender stereotypes." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 54: 212-220.
57. N'Gbala, A., Tsang, J. A., & Crandall, C. (2007). Balance theory, unit relations, and attribution: The underlying integrity of Heiderian theory. *Review of General Psychology*, 11, 12-30.
58. Ngoboka, P., & Schultz, B. (2002). The effects of class size on student academic performance in principles of microeconomics course. *Proceedings of the Midwest Business Economics Association*, 198-207.

59. Ngugi, M. and Thinguri, R. (2017). A critical analysis of the impact of classroom dynamics on students' social interaction in secondary schools in Kenya. *European journal of education studies*, 3 (1), 377-385.
60. Ngware, M., Ciera, J., Musyoka, P., and Oketch, M. (2013). The Influence of Classroom Seating Position on Student Learning Gains in Primary Schools in Kenya. *Scientific Research*. 4 (11), 705-712.
61. Palmer, C. L., & Peterson, R. D. (2021). Physical Attractiveness, Halo Effects, and Social Joining. *Social Science Quarterly*, 102(1), 552-566.
62. Papageorge, N., Gershenson, S., & Kang, K. (2020). Teacher expectations matter. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 102, (2), 234-251.
63. Parker, T., Hoopes, O., & Eggett, D. (2011). The effect of seat location and movement or permanence on student-initiated participation. *College teaching*, 59(2), 79-84.
64. 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.
65. Patriarca, L. and Kragt, D. (1986). Teacher expectations and student achievement: The Ghost of Christmas Future. *Curriculum Review*, 48-50.
66. Phoong, SY, Phoong, SW, Moghavemi, S., & Sulaiman, A. (2019). Effect of Smart Classroom on Student Achievement in Higher Education. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 48 (2), 291-304.
67. Rist, R. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard educational review*, 40(3), 411-451.
68. 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.
69. Robertson, K. F., Smeets, S., Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (2010). Beyond the threshold hypothesis: Even among the gifted and top math/science graduate students, cognitive abilities, vocational interests, and lifestyle preferences matter for career choice, performance, and persistence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(6), 346-351.
70. 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.

71. Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
72. Rubie-Davies, C. (2009). Teacher expectations and labeling. *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching*. (p. 695-707). Springer, Boston, MA.
73. 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.
74. Rubie-Davies, C. (2015). Teachers' instructional beliefs and the classroom climate. *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs*, 266-283.
75. Salvia, J., Algozzine, R., & Sheare, J. (1977). Attractiveness and school achievement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 15(1), 60-67.
76. Sanders, W. L., Wright, S., & Horn, S. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of personnel evaluation in education*, 11(1), 57-67.
77. Smith, DP, Hoare, A., & Lacey, MM (2018). Who goes where? The importance of peer groups on attainment and the student use of the lecture theater teaching space. *FEBS open bio*, 8 (9), 1368-1378.
78. Schneider, J. (2021). Promoting Equity and Mitigating Bias in Online Grading Feedback Processes. TCC 2021 Conference Papers. jschneider@ccp.edu.
79. Sowell, H. (2013). "*Classroom management strategies: The impact on school achievement*." (Doctoral Dissertation). Liberty University. Lynchburg, Virginia.
80. Tagliacolloab, VA, Volpatoac, GL, & Pereira Jr, A. (2010). Association of student position in the classroom and school performance. *Educational Research*, 1 (6), 198-201.
81. 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.
82. Teklu, F., & Kumar, R. S. (2013). Teachers' expectations on academic achievement and social skills and behaviour of students with emotional and behavioural disorders. *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review*, 29 (2), 79-95.

83. Timmermans, A. C., de Boer, H., & Werf, M. (2016). An investigation of the relationship between teachers' expectations and teachers' perceptions of student attributes. *Social psychology of education, 19* (2), 217-240.
84. 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.
85. 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.
86. Tu, M. H., Gilbert, E. K., & Bono, J. E. (2021). Is beauty more than skin deep? Attractiveness, power, and nonverbal presence in evaluations of hirability. *Personnel Psychology*.
87. Van Den Bergh, L., Denessen, E., Homstra, L. Voeten, M. and Holand, R. (2010). The implicit prejudiced attitudes of teachers: Relations to teacher expectations and the ethnic achievement gap. *American Educational Research Journal. 47* (2), 497-527.
88. Verhoeven, M., Poorthuis, A. M., & Volman, M. (2019). The role of school in adolescents identity development A literature review. *Educational Psychology Review 31*(1), 35-63.
89. 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.
90. Watson, P. W. S., Rubie-Davies, C. M., Meissel, K., Flint, A., Peterson, E. R., Garrett, L., & McDonald, L. (2015). Gendered teacher expectations of mathematics achievement in New Zealand: Contributing to a kink at the base of the STEM pipeline? *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology, 8*(1), 82-102.
91. Will, P., Bischof, WF, & Kingstone, A. (2020). The impact of classroom seating location and computer use on student academic performance. *PLoS one, 15* (8), e0236131.
92. Woodcock, S. (2013). "Trainee Teachers' Attitudes Towards Students with Specific Learning Disabilities" *Australian Journal of Education, 38*: (8), 14-29.

93. Woodcock, S., & Faith, E. (2021). Am I to blame? Teacher self-efficacy and attributional beliefs towards students with specific learning disabilities. *Teacher Development*, 1-24.
94. Woodson, H. (2013). *The Effectiveness of Classroom Seating Arrangements on Student Learning and Teacher Instruction*. (Action Research Project). The University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington.
95. Yigit, M., Alpaslan, M., Cinemre, Y., and Balcin, B. (2017). Examine middle school students' constructivist environment perceptions in Turkey: School location and class size, *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 14 (1), 23-34.
96. Zomorodian, K., Parva, M., Ahrari, I., Tavana, S., Hemyari, C., Pakshir, K., Peyman Jafari, P. and Sahraian, A. (2012). The effect of seating preferences of the medical students on educational achievement. *Medical education online*, 17(1), 10448.