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Psychologists have yet to uncover boundaries for the benefits given to physically attractive individuals, solely because of their appearance. Webster and Driskell concluded from their 1983 study that people generally believe "that the world must be a more pleasant and satisfying place for attractive individuals because they possess almost all types of social advantages that can be measured" (p. 164). Although this appears to be an exaggeration, research indicates the statement is possible, if not probable.

Studies consistently confirm that people view unattractive individuals as less warm, kind, poised, sensitive, strong, modest, sociable, outgoing, nurturant and interesting than attractive people. In addition, they are considered to be less sexually responsive, less intelligent, less honest and innocent, and to possess an overall worse character (Patzer, 1986).

Not only does unattractiveness create negative impressions, but it is also responsible for the negative behavior exhibited towards people. For example, unattractive people are allotted less space on the sidewalk by fellow pedestrians (Patzer, 1985), and are less likely to receive help in an emergency situation (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986). In addition, unattractive people are more likely to be convicted of a crime and receive stricter sentences from juries than attractive people (Patzer, 1985). From pedestrians to prisoners--everyone is a victim of the beauty bias. Patzer (1985) found the power of beauty begins at birth when nurses touch and smile at attractive babies more often than unattractive babies, and
increases during the life span. The following excerpt from a news story illustrates the overwhelming power of babies' beauty:

A 17-month old girl, snatched from her home by a gunman who stuffed her into a gift-wrapped box, was found unhurt after a man telephoned her anxious parents and said she was too pretty to kill, authorities say.

"He called and told us . . . she was such a beautiful baby, otherwise he would have wasted her," (Associated Press, 4 February 1981).

Children are also susceptible to attractiveness discrimination. In elementary school, unattractive children are teased more by peers, are less popular, and are more often left out of recess activities than their attractive classmates (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986). In addition, unattractive children are more likely candidates of child abuse in the home, and receive less positive reinforcement from parents and teachers than attractive children (Patzer, 1985). Unattractive children, it would appear, are discriminated against by peers, parents, and teachers.

The role students' attractiveness plays in teachers' perceptions and attitudes was first discovered by Dion in the early 1970's. The educational arena, already torn by evidence of discrimination by race and gender, was now faced with yet another controversy. The possibility of children being disadvantaged in the classroom because they lacked personal beauty instilled fear and curiosity in the minds of educators, psychologists and parents. This
fear lead to two decades of research, with even more controversial findings.

This study synthesizes literature from the late 1960's to the late 1980's in the disciplines of educational, social, and child psychology; sociology; and communication, which examines various aspects of attractiveness discrimination in the classroom and its affects on children.

Although attractiveness discrimination affects all ages and penetrates all aspects of society, the affect it has on the self-esteem, intellectual development, and future success of children is detrimental to America's youth, educational system and society. Because of the magnitude of the effects, this study is primarily concerned with attractiveness discrimination in the classroom.

NATURE OF THIS STUDY

This study is an original synthesis of literature involved with attractiveness discrimination. The concept of attractiveness discussed in this study is not related to attraction, where one's personality and character traits influence how attractive they appear to others. Instead, this study is concerned with those physical characteristics which are generally recognized by society as universally beautiful or ugly. Students' level of attractiveness, in most of the literature, was determined by the ratings of random adults or teachers after viewing photographs of students. The research presented in this study is startling and often frustrating. It is uncomfortable to believe that physical appearances are more powerful than personalities when forming impressions of others. The reader is asked only to keep an open mind, to remove previous
attitudes towards the educational arena, and to become aware of the reality in our schools.

The first chapter provides the theoretical framework for the cognitive processes behind attractiveness discrimination. It is important for the reader to keep this framework in mind throughout the paper, referring back to specific concepts when necessary. Chapter two presents literature on the communication of teachers' discrimination and expectations. Here, the reader will find teachers' specific behaviors displayed toward unattractive students. Students' reactions to this communication are discussed in chapter three. One result of discrimination is the self-fulfilling prophecy, a tendency for students to alter their performance in order to make teachers' expectations of them a reality. The self-fulfilling prophecy is the most detrimental affect of attractiveness discrimination and as such, is an underlying theme throughout this study. Chapter four examines which teachers are likely to discriminate against unattractive students, and the educational conditions which nurture self-fulfilling prophecies. The conclusion of this study summarizes the process of the self-fulfilling prophecy and suggests additional research and programs needed to restore equality in education.

The purpose of this study is not to blame, condemn or criticize teachers, students or the educational system at large. No one group is to blame for discrimination. Instead, the purpose is to open the minds of all people, not just teachers, to the discrimination and stifling of children in our schools. The paper is not after agreement, persuasion, or even action. The goal is simply to bring
about an awareness of a detrimental problem to our educational arena and to our society. The stifling of young minds is a injustice which affects every citizen who believes in equality in education. It is only through awareness that this injustice can be eliminated. And it is only after its elimination that the minds and hearts of our young can be free.
"Open-mindedness is a very definite achievement. It is not a gift from heaven, at least not with the majority of us. It is the most difficult but worthwhile achievement the human mind can make."

-Albert Edward Wiggam, *The Marks of an Educated Man*, p. 17

Although discrimination in education based on sex, race, religion and socio-economic status has been researched and documented for decades, psychologists and educators have only recently realized the power of beauty in the classroom. The scientific study of physical attractiveness which began in the mid-1960's opened up a new world of controversy when it applied the attractiveness discrimination theories to the educational arena in the mid-1970's (Patzer, 1985). Today, social psychologists, understanding the powerful effects of physical attractiveness, and educators, understanding the importance of equality in the classroom, are both deeply concerned with the possible existence and implications of beauty bias in education.

Psychologists initially lumped attractiveness discrimination into the same category as discriminations by race, sex, religion and socio-economic status. This movement was acceptable due to the similarities in nature of all forms of discrimination (Webster & Driskell, 1983 p. 144). In fact, the only major differences are...
attractiveness discrimination (1) is not affected by current law and educational practices (Patzer, 1985, p.11). (2) is somewhat of an achieved status and can be altered (Webster & Driskell, 1983, p. 162), and (3) "probably excels prejudicial discrimination based on sex, race and religion" (Patzer, 1985, p. 11). Chapter one will investigate two concepts which define the processes behind stereotyping and discriminating against physically unattractive students.

THE STATUS CHARACTERISTIC FORMULATION

The Status Characteristic Formulation and the halo effect both represent ways in which teachers cognitively label students according to appearance. Because both concepts provide the framework for understanding the power of appearance, it is crucial they be understood before analyzing the effect teachers have on the intellectual development of unattractive students.

Perhaps one of the most important models for understanding how the discrimination process occurs is the Status Characteristics Formulation originally designed by Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch (1972) and modified by Humphreys and Berger (1981). The model describes the operation of the status organizing process, "a process by which differences in cognitions and evaluations of individuals or social types of them become the basis of differences in the stable and observable features of social interaction"(Humphreys & Berger, 1981, p. 954). The model, created with the intention of providing a theoretical explanation of discrimination on the basis of race and sex, is applicable to other discrimination forms, including physical attractiveness (Webster & Driskell, 1983, p.141). This paper is
concerned with discrimination based on levels of attractiveness, the
definition and illustration of the Status Characteristic Formulation
will be specifically presented to explain how teachers cognitively
use the levels of students' attractiveness as an indicator of
students' status.

Humphreys & Berger (1981) explain that a status
characteristic is a human characteristic that has at least two
distinct degrees of worth: specific and diffuse. Specific status
characteristics are directly linked to how an individual will
perform in a specific situation or on a specific task (p.955). An
eexample of this would be reading ability (specific status
characteristic) acting as an indicator of how well a child will
perform on an assignment which includes reading (specific task).
Diffuse status characteristics are indirectly linked to an
individual's performance and are not bound to any specific situation
or task, but instead are liberally applied to various situations
level of physical attractiveness as an indicator of that student's
ability in math (specific performance) is an example of how
physical attractiveness is used as a diffuse status characteristic.

Physical attractiveness, however, is not always employed as a
diffuse status. When attractiveness is directly linked to a certain
outcome, for instance one's chances of becoming a model,
appearance would in fact be a specific status characteristic.
Diffuse status, on the other hand, makes a connection between a
characteristic and an outcome that are not necessarily related. This
type of status characteristic formulation provides the foundation for beauty bias in the classroom.

The second stage of Humphreys and Berger's model is the salience process (1981). When two or more status characteristics are either directly or indirectly linked to a specific outcome, one characteristic must override all others and become the salient feature (p. 958). When a status characteristic becomes salient, people assume the characteristic is a strong indicator of the ability to perform the specific task (Webster & Driskell, 1983). The characteristic which occurs most frequently and is most visible often becomes the overriding characteristic. Because physical attractiveness, along with sex, race and socio-economic levels, is a constant characteristic visible throughout an entire interaction, it is most likely to become the salient feature (Webster & Driskell, 1983).

The probability of physical attractiveness becoming the overriding status characteristic would appear to be even higher in the early elementary years. When children first enter school, they have not developed (or displayed) many specific status characteristics directly linked to academic performance. Children have little prior educational training and have not yet received ample opportunities to show their abilities to their teachers. Thus, teachers in the early grades have less specifics to rely on and may resort to general observations or global impressions as status cues. The most easily accessible general observation is children's appearance (whether it indicates sex, race or levels of attractiveness), and it is often this characteristic which becomes
salient and dominates teachers' perception of students' status (Webster & Driskell, 1983). As Patzer (1985) explains, "Appearance is the sole characteristic apparent in every social interaction. People do not have their IQ's tattooed on their foreheads" (p. 43).

Hatfield & Sprecher (1986) argue against this theory claiming younger students are less harmed by the attractiveness status due to teachers' tendency to perceive all young children as cute (p. 55). However, research on adult perceptions of the attractiveness levels of two- and four-year-old children found that although adults' perceptions of children's behavior were not influenced by two-year old children's levels of attractiveness, looks were a definite indicator of behavior in four-year-olds (Horvath & MacDonald, 1989). Stephan and Langlois (1984) in interviews with thirty undergraduate students, also found that babies are considered by adults to have varying degrees of attractiveness. Therefore, because randomly selected adults and even parents do not consider all children to be cute, teachers may also view young children as possessing differing degrees of attractiveness.

The final and perhaps most detrimental stage in the status characteristic formulation model is burden of proof. After a status characteristic becomes salient, its power over teachers' minds is so great that the burden of proof lies not in proving that the status characteristic is an accurate indication of students' academic performance or behavior, but instead the burden is placed on proving that the characteristic is not a reliable indicator of performance in the classroom (Humphreys & Berger, 1981). Because the salient characteristic forces the teacher to make a judgement early in the
impression-formation stage of the interpersonal interaction, previous information on the student may decay in memory because it is not as powerful as, nor is it consistent with, the overriding status characteristic of attractiveness (Scrull & Wyer, 1979). The ability of one characteristic to distort or decay previous information which conflicts with that specific characteristic is a phenomenon known as the halo effect or halo error (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986).

The halo effect is defined as "a general impression that seeps into ratings of all categories" or "salient features [that] affect the ratings of categories which the rater believes are related to the salient features" (Cooper, 1981, p. 219). In simpler terms, the halo effect illustrates the tendency to use one attribute or characteristic of an individual to describe the whole personality of that certain person. Much like a halo represents a good person, the salient feature of physical attractiveness is used to represent either a positive or negative whole person (Patzer, 1985). Once we see the halo, our perception of the person is formed and is extremely difficult to change (Cooper, 1981). From that point forward, we assume halo = personality.

It is easy to assume from the name of the theory that the halo is always a positive characteristic representing a favorable personality. Thorndike (1920), who first recognized the theory, defined the halo effect as, "the tendency to think of a person in general as rather good or rather inferior and to allow a global evaluation to color the judgement of specific qualities" (p. 25). Therefore the halo is not always an advantageous labeling
mechanism. In fact, it is the negative halo (unattractiveness = bad) which is most detrimental to equal opportunity in the classroom. Although the halo effect in essence appears to be nothing more than a summation of the Status Characteristics Formulation model, it is much more encompassing. The Status Characteristics Formulation model illustrates how one attribute (i.e. physical attractiveness) labels or defines an individual's degree of status (Humphreys & Berger, 1981). The halo effect, on the other hand, illustrates how one characteristic, such as attractiveness, is used to label an individual's entire personality (Cooper, 1981). Both theories are important to the understanding of stereotyping and discrimination. Teachers may rely on status cues either to predict or determine students' performance or to create overall global impressions (halo effect). The following section defines the halo effect and describes the cognitive processes which create and protect them.

THE HALO EFFECT

Although a great deal of time has been devoted to researching the existence of halos in various settings with various individuals, the mechanics behind the formation, growth and reduction of the halo effect is still an area of scientific uncertainty (Cooper, 1981). Taylor, Bernardin and Riegelhaupt (1984) explain that, "even though the halo effect is one of the oldest and most widely known of psychological phenomena, little has been learned about it since Thorndike's time" (p. 447). In addition, because the halo process is thought to occur subconsciously, it is difficult to test both the sources and growth of the halo problem (Wetzel, Wilson & Kort, 1981). Furthermore, the studies conducted during the past twenty
years have produced conflicting results and have often failed to identify a common theme. This section will describe (1) the two types of halo: true and illusory, (2) the five sources of halo formation and (3) the cognitive distortion processes which protect the halo from deteriorating.

Cooper (1981) identifies two forms of halo: true and illusory. True halo exists when the global impression of a person (the halo) is actually congruent with all of the person's individual attributes (p. 220). In other words, the halo is an accurate assessment of the individual. An example of this would be a priest's collar. The collar may create a global impression of good. In this case, however, all of the individual attributes of the priest may indeed be good qualities. Although a halo effect does exist, it is a true halo and therefore may not produce any inaccurate judgements.

The illusory halo appears when the global impression and the individual attributes are incongruent (Cooper, 1981). The attribute, representing a characteristic of the person, may be unrelated to the person's whole character but is still employed as an indication of the person's attitude, behavior, status and intelligence (Cooper, 1981). When this halo type occurs, inaccurate judgements made about the person tend to cloud the observer's view. Perceiving an overweight person as lazy, unclean, depressed, unintelligent and lonely after only passing him or her on the street is an example of an illusory halo.

References made to the halo effect will be referring only to the illusory halo, since it is this type of halo which leads to teachers' bias in the classroom. Although the halo effect is not by
any means limited to the classroom, all of the research will be adapted to and specifically adhere to teachers' perceptions of students in the classroom.

Because the halo effect is a subconscious process (Cooper, 1981 & Wetzel et al., 1981) it is difficult to locate the exact source of the phenomenon. Subjects in studies are unable to describe the reasoning procedures that lead them to their judgements of people. While investigating various methods of reducing halo error, Cooper (1981) discovered the following five possible sources of illusory halo: undersampling, engulfing, insufficient concreteness, insufficient motivation and knowledge, and cognitive distortions (p. 220).

Undersampling occurs when the teacher has only observed a small amount of the student's academic or behavioral performance and thus must rely on a global impression to assess the student's ability. This source of halo may be most evident in the early years when minimal information is available on the student's performance. Situations where the student and teacher are unfamiliar with one another also tend to produce a stronger, more long-lasting halo effect (Cooper, 1981, p. 230).

The second source of halo, engulfing, occurs when a teacher is exposed to a large amount of student information in a short time period (Cooper, 1981). Because the human cognitive processes are not efficient and fast enough to accurately categorize memory and store it in long-term memory, the teacher loses much of the student's performance information when the data is moved from short-term memory to long-term memory (Cooper, 1981, p.
The attractiveness level of a student is one of the most powerful observations (Webster & Driskell, 1981) and as such, may very well be the only data moved to long-term memory.

Insufficient concreteness, the third source of halo, surfaces when the teacher has accumulated a substantial amount of data on the student, but the data is subjective and not concrete enough to form a specific evaluation on a given task (Cooper, 1981). Without specific information, teachers may group vaguely related areas together and evaluate the individual areas as a whole instead of rating the individual pieces of data (Cooper, 1981). Thus, one can assume that the teacher's subconscious evaluation of the student's attractiveness level will be grouped with evaluations of the student's academic and behavioral performance. As noted earlier in the discussion of the power of the salient feature, the most visible and constant characteristic in most interactions becomes the salient feature (Webster & Driskell, 1983). Because academic and behavioral performances may change whereas attractiveness is constant, the overall evaluation of the student may tend to rely more on attractiveness than performance.

Cooper (1981) labels the fourth source of halo as insufficient rater motivation and knowledge (p. 220). When teachers are careless and unmotivated in the classroom and while grading assignments, they may not pay attention to the individual academic abilities of each student in specific performance areas. Thus, they use a global impression of the student as a means of rating instead of focusing on the student's individual strengths and weaknesses.
Cognitive distortions, the fifth halo source, is thought to be the most common of the halo sources (Webster & Driskell, 1983, p.144), and yet is the least researched (Cooper, 1981, p.221). Cooper (1981) explains there are a variety of ways in which distortions occur and psychologists have only a vague grasp on the specifics of the different processes. The common underlying problem among all of them, however, is that stored observations are distorted causing teachers to cognitively lose and add information (Cooper, 1981, p.220). What teachers are losing during the distortion process is detail. What they are arbitrarily adding to their memory are links between students' performance categories and the teacher's general impression of the students (Cooper, 1981). The general impression often focuses on appearance (Webster & Driskell, 1983). Therefore, the link cognitively being formed is one between students' academic performances and their levels of physical attractiveness.

Cognitive distortions are not only a source of halo error, but they are also most responsible for the survival of a formed halo (Archer & McCarthy, 1988). The information teachers receive about students that does reach long-term memory is organized and stored in the brain (Cooper, 1981). This stored data is referred to as schema (Harre' & Lamb, 1983).

Schema not only acts as a file for past information, but it also as a filter for incoming pieces of data. Students behaviors which are consistent with existing schema is allowed through teachers' cognitive filter and is stored with the previous data in long-term memory. This process tends to reinforce teachers' preconceived
impressions and evaluations of the students' performances and behaviors (Archer & McCarthy, 1988).

Information teachers receive about each student which is inconsistent with teachers' existing schema is most often discounted in order to maintain a coherent cognitive picture of each individual student (Cooper, 1981). Therefore, if students' original impressions on teachers is not representative of the students' later performances, the original impressions prevail, even if they are inaccurate depictions of students. Thus, it is extremely important for students to make a positive first impression on teachers. Unfortunately, the original impression in any human encounter is most often the one we have least control over, appearance (Webster & Driskell, 1983).

Cooper's (1981) theory suggests that the halo created by physical attractiveness during the impression-formation stage of interaction may indeed be so strong, that later academic and behavioral performance is only accepted into teachers' memory if it reinforces teachers' original impressions of students. In fact, the sole reason halos survive is because teachers cognitively "select to attend to only that information which confirms their pre-existing evaluations" (Cooper, 1981, p. 227). Unfortunately, as mentioned previously, not all halos are positive. Attractiveness almost always acts as a halo for a positive personality, whereas unattractiveness serves the opposite function (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986). Therefore, unattractive students who are victims of the halo effect have little chance of changing teachers' perceptions of their overall personality and academic performance.
The Status Characteristic Formulation and the halo effect both illustrate teachers' tendency to allow the level of students' physical attractiveness to predict or define other characteristics unrelated to attractiveness. The specific ways in which teachers behaviorally and cognitively react to these halos and discriminate in the classroom are discussed in Chapter two.
"If you arrive at your beliefs by the way of open-mindedness you will believe one set of things; if you arrive by the way of tight-mindedness you will believe quite a different set of things. And you will behave differently, will exercise a different kind of influence. In short, you will be a different kind of person as you move through the world."

-Albert Edward Wiggam, The Marks of an Educated Man, p. 35

The influence of the halo effect on teachers' cognitive and behavioral reactions to unattractive students is the most damaging factor to equality in education. Chapter two examines the discrimination in the classroom created by the halo effect and illustrates the communication process which leads to the stifling of the intellectual development of unattractive students by analyzing the following areas: (1) perceptions and expectations of unattractive students, (2) channels and behaviors employed by teachers to communicate expectations and (3) two possible effects of expectation communication: self-verification (students' performance changes teachers' expectations) and the self-fulfilling prophecy (teachers' expectations change students' performance).
PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF UNATTRACTIVE STUDENTS

The communication which occurs between students and teachers may very well be the most influential and constant interaction children engage in during the early stages of education. Teachers not only communicate educational messages to children, but they also communicate their own feelings and attitudes about the children in the classroom (Dusek, 1985). Whether it be direct through verbal and non-verbal behavior or indirect through cognitive expectations, teachers have different attitudes towards children, they communicate their attitudes in the classroom, and the attitudes often have more to do with each child's appearance than with the child's behavior or academic performance (Kenealy, Frude & Shaw, 1987).

Interviews with preschool teachers revealed that teachers attribute more negative characteristics to unattractive children than to their attractive classmates (Adams, 1978). Teachers perceived less intellectual ability, academic achievement, social success and athletic skills in unattractive children (Adams, 1978). In 1981, Stohl discovered teachers attached the same low ratings to unattractive three-, four- and five-year-olds, and also described unattractive children as less friendly, attentive and relaxed in the classroom. Teachers expectations of preschool children are also directly related to attractiveness, with less attractive children receiving the lower expectations (Adams & Crane, 1980). These perceptions and expectations of unattractive children are consistent throughout all levels of elementary education.
Although the main concern of this paper is how teachers influence unattractive students, the role parents and school psychologists play in children's intellectual development cannot be ignored. Not only do parents and psychologists directly affect children's development, but they also have the opportunity to detect classroom discrimination by communicating with children and monitoring the interaction between teachers and students. Unfortunately, parents and school psychologists not only fail to discover and eliminate the problem, but they actually contribute to its affects.

For instance, unattractive students are perceived by teachers as having weaker parental interest than their attractive peers (Bognar, 1983). In addition, Kenealy et al., (1987) reported that teachers' perceptions and judgements about students may be more reliant on parents' involvement with their children (keeping their child clean and well-groomed) and parents' income level (keeping their child well-dressed) than on the actual degrees of physical attractiveness.

Parents also have a more direct hand in the beauty bias. The messages sent to students in the classroom are even more powerful when reinforced in the home. The halo effect is so powerful, even parents perceive unattractive children as less intelligent, less pleasant and less likely to excel in school (Tapp & Downs, 1983). In the same study by Tapp and Downs (1983), parents expected unattractive boys to be more aggressive and less well-behaved than their attractive classmates, and preferred their child have attractive, as opposed to unattractive playmates.
Parents also behave differently toward unattractive children. Less attractive children face a variety of hardships in the home that the more attractive children seem immune to. Patzer (1985) found parents of unattractive children punish more often for mistakes in homework assignments. In a study of adults' behavior towards unattractive 10-year-olds, males and females exhibited more aggression and less patience toward unattractive children than attractive children (Marwit, 1982). Unattractive children may also be more likely victims of child abuse. Berkowitz and Frodi (1979) explain how lack of patience, aggression and unattractiveness may form a deadly combination.

"The foundation is laid when youngsters' appearance is unpleasant to their mothers and fathers. As a result, the parents may develop even more negative feelings about their children, and consequently they are more inclined to beat them. If the adults then happen to be angry for some reason, their offspring's looks might be the extra spark to a violent outburst, especially when the children are misbehaving (p. 20)."

Unattractive children, victimized by inaccurate perceptions and harmful behavior from teachers and parents, are often unable to even receive help from school psychologists. Studies show this group of professionals, integrated into the school system to monitor and nurture the psychological and intellectual development of children, also discriminate based on attractiveness. Hatfield and
Perlmutter (1983), in a study of more than 100 psychologists, found that unattractive individuals are perceived as being less emotionally stable and more in need of therapy than their attractive peers.

Perhaps even more alarming is how psychologists assess unattractive, as opposed to attractive children. To test how biases due to attractiveness would affect professional psychological assessments of children, Elovitz and Salvia (1982) distributed a fictitious behavior report and a photograph of a third grade child to psychologists and asked them to assess the child's psychological condition. Although all psychologists received the same behavior report, half received a photo of an attractive child while the other half received a photo of an unattractive child. Those psychologists with the attractive photo labeled the student as learning disabled and socially-emotionally disturbed. They suggested the student remain in the mainstream classroom, but receive additional tutoring and therapy. Psychologists receiving the unattractive photo responded much differently. Now, the same behavior elicited a psychological label of mentally retarded and a proposed program which included removing the student from the mainstream classroom and placing the child in a more remedial learning atmosphere. In addition, the unattractive child was perceived as having more difficulty in peer relationships and was considered to perform less adequately on future psychological evaluations than was the attractive student (Elovitz & Salvia, 1982). When all academic and behavioral information is identical, the mere appearance of a child can change a psychologist's diagnosis from learning disabled to mentally retarded.
Ironically, although research shows that teachers and psychologists perceive unattractive children as being more in need of therapy, research indicates that unattractive children are less likely than their attractive peers to receive adequate counseling. Hatfield and Perlmutter (1983) discovered that psychologists devote more time to warming up with an attractive client than an unattractive client, and the sessions with attractive clients tend to last longer. Teachers also believe unattractive students are in more need of therapy, but they refer them for psychological assessments less frequently than they refer attractive children (Barocas & Black, 1974). From this research it appears that although teachers and psychologists believe unattractive people are more in need of therapy, they are less willing to work with unattractive children.

Although psychologists agree that the judgements of teachers, parents and school psychologists are influenced by the unattractiveness halo, there is little information available as to why unattractiveness is directly linked with mental health. Perhaps the halo is the result of past stereotypes of mentally handicapped people. Because many mentally handicapped people also suffer from facial and body deformities, people may have cognitively formed the generalization that all mentally handicapped people are physically deformed. The next section illustrates how teachers' low expectations are communicated to unattractive students.
The academic and psychological labeling of unattractive children as less intelligent plays an enormous role in children's intellectual development. When teachers believe students are intellectually slow, they communicate negative messages regarding students' performance and behavior. When students become aware of teachers' low expectations, they may lower their own self standards in order to match the teachers' expectations (Swann & Ely, 1984). It is not the expectation which causes harm to children, but the teachers' communicating the expectation to the student which results in negative effects (Cooper & Good, 1983). Expectation communication, therefore, is an important factor in determining the influence teachers have on the intellectual development of physically unattractive students. Teachers communicate their biases to students through four channels: (1) climate, (2) verbal output, (3) verbal input and (4) feedback.

The teacher created socio-emotional climate involves non-verbal communication in the classroom which establishes a mood that either enhances or stifles verbal communication. The climate of the classroom has great effect on the overall communication interaction between the student and the teacher. For example, low expectation students receive less smiles, head nods, forward body leans, eye contact, support and friendliness from teachers than high expectation students (Rosenthal, 1974).

Seating charts and achievement groups can also create a negative socio-emotional climate. Good and Brophy (1980) discovered low expectation students are seated farther away from
the teacher or are seated in groups with one another more often than high expectation students. In one study, kindergarten teachers exhibited a tendency to rely more on factors such as appearance instead of on academic information when dividing children into achievement groups (Didham & Stewart, 1989). Not only were these divisions stable throughout the kindergarten year, but the students remained in their originally designated achievement groups through both first and second grade (Didham & Stewart, 1989). Therefore, a child with high academic potential may have been placed in a slow learning group because of appearance, and may have remained there for three consecutive years.

Teachers also communicate their expectations through verbal inputs and outputs. For example, low expectation students receive less opportunities to learn new material or more difficult material (Rosenthal, 1974), are allowed less time to answer questions, are called on less frequently to answer questions in public demonstrations (Good & Brophy, 1980), and are interrupted two to five times more often while reading aloud in class (Didham & Stewart, 1989). Teachers give less clues, repetition, and rephrasing to low expectation students and call on them less frequently in class to answer questions than high expectation students (Rosenthal, 1974).

The last channel of expectation communication is affective feedback. This channel is probably the easiest to identify because feedback occurs so often in a classroom and it has a strong influence on the students' perceptions of the student - teacher relationship. Teachers' behavior towards unattractive as opposed to attractive
preschool children was observed in a study conducted by Downs and Nelson (1983). Nine preschool teachers were observed interacting with children during unstructured play times. Observers found the halo effect present when children were playing independently of the teacher and also when children were specifically interacting with a teacher. While playing with peers in the classroom, unattractive children received far more negative feedback from teachers than did attractive children. In addition, when children directed their attention specifically to the teacher in the form of a question or a smile, attractive children were more likely to elicit a favorable response than were their unattractive classmates (Downs & Nelson, 1983, p.7). Algozzine (1977) discovered that not only is the quality of elementary school teachers' feedback influenced by the child's level of attractiveness, but the quantity of feedback is also directly tied to appearance. Unattractive children, it would appear, receive less encouragement and positive reinforcement in the classroom. Good and Brophy (1980) discovered the following discrepancies between feedback given to low as opposed to high expectation students: (1) lows are criticized more frequently than highs for incorrect public responses, (2) highs are praised more frequently for correct public responses, (3) lows are praised more often for marginal or adequate public responses, (4) lows receive less accurate and detailed feedback than highs and (5) overall, lows receive less feedback regarding their academic and behavioral performance. In addition, Cooper (1983) added that not only do lows receive less praise, but they also receive more criticism for
inappropriate behavior and insufficient academic performance than high expectation students.

TWO POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF EXPECTATION COMMUNICATION

After students receive messages from teachers regarding what is expected of each student in the classroom, one of two outcomes may occur: (1) students' performances may be sustained at achievement levels accurately estimated by teachers or (2) students' performances may be altered so that they become more congruent with inaccurate teacher expectations (Cooper, 1985, p. 135 & 136). The first outcome is a result of accurate teacher expectations, where students' performances and teachers' expectations are naturally congruent and consistent. This would be the result of a true halo, where the attractiveness level and the academic capacity of a student were either both low or both high.

The second outcome, however, is the result of inaccurate teacher expectations which by being successfully communicated to students alters students' performances. Therefore, a child whom the teacher expects is a poor student will actually become a poor student. This process is referred to as the pygmalion effect, or the self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton, 1957). Rosenthal and Jacobson's experiment in 1968 at Oak Elementary School in San Francisco was the first to demonstrate the self-fulfilling prophecy in education. To test the power previous information has on forming expectations, Rosenthal and Jacobson selected 20% of Oak School's students by drawing their names out of a hat and reported to their teachers that these students displayed strong potential for intellectual growth. When teachers were asked to describe the behavior of the students
eight months later, the selected group were described as more interesting, curious, happy, well-adjusted and affectionate than the other children. In addition, only eight months later, these randomly selected students displayed significant increases in IQ. In comparison, the IQ increase in students who were not identified as "high potential" was marginal (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). Rosenthal and others concluded from this study that teachers' expectations, when successfully communicated to students, are powerful determinants of students' intellectual growths and performances (Blease, 1983; Brophy, 1983; Cooper & Good, 1983; Didham & Stewart, 1989; Dusek, 1985; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). Chapter three discusses the self-fulfilling prophecy further and describes students' reactions to teachers' expectations which lead to the phenomenon.
CHAPTER THREE

STUDENTS' REACTIONS TO TEACHERS' MESSAGES

"There will always be conflict, unless perchance education may in time become such a true science that the curse of tight-mindedness shall never have the opportunity to cast its blight upon the mind and heart of the growing child."

-Albert Edward Wiggam, The Marks of an Educated Man, p. 73

Although a large amount of data has been accumulated on teachers' differential treatment of unattractive students, little research has been devoted to how students react to the treatment they receive in the classroom. The ways unattractive children are responding to classroom discrimination is the basis for the argument of inequality in education. This inequality, created out of a subconscious tendency to label an individual's entire personality by using one independent attribute, often leads to a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Merton (1957), the first to label the self-fulfilling prophecy, explained that, "The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the original false conception come true" (p. 421). The self-fulfilling prophecy has surfaced in a wide array of experiments, ranging from the behavior of laboratory rats to the actions and attitudes of husbands and wives. In all cases, the subjects change their behavior in order to make it consistent with a significant other's impression (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). In the educational
arena, the self-fulfilling prophecy describes students' tendency to alter their academic or behavioral performances in order to make it congruent with the expectations of the teacher (Moran & McCullers, 1984). The process of academic and behavior change is not a conscious decision by the student to become what the teacher wants or expects. The change process is a complex and ambiguous succession of psychological, behavioral and academic alterations which eventually erode the student's original performance and form a new performance mode more consistent with the original expectations of the teacher. Unattractive children, whom teachers expect less from, may decrease their performance in the classroom to make it consistent with teachers' expectations.

Students' reactions to teachers' expectations can be categorized into three main areas: 1) psychological, 2) behavioral and 3) academic. The three areas are not strictly defined by boundaries as they often overlap and mesh with one another. More importantly, each area has an effect on the other two. For example, the psychological reactions affect the children's overall performance in the classroom as well as behavior and academic achievement. All three reactions influence children's performance and the probability that a self-fulfilling prophecy will occur.

PSYCHOLOGICAL REACTIONS

The messages teachers convey to students about their ability and performance in the classroom affects the psychological make-up of students. Not all students react to teachers' messages the same.
way. Cue reading ability, listening skills, comprehension and self-concepts all affect how a student will receive and process the expectation messages communicated by teachers (Swan & Ely, 1984). Students' psychological reactions to teachers' expectations generally surface in three cognitive areas: 1) self-esteem, 2) self-schema and 3) attitude toward learning and school.

The relationship between self-esteem and achievement was discovered almost a century ago and still holds true today (Bohrnstedt & Felson, 1983). Most studies find a positive correlation between the two—the higher the perceived level of achievement, the higher the individual's self-esteem (Bohrnstedt & Felson, 1983). Self-esteem, developed through social interaction, involves the communication of attitudes, expectations and behaviors (Patzer, 1985). Dusek (1985) found parents, teachers and peers to be most influential in the formation and alteration of children's self-esteem, with adults significantly more influential than peers in the early grades of education.

The teacher-student interaction in the classroom is a continuous process, making it an influential channel of communication. Messages sent to students, either verbally or non-verbally, are likely to express teachers' perceptions of students' achievement (Rosenthal, 1974). Each message accurately received by children is stored in memory with other achievement messages, eventually forming their self-esteem (Bohrnstedt & Felson, 1983).

Students self-esteem is greatly influenced by feedback from teachers and parents. Even one piece of feedback can have a great effect on how students feel teachers perceive them (Coleman,
Abraham & Jussim, 1987). As noted previously in chapter two, unattractive children, whom teachers expect less from, receive little if any feedback, and the feedback they do receive is usually negative (Patzer, 1985). The main messages unattractive students receive in the classroom are negative comments regarding their level of achievement. Unfortunately, the negative messages tend to be reinforced at home, as unattractive children are more often criticized and punished for homework mistakes (Patzer, 1985). Receiving negative feedback from the two most influential groups in children's lives may lower their self-esteem.

Non-verbal messages are also powerful determinants of children's self-esteem. According to Didham and Stewart (1989), even young children can accurately read non-verbal cues. When teachers lean forward, nod and smile at students, the students perceive them as more satisfied with their performance and more pleased with their personality (Didham & Stewart, 1989). These signs of approval are more often displayed to attractive children, or children for whom the teacher has high expectations (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986).

Students initially perceive themselves more favorably and perceive the task as more difficult than teachers do (Coleman et al., 1987). Thus, the verbal and non-verbal messages teachers send to unattractive students imply that the task was not as difficult and the outcome not as successful as the students originally anticipated. This information may lower students original self perceptions (Coleman, et al., 1987) and severely damage their self-esteem.
In one study, girls in the early elementary grades exhibiting outstanding academic ability, intense commitment to their chosen interests, and strong leadership ability lost their self confidence and became extremely self critical by the time they reached fourth grade. When asked what blocked their road to success, the fourth most common reply was "I'm not pretty enough" (Bell, 1989, p.125). The original motivation and confidence the girls experienced in the early educational levels were stifled by societal halo effects that were possibly communicated in the classroom.

When students receive negative messages from teachers, their minds act as tape recorders. The message is recorded in memory and periodically played back. Thus, the negative messages continue to affect psychologically the students even when the teachers are not there to communicate them. Just as teachers have a difficult time changing their original impressions, students tend to key in cognitively to only information which is consistent with their pre-existing schema (Jussim, 1986). Once students receive enough negative messages to confirm that their performances in class are inadequate, they will attend to and recall only those messages from the teacher that express discontent in their abilities (Jussim, 1986). Even if teachers' original impression changes after students' academic performance is exhibited, students may still believe teachers hold unfavorable views of them and continue their performance accordingly.

In cases where a student's school-related schema and the teacher's expectations conflict, one of two outcomes will occur. First, if the student is more confident of his ability than the teacher
is of her expectation, than the teacher will eventually give in to the student. This process is known as self-verification (Swann & Ely, 1984). Behavioral confirmation, on the other hand, occurs when the student's self-perception, which is not as strong as the teacher's expectation, is altered to be more congruent with the expectation (Swann & Ely, 1984). Unfortunately, because a student's self-schema in the early educational levels is still in the formation stage, the teacher's expectations more often overpower and alter the student's school-related schema.

Feedback psychologically affects unattractive students in a second way. During class when students receive less positive and more negative feedback and are subject to other forms of negative treatment from teachers, they begin to view school as a "punishing situation" (Jussim, 1986, p.440). The excitement and interest the students may once have had in learning is replaced by a feeling of mandatory and unwilling attendance. They soon lose all value in school and education in general (Jussim, 1986). This decreased interest in school is an illustration of the cognitive evaluation theory (Ryan, Connell, & Deci, 1985).

The cognitive evaluation theory attributes a decrease in intrinsic motivation to three types of feedback patterns: (1) feedback designed to control the behavior of the student, (2) feedback that is not contingent on effort or performance and (3) feedback that communicates failure or disapproval (Ryan, et al., 1985). All three forms of feedback communicate to students that they must engage in classroom exercises or perform in school in order to satisfy the demands of others. Now, the intrinsic value once
placed on education is replaced with a feeling of obligation. When students lose this intrinsic value, they will do almost anything to avoid school, including missing class, consistently being tardy, and withdrawing from classroom activities (Jussim, 1985).

A loss of intrinsic motivation to learn results in a wide array of behavioral problems in the classroom. The following section will review the behaviors associated with the cognitive evaluation theory as well as other behavioral reactions of unattractive students.

BEHAVIORAL REACTIONS

The behavioral reactions which occur as a result of a loss of intrinsic motivation to learn include more than just truancy and tardiness. When students feel obligated to attend and participate in class, they frequently put forth little effort and are less willing to cooperate with teachers (Coleman et al., 1987). Unattractive students also receive less praise for their effort in class (Cooper, 1979). As a result, unattractive children are less likely to believe that effort leads to academic success and thus are less likely to put forth any effort.

The socio-emotional climate created in the classroom affects the behavior of unattractive students. When teachers smile at, engage in interaction with, and encourage attractive students, the message being communicated to unattractive students is "I like you less than I like these students." As a result, unattractive children are less willing to initiate and engage in communication with the teacher (Coleman et al, 1987). In addition, when students feel teachers dislike them, they are less likely to request help (Coleman
et al., 1987). By creating this cold climate for unattractive children, teachers put up barriers which limit communication between teachers and students and also limit students' chances to request and receive assistance in the classroom.

The amount of negative feedback, the lack of praise and the cold socio-emotional climate created by teachers provoke several negative behaviors from unattractive children--decreased effort, lack of participation, and little desire to cooperate (Jussim, 1986). These negative behaviors strengthen teachers' original impression of unattractive children as low achievers (Bell, 1989) and lead to continued discrimination in the classroom.

**ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE REACTIONS**

The psychological and behavioral reactions to differential treatment in the classroom affect the academic performance of unattractive students. When students' self-esteem is low and they lack a feeling of achievement, their academic performance will be greatly affected (Bohrnstedt & Felson, 1983). In addition, a decrease in motivation, class participation and cooperation with the teacher all have negative effects on a child's performance (Jussim, 1986). Still, several reactions exist which are solely associated with academic performance.

First, the lack of opportunity in the classroom affects the performance of unattractive children. By allowing low expectation students less opportunities and less time to answer questions aloud in class, teachers give these students less opportunities to think spontaneously, to attempt to articulate their ideas, to make their own corrections and to develop necessary public speaking skills.
(Jussim, 1986). Didham and Stewart (1989) also found that by interrupting low expectation students more while reading aloud in class, teachers contribute to students' hesitancy to read in front of a group.

The nature and amount of feedback also affects academic performance. Unattractive students, who receive less overall feedback, are not given specific suggestions on how to improve their academic performance (Patzer, 1985). Because of the lack of feedback, students may be less able to correct their mistakes and work on academic improvement in the classroom. Low expectation students are also given easier material in class (Jussim, 1986). Teachers tend to increase the amount and difficulty of class material for high expectation students, but keep low expectation students at a slower and more stable pace. As a result, unattractive children are given less opportunity to develop important skills and broaden their base of knowledge.

Many specific psychological, behavioral and academic effects resulting from teachers' differential treatment are evident, but perhaps the best indicators of a self-fulfilling prophecy induced by the halo effect are report card grades and standardized tests scores. These grading mechanisms are not only concrete measures of the halo effect, but they can also greatly influence the future academic and professional success of each student. Report cards and standardized tests are often used by future teachers as an indication of students' abilities (Cooper, 1985). Therefore, an unattractive student who is perceived as a low achiever and receives low grades as a result of the teacher's perceptions may continue to be a victim.
of discrimination in the classroom in higher levels of education. The differential treatment is caused not by attractiveness, but by the previous teacher's expectations and discrimination. Previous academic success or failure is a strong influence on teacher expectations (Cooper, 1985) and is also an important aspect of the self-fulfilling prophecy.

Studies that compared students' level of attractiveness with report card grades determined that more attractive students do receive higher grades (Adams & LaVoie, 1974; Clifford, 1977; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986; Kenealy, Frude & Shaw, 1987; Lerner & Lerner, 1977; Felson, 1980; Patzer, 1985; Salvia, Algozzine & Sheare, 1977). There are two possible explanations for these findings. First, it is possible that attractive children, because of the socialization and positive feedback they receive from parents and teachers, actually perform better in the classroom and are worthy of higher grades. Secondly, the halo effect may be responsible for teachers inaccurately perceiving attractive students as smarter and unjustly awarding the unattractive students lower grades.

Although the psychological, behavioral and academic reactions of unattractive students may lead them to perform less adequately in the classroom, students' performance cannot be solely responsible for the discrepancy in report card grades between unattractive and attractive students. Unattractive students, though they receive lower report cards, actually score higher than attractive children on standardized test scores (Moran & McCullers, 1984). In fact, researchers find a link between beauty and brains only when
teachers have a chance to influence students' scores (Patzer, 1985). Several factors may explain the inconsistencies between class performance and standardized test scores.

First, as victims of teachers' low expectations, unattractive students may lose their intrinsic motivation, and cooperate and participate less in class discussion. These reactions may lead to lower scores on class assignments. When students are not subject to negative receptive communication from teachers, they may feel more relaxed and able to perform at their actual intelligence level.

A second explanation is that teachers do bias the grading of students' work according to each student's level of attractiveness. In this case, although the students' actual intelligence is visible in class, the teacher is victimized by the halo effect and cannot process any performance information incongruent with the original expectations. The standardized test, which is a blind scoring method and is not subject to the halo effect, may record information accurately.

Third, standardized tests may be an inaccurate grading mechanism. Achievement tests only measure students' ability to reason through specific questions. Students' emotional stability and social skills are not detected on this form of testing as they are in the classroom. These factors may alter students' overall academic performance and behavior in the classroom. Unattractive children, because of the previous hardships they have experienced as a result of their appearance, may lack certain social and emotional skills necessary for achievement but undetected by the standardized intelligence tests.
The psychological, behavioral and academic reactions unattractive students experience as a result of teachers' expectations and discrimination may lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy in the classroom. The intellectual development of children who are victims of the self-fulfilling prophecy is often sustained at a certain level or even crippled. Fortunately, the percentage of teachers who discriminate against unattractive students is relatively low (Rosenthal & Babad, 1985). Even one crippled child, however, indicates inequality in education and is a significant reason to investigate our educational system. The first step in eliminating discrimination in the classroom is locating the instances where the self-fulfilling prophecy is likely to occur. Chapter four presents the teachers and the educational conditions which promote unattractiveness discrimination and the self-fulfilling prophecy in the classroom.
CHAPTER FOUR

TEACHERS AND EDUCATIONAL CONDITIONS WHICH PROMOTE SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECIES

"...these people do not lack intelligence. They are just as bright as anybody. What they lack is education--specific education in the technique of open-mindedness."


Locating the teachers who promote self-fulfilling prophecies by discriminating in the classroom is an ambiguous and complex journey. It is difficult to detect characteristics and attitudes which lead to bias, and even more difficult to recognize these traits in individual teachers. Babad, Inbar and Rosenthal (1982) were unable to identify high bias teachers from grades and evaluations in teacher training files or teachers' educational ideologies and demographic characteristics. Through several observational studies and interviews, however, the three were able to identify some common traits among high bias teachers in age, education and experience as well as specific behaviors and attitudes.

The less teaching experience and formal education teachers have, the more likely they are to discriminate (Babad et al., 1982). Bognar (1983) found that teachers with more educational experience rate unattractive students higher and have a large amount of confidence in students' abilities than less experienced teachers, but they also view students as less attentive, motivated and likely to overachieve (p. 54). The behavioral problems and lack of motivation
exhibited by students during teachers' careers may be frustrating to those who believe in students' growth and yet fail to see results. This frustration, however, is equally distributed to attractive and unattractive students, and thus does not lead to inequality in the classroom. Educational levels influence teachers in an obscure way. Not only do teachers with lower levels of education bias more, but teachers with less educated parents also tend to discriminate (Babad et al., 1982). The personality traits of high-bias teachers were accumulated through two separate methods: classroom observations and teachers' self-reports. Babad and Inbar (1981) found teachers' self-reports to be fairly consistent with classroom observations.

During classroom interactions, high-bias teachers were more autocratic and impulsive, and remained physically and emotionally more distant from students than non-bias teachers (Babad & Inbar, 1981). High bias teachers also appeared less trusting of the students, and constantly reinforced rules and procedures (Babad & Inbar, 1981). After watching teachers for only a few days, researchers were able to identify which students were favorites of their teachers by the preferential treatment they received. The socio-emotional climate and communication fostered by high-bias teachers, therefore, is not only apparent to students, but can also be detected by uninvolved observers.

On self-reported attitude and personality traits, however, highs described themselves as more rational, objective, and reasonable than did their non-biasing colleagues (Babad, 1979). Highs also responded more extremely to questions pertaining to
their political views, and rated themselves less emotionally extreme in toughness, tenderness and levels of enthusiasm (Babad, 1979). In addition, highs reported stronger tendencies to be group dependent and conventional, and felt a stronger need to conform to social norms (Babad, 1979).

The most consistent trait among high-bias teachers,surfacing in their interaction with students as well as their self-reports, was dogmatism. The beliefs and values of high-bias teachers were more extreme than the opinions of non-bias teachers, but highs could not explain why they held specific beliefs (Babad, 1979; Babad et al., 1982; Babad & Inbar, 1981). In addition, these teachers treated low expectation students more dogmatic in the classroom than students they had high expectations for (Babad et al., 1982). These findings are consistent with the halo effect—teachers believe unattractive students are less intelligent, but have no specific reasons for their beliefs. By not questioning their methods of judgement, teachers continue to discriminate against unattractive children because they honestly believe they are judging them accurately. Non-biasing teachers, on the other hand, may be inclined to form impressions of students based on attractiveness, but deny their inclinations after failing to find rational reasons for their judgements. Ironically, although the statements and actions of high-bias teachers display dogmatism, highs were unidentifiable from their responses on dogmatism scale (Babad & Inbar, 1981). Therefore, although observers may detect high-bias teachers from classroom interactions and teachers self-reported personalities and attitudes,
questionnaires regarding dogmatic tendencies are invalid measuring tools of bias.

Written responses to hypothetical treatment of problem children, educational ideologies, educational files and dogmatic surveys are all invalid methods of detecting high-bias teachers. There has been some success, however, with classroom observations and teachers' self-reports. The tendency to form opinions and respond to children dogmatically appears to be the underlying common trait among high-bias teachers. The halo effect, therefore, is not solely responsible for unattractiveness discrimination since many teachers, affected by the halo, originally believe unattractive children are less intelligent but do not bias based on those early assumptions. Instead, it is the dogmatic mindlessness of teachers who fail to question the foundations of their judgements, and eventually come to accept them as fact, that is most responsible for inaccurate perceptions of unattractive students.

Teachers' dogmatic mindlessness only lead to self-fulfilling prophecies if the educational environment allows room for bias. Several factors in children's education may foster the survival of teachers' bias and ultimately change the academic performances of children. Consistency in teacher behavior, the level of schooling and the subject matter, all influence the power of teachers' expectations and personal biases.

In order for high-bias teachers' perceptions and low expectations to influence unattractive students, their behavior (attitude, verbal inputs and outputs, and feedback) must be consistent over a period of time (Blease, 1983).
mixed messages to students about their performance and behavior in the classroom, the students are more likely to be confused, but are less likely to alter their behavior. The repetition of negative messages is essential for students to understand and internalize teachers' attitudes towards them. In addition, negative verbal messages sent to unattractive students are more effective if they are supported with congruent non-verbal messages (Blease, 1983). Teachers who constantly criticize students during public demonstrations, but also smile at them often during class, are less likely to influence their behavior than teachers whose verbal and non-verbal messages are both negative.

Students are also more likely to become victimized by the self-fulfilling prophecy if they have high-bias teachers for several years in a row. If all teachers share the same views of students, there is likely to be a cumulative effect and students are more likely to alter their performance (Blease, 1983, p. 126). Teachers views which are out of sync with the majority of teachers have a minimal effect on students and are often disregarded.

Unfortunately, unattractive students who have high-bias teachers one year and the following year have low-bias teachers may continue to be discriminated against. Rosenthal and Babad (1987), in a study of high and low bias teachers, found that highs use traits such as clothing, socio-economic status and physical attractiveness to determine their academic expectations of students. Lows, on the other hand, use students' previous academic performance. Therefore, unattractive students who receive lower grades from high-bias teachers may continue to be perceived as low
ability students the following year by low-bias teachers, not because of their unattractiveness, but because of their previous academic record. Thus, the effects of high-bias teachers not only penetrate the minds of unattractive students, they also influence other teachers, even those less apt to discriminate. Unattractive students become victims of the self-fulfilling prophecy throughout their education because of the continued discrimination among teachers.

Although students at any age may be affected by teachers' discrimination, some grade levels are more susceptible to self-fulfilling prophecies than others. Students in the beginning levels of education are affected most by teachers' expectations and perceptions, and the effect diminishes the higher the student climbs in the educational structure (Cooper, 1985). The strength of early level expectations is caused by two factors. First, young children in general are more influenced by adults than are older children or adolescents. Cooper (1985) attributes this to the choice of significant others, which at an early age is adults but later changes to peers. Children at a young age still look to adults for approval and direction. Although older children are still influenced by adults, their realm of significant others expands to include peers. Secondly, teachers in the early grades spend more time with students (Cooper, 1985). Not only do young children require and receive more interpersonal communication, but children in kindergarten through third grade usually have only one teacher throughout the school year, whereas children in higher grades often alternate classrooms for
various subjects (such as reading and art). This constant interaction strengthens the effects of teachers' expectations.

Expectation communication and behavior influence are also altered by the subject matter being taught in the classroom. Smith (1980) found expectations are communicated more often and are more effective at influencing behavior during reading as opposed to math class. The highly structured nature of math problems and assignments, which is more objective than reading assignments, may allow less freedom for teachers to bias. Children are often required to read aloud in class. This task may make some students, especially those already self-conscious about their image and appearance, even more self-conscious when their teacher's and classmates' attention is directed toward them and their ability. As noted in chapter two, low expectation students are interrupted more often during public performances and responses (Good & Brophy, 1980) and while reading aloud in class (Didham and Stewart, 1989). Expectations may be communicated easier in reading because of the frequency of feedback, and may be more damaging due to having the attention of the entire class focused directly on the individual student.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

"...the method of waiting upon evidence before reaching conclusions, the method of open-mindedness investigation of the facts of nature-- these mental habits can be achieved by everyone and constitute the essence of education."

-Albert Edward Wiggam, The Marks of an Educated Man, p.19

In the classroom, different expectations are not only existing, but they are considered essential. In order to teach children at individual paces suited towards the students' intellectual levels, teachers must have different expectations for different students. Although equality in education is a must, teaching students the same material at the same pace may result in slower children becoming lost in the classroom or smarter children becoming bored (Didham & Stewart, 1989). Therefore, it is advantageous to children if teachers have different expectations for them and design academic paths most suited to the individual students' educational paces.

Unfortunately, expectations teachers have for students are often determined by the students' attractiveness level instead of students' abilities. Thus, students are learning less material at a slower pace and are receiving negative feedback on their performance, not because they are slow learners, but because they are unattractive. Unattractive students receiving lower grades from high-bias teachers continue to receive low grades in higher levels of
education, not because of their ability or their appearance, but because of their previous poor academic record. After receiving consistent negative messages from teachers over a period of time, students may become victimized by the self-fulfilling prophecy. In other words, unattractive students act less intelligent, and eventually may become less intelligent, because of the messages they receive from their teachers.

Although all teachers are susceptible to the halo effect, not all teachers discriminate against unattractive children. Babad, Inbar and Rosenthal, in a series of studies, found that high-bias teachers are more dogmatic. Highs believe unattractive students are less intelligent, but they have no basis for their beliefs. They fail to question their reasoning process, and thus remain under the influence of the halo. Children in the early levels of education, because of their need for adult guidance, are most affected by high-bias teachers. Unfortunately, these children also spend most of their school day with the same teacher. Teachers can not be trained to ignore the halo effect, but they can learn to question their beliefs about students and possibly open their minds to students' performances instead of students' attractiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

High-bias teachers do not need to be removed from the classroom. The halo effect which influences their judgements is a subconscious process. These teachers are not trying to harm the intellectual development of children. They are simply responding to children as they realistically view them. Discriminating teachers do need, however, to be trained to question the reasons behind their
judgements. And students, in order to protect themselves against the discrimination, need to learn how to request feedback from teachers which may force teachers to give explanations for why students' receive specific evaluations.

One of the more successful methods of detecting dogmatic teachers who fail to question their original impressions of students is classroom observations from objective persons. Schools may benefit from hiring communication consultants to observe the interaction between teachers and students in the classroom. These professionals may be able to identify the specific discriminatory messages teachers send to students, and thus identify which teachers need training in resisting the halo effect.

NEEDS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Most of the literature in this study is from the field of psychology. Although the halo effect and self-fulfilling prophecy are communication topics, professionals in interpersonal communication have produced little, if any, research on the effects both have in the classroom. By analyzing the dilemma from a communications perspective, specific guidelines on sending non-discriminatory verbal and non-verbal messages to students could be researched. Such guidelines could provide teachers with tangible methods of altering their behavior towards students in order to provide them with more productive reinforcing messages. Students also need to learn how to request more feedback on their performance and their evaluations from teachers. Communication specialists, through specific research, may be able to identify certain messages and behaviors teachers and students can employ to
improve the communication between them and hopefully eliminate unattractiveness discrimination.

Research is also needed on the discrepancy between unattractive students' report card grades and standardized test scores. Although many studies have illustrated possible reasons why unattractive students score lower on report cards, little is known as to why unattractive students score higher than attractive students on standardized tests. Research in this area would be intriguing, and could provide new insight into the attractiveness discrimination controversy.

Finally, more research is required on long-lasting effects of the self-fulfilling prophecy. The longitude of most studies was one school year. If students are affected by the self-fulfilling prophecy for several years, than the low grades they receive from low-bias teachers may be more the result of their stifled intellectual development than of the effects previous academic record has on teachers. The information currently available on the halo effect and the self-fulfilling prophecy in the classroom indicates that the intellectual development of unattractive students is being temporarily stifled or sustained at a certain level. The long-term harms of the two phenomenons, however, would have an even more detrimental effect on equality in American education, and has yet to be determined.
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