

## INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN EDUCATION

ADVANCES IN LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS RESEARCH  
Volume 3

*Series Editors*

**Barry J. Fraser**  
*Curtin University of Technology*

**Jeffrey P. Dorman**  
*Australian Catholic University*

*Editorial Board*

**Perry den Brok**, *Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands*

**Shwu-yong Huang**, *National Taiwan University, Taiwan*

**Bruce Johnson**, *University of Arizona, USA*

**Celia Johnson**, *Bradley University, USA*

**Rosalyn Anstine Templeton**, *Marshall University, USA*

**Bruce Waldrup**, *University of Southern Queensland, Australia*

*Scope*

The historical beginnings of the field of learning environments go back approximately 40 years. A milestone in the development of this field was the establishment in 1984 of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Special Interest Group (SIG) on Learning Environments, which continues to thrive today as one of AERA's most international and successful SIGs. A second milestone in the learning environments field was the birth in 1998 of *Learning Environments Research: An International Journal* (LER), which fills an important and unique niche.

The next logical step in the evolution of the field of learning environments is the initiation of this book series, *Advances in Learning Environments Research*, to complement the work of the AERA SIG and LER. This book series provides a forum for the publication of book-length manuscripts that enable topics to be covered at a depth and breadth not permitted within the scope of either a conference paper or a journal article.

The *Advances in Learning Environments Research* series is intended to be broad, covering either authored books or edited volumes, and either original research reports or reviews of bodies of past research. A diversity of theoretical frameworks and research methods, including use of multimethods, is encouraged. In addition to school and university learning environments, the scope of this book series encompasses lifelong learning environments, information technology learning environments, and various out-of-school 'informal' learning environments (museums, environmental centres, etc.).

# Interpersonal Relationships in Education

An Overview of Contemporary Research

*Edited by*

Theo Wubbels  
*Utrecht University, The Netherlands*

Perry den Brok  
*Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands*

Jan van Tartwijk  
*Utrecht University, The Netherlands*

and

Jack Levy  
*University of Massachusetts, USA*



SENSE PUBLISHERS  
ROTTERDAM / BOSTON / TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-94-6091-937-4 (paperback)  
ISBN 978-94-6091-938-1 (hardback)  
ISBN 978-94-6091-939-8 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,  
P.O. Box 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, The Netherlands  
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

*Printed on acid-free paper*

All rights reserved © 2012 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
1. Introduction to: Interpersonal relationships in education <i>Theo Wubbels, Perry den Brok, Jan van Tartwijk and Jack Levy</i>	1
<b>STUDENT ORIENTED</b>	
2. Teacher-student relationships and adolescent competence at school <i>Kathryn R. Wentzel</i>	19
3. Understanding discordant relationships between teachers and disruptive kindergarten children: An observational study of teachers' pedagogical practices <i>Jantine L. Spilt and Helma M.Y. Koomen</i>	37
4. An observational study of teachers' affiliation and control behaviours towards kindergarten children: Associations with teacher-child relationship quality <i>Debora L. Roorda, Helma M.Y. Koomen and Frans J. Oort</i>	51
5. Elementary teachers need to recognize bullying before it peaks at the middle school <i>Janet M. McGee</i>	67
<b>SCHOOL ORIENTED</b>	
6. Exploring patterns of interpersonal relationships among teachers: A social network theory perspective <i>Nienke M. Moolenaar, Alan J. Daly and Peter J.C. Sleegers</i>	87
7. School principal-staff relationship effects on school climate <i>Heather E. Price</i>	103
8. The impact of teacher and principal interpersonal behaviour on student learning outcomes: A large scale study in secondary schools of Cyprus <i>Maria Georgiou and Leonidas Kyriakides</i>	119
9. The ecology of curriculum enactment: Frame and task narratives <i>Walter Doyle and Dennis Rosemartin</i>	137

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### TEACHER ORIENTED

10. Relations among beginning teachers' self-reported aggression, unconscious motives, personality, role stress, self efficacy and burnout <i>Philip Riley, Helen M.G. Watt, Paul W. Richardson and Nilusha De Alwis</i>	151
11. Students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom management in elementary and secondary science lessons and the impact on student achievement <i>Katharina Fricke, Isabell van Ackeren, Alexander Kauertz and Hans E. Fischer</i>	167
12. Teacher-student interpersonal behaviour in the Turkish primary to higher education context <i>Sibel Telli and Perry den Brok</i>	187
13. Teacher-student interpersonal relationships during the first year of secondary education: A multilevel growth curve analysis <i>Ridwan Maulana, Marie-Christine Opdenakker, Perry den Brok and Roel J. Bosker</i>	207
14. Let's make things better: Developments in research on interpersonal relationships in education <i>Theo Wubbels, Mieke Brekelmans, Perry den Brok, Jack Levy, Tim Mainhard and Jan van Tartwijk</i>	225
Notes on Contributors	251

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the following persons for reviewing draft versions of the contributions to this book:

Roel Bosker, University of Groningen, The Netherlands  
Mieke Brekelmans, Utrecht University, The Netherlands  
Darrell Fisher, Curtin University, Perth, Australia  
Jerome Freiberg, University of Houston, United States  
Helma Koomen, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
Leonidas Kyriakides, University of Cyprus, Cyprus  
Paulien Meijer, Utrecht University, The Netherlands  
Marie-Christine Opdenakker, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

The production of the book would not have been possible without the careful copy editing and organization of the final publishing by Madelon Pieper.



THEO WUBBELS, PERRY DEN BROK,  
JAN VAN TARTWIJK AND JACK LEVY

## 1. INTRODUCTION TO: INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN EDUCATION

### CONTENTS OF THE BOOK

This book is the third volume in a series reporting on advances in learning environments research. While the first two volumes dealt with ‘outcomes-focused learning environments and its determinants and effects’ (Aldridge & Fraser, 2008) and ‘applications of Rasch measurement in learning environments research’ (Cavanagh & Waugh, 2011), the present volume entirely focuses on the interpersonal aspect of the learning environment.

In 2010 on April 28-29, over 90 researchers and teacher educators from more than ten countries gathered in Boulder, Colorado, for the first *International Conference on Interpersonal Relationships in Education: ICIRE 2010*. Through keynote addresses by Jerome Freiberg (University of Houston), Kathryn Wentzel (University of Maryland at College Park), Walter Doyle (University of Arizona) and Theo Wubbels (Utrecht University), two roundtable, two poster, and six paper sessions, the participants exchanged research results and discussed the conference theme.

The invitation for the conference described the theme as follows:

*Clearly, a positive teacher-student relationship strongly contributes to student learning. Educators, parents and students understand that problematic relationships can be detrimental to student outcomes and development. Productive learning environments are characterized by supportive and warm interactions throughout the class: teacher-student and student-student. Similarly, teacher learning thrives when principals facilitate accommodating and safe school cultures. A variety of research perspectives help explain how these constructive learning environment relationships can be developed and sustained. Contributions have come from educational and social psychology, teacher and school effectiveness research, and communication and language studies, among other fields. Recently, developments such as dynamic system theories have added often-spectacular directions to the topic. While the importance of interpersonal relationships in education has been appreciated for decades, research in this field is still young, with an increasing number of studies appearing in journals and books. Therefore, it is an appropriate time to*

*celebrate, evaluate and advance these efforts through a conference that focuses on the state of the field and avenues for future research.*

The *ICIRE 2010* participants approached the conference theme from several different perspectives. This book includes a number of the conference presentations that demonstrate the breadth and depth of the contributions. The chapters are organized in three sections:

1. Those that primarily focus on individual students and how peers or teachers treat them;
2. Those in which relationships at the school level are central; and
3. Those that focus on the role of the teacher. Most of these chapters are based on teachers' or students' perceptions of teacher actions or teacher-students' relationships in class.

The first section begins with the keynote presentation by Kathryn Wentzel. The chapter focuses on student motivation and engagement for learning, with the teacher-student relationship as its precursor. Wentzel integrates many different theoretical perspectives and provides examples from empirical studies of adolescents' relationships with their teachers. The chapters by Spilt and Koomen, and Roorda, Koomen and Oort are closely connected. Both report on observational studies of interactions between kindergarten teachers and their students. Spilt and Koomen investigated teacher perceptions of teacher-student relationships, observed interactions for disruptive children and analyzed associations between the two. Roorda, Koomen and Oort, discuss whether observed interactions between teacher and children can be predicted from teachers' perceptions of the relationship. Finally, McGee reports on a study of teacher perceptions of bullying in elementary schools. As frequently noted, a teacher's role in and reaction to bullying has important implications for her/his relationship with students, especially at the primary level.

The second section examines relations at the school level, mostly among teachers and between teachers and principals. The chapter by Moolenaar, Daly and Slegers examines relationships among teachers and how the interconnected patterns of associations affect school resource allocation. Price reports on a study on the relationships of principals and teachers and how positive attitudes can upgrade school climate. The next chapter by Georgiou and Kyriakides could have been placed in either the second or third sections, since it examines the impact of principal-teacher relationships as well as teacher-students relationships on student outcomes.

As noted, the last section of the book focuses primarily on teachers and their role in providing learning opportunities for students. Most of the chapters approach this theme by investigating teachers' or students' perceptions of teacher actions or teacher-students' relationships. The section opens with a chapter by Doyle and Rosemartin, based on Walter Doyle's keynote address. The authors analyze how curriculum influences instructional strategies in the context of teacher-student interpersonal relationships. They begin with the longstanding observation that

## INTRODUCTION

many curriculum innovations are not implemented in the classroom, an occurrence that highlights the essential role of the teacher. The next chapter, by Riley, Watt, Richardson and De Alwis, explores relationships between beginning teacher background variables such as unconscious motives, self-efficacy, role stress and teachers' burnout and their self reported use of aggressive techniques to cope with student disruptive behaviour. The section continues with a study by Fricke, Van Ackeren, Kauertz and Fisher on students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom management strategies. They investigate the relationship between K-12 students' perceptions and their interest and achievement in physics. The last three chapters focus on the use of the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI) for measuring teacher-students' relationships. The QTI has served as a valid measure of teacher-student relationships for over two decades, and has been effectively utilized in over 20 countries. Telli and Den Brok report on the adaptation of the questionnaire to the Turkish language and context. The authors adapted the instrument across a wide student age range - from primary to higher education. Next, Maulana, Opdenakker, Den Brok and Bosker describe how the QTI was used to investigate the development of the teacher-student relationship in students' first year of secondary education. Examination of this context is particularly important since the transition from primary to secondary school can significantly affect students' perceptions of the learning environment. The final chapter by Wubbels, Brekelmans, Den Brok, Levy, Mainhard and Van Tartwijk, focuses on the theory, assumptions and conceptualization behind the original version of the Model for Interpersonal Teacher Behaviour and the QTI. After reflecting on some problematic issues of previous work, the authors analyze research on moment-to-moment interactions and teacher-students' relationships. They conclude with an outline of future developments in the field.

## THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

As mentioned, this book reflects the many theoretical perspectives that have informed the study of interpersonal relationships in education. They include a developmental psychological view featuring (among others) models of attachment, as well as a perspective from general interpersonal theory and explanations from dynamic systems, social networks, school effectiveness, school and class climate, and class management. These conceptual frameworks are briefly described below.

### *Developmental Psychological Theory*

In the opening chapter, Wentzel views the affective quality of teacher-student relationships as the central and critical motivator of student adjustment (Pianta, Hamre, & Stuhlman, 2003). The developmental psychological perspective is also presented in chapters by Roorda et al., Spilt and Koomen and McGee. As Wentzel notes, models that guide the study of child and adolescent development are derived from analyses of parent-child relationships that are thought to be experienced

through the lens of mental representations developed over time with respect to specific experiences (Bowlby, 1969; Laible & Thompson, 2007). Early representations of relationships with caregivers theoretically provide the foundation for interactions with people outside the family context, with the quality of parent-child relationships (i.e., levels of warmth and security) often predicting the quality of subsequent peer and teacher associations in early and middle childhood (Wentzel & Looney, 2007). The basic tenets of attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969; Bretherton, 1987) reflect this notion.

Other perspectives that have contributed to this literature describe teacher-student relationships along specific dimensions and provisions, as specified by models of parent-child interactions (e.g., Baumrind, 1971). In greater detail Wentzel (2004) described how teacher-student interactions along these dimensions can promote student motivation and subsequent performance. Derived from theoretical perspectives on person-environment fit and personal goal setting (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1989; Eccles & Midgley, 1989), she argues that school-related competence is achieved to the extent that students are able to accomplish goals that have personal as well as social value, in a manner that supports continued psychological and emotional well-being (Wentzel, this volume).

### *Interpersonal Theory*

The research reported in several chapters (Roorda et al., Georgiou and Kyriakides, Telli and Den Brok, Maulana et al., Wubbels et al.) is founded on general interpersonal theory, often embedded in a systems approach to communication (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967). Interpersonal theory originally offered a conceptual framework to describe and predict dyadic interactions between individuals (Kiesler, 1996; Sadler & Woody, 2003). The chapters cited above extend this model to teacher-class relationships. According to interpersonal theory (Leary, 1957), interactions can be described according to two dimensions: Control and Affiliation (see the Wubbels et al. chapter for a discussion of these terms). Control represents the degree of influence that one person applies to the partner in the interaction, with dominance at one end of the dimension and submissiveness at the other. Affiliation describes the degree of emotional immediacy, warmth, and support in the interaction, and ranges from friendliness to hostility (Gurtman, 2001; Kiesler, 1996). These dimensions are considered to be orthogonal (Sadler & Woody, 2003).

Roorda et al. (this volume) state that a central concept in interpersonal theory is the complementarity principle (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983). Complementarity can be used to predict people's reactions to the behaviours of their partner in the communication. For the Affiliation dimension complementary behaviours would include reactions that are similar – friendly behaviour is answered with friendly behaviour, anger with anger. The opposite would be expected on the Control dimension – dominance might be met with submissiveness or vice-versa. For example, a person might be talking (high Control), while the companion responds

by listening (low Control; Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Sadler & Woody, 2003; Tracey, 1994; 2004; Wubbels et al., this volume). While complementarity is theorized to be the most probabilistic pattern, it is quite possible for partners to respond in a variety of ways (Estroff & Nowicki, 1992; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tracey, 2005).

### *Dynamic Systems Theory*

A recent theoretical framework known as Dynamic Systems Theory, is employed in the work of Wubbels et al. (this volume), among others. Teacher-students' relationships can be understood in terms of the general interpretations that students and teachers attach to their interactions with each other. However, the exact moment-to-moment, individual interpretations that together produce generalized meaning remain unknown. Dynamic Systems Theory (e.g., Thelen & Smith, 1994) can help analyze the relationship between these levels by connecting two separate time scales: a micro-social or moment-to-moment scale (i.e., teacher-students interaction) and a macro-social or outcome scale (i.e., the teacher-students' relationship). The theory aims to understand the changing patterns of moment-to-moment interactions in relation to changes in outcome patterns. For example, Bronfenbrenner and Morris's (1998) bio-ecological theory posits that the micro-social scale is the primary engine of development and outcomes (e.g., teacher-students' relationships). Thus, these individual interactions may be regarded as the building blocks of patterns of interaction within a social system (Hollenstein, 2007). Self-stabilizing feedback, such as the self-fulfilling prophecy, is the mechanism by which moment-to-moment processes determine macro-level outcomes. In turn, macro-level factors can respond to and restrict moment-to-moment interactions, thus serving both as outcomes (of previous processes) and as constraints (for subsequent processes). In terms of dynamic systems theory, the challenge for future research is to learn which type of moment-to-moment interactions lead to profitable teacher-students relationships.

Linked to both the developmental psychological perspective and dynamic systems theory, the Developmental Systems Model of Teacher-Child Relationships (Pianta, Hamré, & Stuhlman, 2003) attempts to describe the teacher's observable interactive behaviour. It supports the research featured in the Roorda et al., and Spilt and Koomen chapters. This perspective considers interactive behaviours as one of the key components of affective relationships between teachers and children (Roorda et al., this volume). It consists of four relationship components: features of individuals (developmental history and biological factors), representational models of teacher and child (perceptions and emotions), information exchange processes (interactive behaviours), and external influences. These factors influence each other in dynamic, reciprocal ways.

*Social Network Theory*

Social network theory highlights the manner in which the underlying patterns of relationships among teachers shape professional communities and affect educational improvement (Moolenaar et al., this volume). The chapters by Moolenaar et al. and Price feature this concept. In educational research social network theory and analysis help explain how relationships among teachers in social networks can support or constrain their learning, instructional practice, and approach to change (Daly & Finnigan, 2010; McCormick, Fox, Carmichael, & Procter, 2010; Moolenaar, 2010). Social network theory builds on the notion that social resources such as information, knowledge, and expertise are exchanged through informal networks of actors in a system. Social network theory focuses on both the individual actors and the social relationships connecting them (Wasserman & Galaskiewicz, 1994), and several network features and mechanisms highlight a distinctive facet of the interaction between individuals. Together these offer a nuanced understanding of social structure as they explain the flow of resources among individuals and its implications for individual behaviour, opinions, and preferences (Moolenaar et al., this volume). For example, these networks can facilitate or inhibit access to social capital (Lin, 2001). Network visualizations and characteristics such as density and centrality aid scholars in illuminating how social networks in schools are shaped and changed to achieve individual and organizational goals. As a result, applying social network theory to the study of teachers' interpersonal relationships makes the social fabric of schools and their influence more tangible (Moolenaar et al., this volume).

Price (this volume) proposes faculty networks as the central mechanisms that bind schools together in terms of structure and organizational culture (Bidwell & Yasumoto, 1999; Meyer & Rowan 1977; Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Through relationships, principals and teachers develop and evolve a school culture out of relational trust, shared values and norms, diffuse work roles, and common experiences (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Bryk et al., 2010). Thus, the network's membership produces a structural interdependence that has attitudinal ripple effects throughout the building (Price, this volume). For example, principals' interactions with their staff are found to be central variables associated with these outcomes (Hoy & Henderson, 1983; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990; Ogawa & Bossert, 1995).

*School Effectiveness Theory and School and Class Climate*

The chapters by Price, and Georgiou and Kyriakides (among others) are rooted in the school effectiveness tradition. Creemers and Kyriakides (2008) developed a dynamic model of educational effectiveness. This perspective defines the dynamic relations between the multiple factors associated with teacher effectiveness. It includes eight factors describing teachers' instructional role that are associated with student outcomes: *orientation, structuring, questioning, teaching-modelling, applications, management of time, teacher role in making the classroom a learning*

*environment, and classroom assessment* (Georgiou and Kyriakides, this volume). Due to their influence on classroom-environment and teaching practice, school-level factors are expected to have both direct and indirect effects on student achievement, though an indirect impact is in greater evidence. Educational effectiveness research has shown that aspects at the classroom level have a more significant relationship with educational outcomes than those at the school level (e.g., Kyriakides, Creemers, Antoniou, & Demetriou, 2000; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000).

Closely connected to school effectiveness theory are the school and class climate and environment conceptualizations included in the Price, Georgiou and Kyriakides, and Wubbels et al. chapters. These models originated in early teacher effectiveness studies and research on the interaction between people and their environment (Moos, 1979; Walberg, 1979). Over the past thirty years, classroom environment research has shown the quality of the classroom environment in schools to be a significant determinant of student learning (Dorman, 2003; Fraser, 1994). School effectiveness and climate research solidly identified the variables associated with successful schools: shared values and norms, openness of governance, and trusting relationships (Price, this volume).

### *Classroom Management Theories*

Theories on classroom management are discussed in the Wentzel, Doyle and Rosemartin, Fricke et al., Riley et al., and Wubbels et al. chapters. They present a wide variety of views on the nature of classroom management, including a range of effectiveness aspects (Fricke et al., this volume). Anderson, Evertson, and Emmer (1980) contend that classroom management is too complex a construct to account adequately for all dimensions. Duke (1979, p. xii) describes classroom management as the “provisions and procedures necessary to establish and maintain an environment in which instruction and learning can occur”. Doyle (1986) focuses on the guidance of student behaviour: “Classroom management refers to the actions and strategies teachers use to solve the problem of order in classrooms” (Doyle, 1986, p. 397). According to Fricke et al. (this volume) the efficient management of a class includes reactive, preventive and proactive elements (Helmke, 2009). Based on these parameters, they identify discipline, rule clarity, and prevention of disruptions as the three main constructs of classroom management.

The ecological approach to classroom management originated from the seminal work of Gump (1969), Kounin (1970) and Doyle (2006) and emphasizes how to create a classroom ecology that invites student cooperation rather than disruption. Doyle and Rosemart (in this volume) argue that classrooms are multidimensional activity settings or ecologies in which teachers must establish, orchestrate, and sustain events that elicit student collaboration over long periods of time and across challenging daily, weekly, monthly, and seasonal variations. These events are jointly constituted by a teacher and her or his students and contain, at their core,

action vectors that draw participants to learning and maintain order. Seatwork, for example, is a familiar event in which students typically work individually on well-structured assignments or worksheets that sustain their involvement. A class discussion, on the other hand, is a more complex action system involving bidding for turns, multiple speakers whose contributions may or may not address the central topic, and unpredictable sequences and directions (Doyle & Rosemartin, this volume). We also know that the ability and willingness of students to engage in classroom tasks affects classroom stability. "When familiar work is being done, the flow of classroom activity is typically quite smooth and well ordered. Tasks are initiated easily and quickly, work involvement and productivity are typically high, and most students are able to complete tasks successfully" (Doyle, 1988, p. 174).

Classroom management can be seen from the perspective of individual students or from the class as an entity (Fricke et al., this volume). From the student's standpoint it specifies expectations, clarifies duties, and establishes possibilities in a specific situation. Fricke et al. (this volume) state that at the class level management is aimed at giving all students the boundary conditions for learning-oriented interaction. This is a necessary prerequisite for ensuring time-on-task, which is again closely related to students' knowledge gains. Also, according to theories about the development of interest, learning-related interactions and the individually-perceived quality of classroom management can evoke and foster topic-related interest.

When, however, students misbehave, teachers have a responsibility to manage the situations as they arise and employ strategies to reduce disruptions over time. In doing so they must manage their own emotional reactions to students, which in turn affects their own classroom behaviour (Riley et al., this volume). Student misbehaviour may provoke an aggressive teacher response (Sava, 2002) that can take many forms, from overt acts such as yelling, to more subtle, even covert behaviours, such as not rewarding or acknowledging students' pro-social behaviours. Three types of aggressive conduct are distinguished: deliberately embarrassing students, using sarcasm to discredit, and yelling angrily (Riley et al., this volume).

## INSTRUMENTS

Given the breadth of theoretical perspectives it is no surprise that a number of instruments have been employed to investigate the various interactions and relationships discussed in these chapters. The tools range from questionnaires that have been specifically developed to measure relationships or interactions, to excerpts or results from existing broader instruments with the same purpose. Although the use of existing instruments limits the number and type of variables that can be investigated, it presents a clear resource advantage to developing new measures since data can be collected or reused more efficiently. As noted, a number of our authors (Price, Wentzel, and Spilt & Koomen) utilized this

approach. The following is a brief discussion of instruments that were specifically developed to measure teacher-student relationships and interactions.

#### *Student-Teacher Relationship Scale*

Roorda et al., and Spilt and Koomen employed the Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS; Pianta, 2001), which was derived from the Developmental Systems Model. The STRS measures teacher perceptions of her/his relationship with a child and includes three dimensions: closeness, conflict, and dependency. Closeness measures the degree of affection, warmth, and open communication in the teacher-child relationship. Conflict describes the extent of negativity, anger, and discordance. Dependency refers to the degree of clinginess, overreliance, and possessiveness of the child in the relationship.

#### *Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI)*

Several chapters (Georgiou & Kyriakides, Telli & Den Brok, Maulana et al.) utilized the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI), which is based on Interpersonal Theory (Wubbels et al., this volume). The QTI measures the perceptions of teachers and students of teacher-students relationships according to a two-dimensional model first described by Leary. In addition to the two dimensions – Control and Affiliation – the instrument assesses the following eight teacher behaviour types based on dimensional ratings: Steering, Friendly, Understanding, Accommodating, Uncertain, Dissatisfied, Reprimanding, and Enforcing. The QTI items are divided into eight scales that correspond to the eight behaviour types. (Wubbels et al., 1985; 2006). Also in this volume, Georgiou and Kyriakides describe the use of a similar instrument – the Questionnaire on Principal Interaction (Kremer-Hayon & Wubbels, 1993) – to assess relationships between principals and teachers.

#### *Students' Perceptions of Classroom Management*

The Students' Perceptions of Their Teacher's Classroom Management (SPCM) by Fricke et al. is a newly developed instrument reported in this volume. It consists of three scales, with five or six items in each: (1) discipline (how disruptive perceive the students their lessons and how often has the teacher to remind students to work quietly), (2) rule clarity (did the teacher set up a system of rules and rituals, and know, understand, and adhere students to these), and (3) prevention of disruptions (is the teacher "omnipresent" and is he or she able to notice and prevent disruptive behaviour, even when being busy with individual students).

### *Observational Measures*

In studies reported in two chapters – Mainhard, Brekelmans and Wubbels (2011, reported in the Wubbels et al. chapter) and Roorda et al. – similar observational measures were utilized that are based on Interpersonal Theory. Roorda et al. analyzed videotaped teacher behaviours towards a child by having them rated independently by different groups of observers. They viewed five-second episodes, using two six-point scales for Teacher Affiliation and Teacher Control (Thijs, Koomen, Roorda, & Ten Hagen, 2011). Teacher Affiliation ranged from *very low* (1) “is repulsive, morose, or unfriendly to the child” to *very high* (6) “is strongly positive, clearly supportive, companionable, or warm, both verbally and nonverbally”. Teacher Control varied from *very low* (1) “shows a passive attitude towards the child, and does not try to influence his/her behaviour at all” to *very high* (6) “tries to have a strong influence on the child, has (or takes) complete control over the situation without acknowledging and permitting any independent contribution from the child”.

The Mainhard et al. (2011) study coded teacher behaviour in a similar manner and also rated class behaviour in real-time following an event-sampling procedure. They employed five-point scales that extended from dependent to independent (Control) and hostile to friendly (Affiliation) for both teacher and class.

### CONCLUSION

As can be seen, combining and integrating various theoretical perspectives greatly enriches the study of interpersonal relationships in education. The combination of developmental and interpersonal models in the Roorda et al. chapter is a good example. By developing an observational measure based on interpersonal theory and combining it with a developmental systems instrument that assessed teacher-student relationships, the authors were able to describe novel associations between teacher-student relationships and actual teacher-child interactions. Price demonstrated how a merger of social network and school climate and effectiveness can enhance the prediction of principal-teacher relationships and attitudes. The Wubbels et al. chapter illustrates the benefits of linking dynamic systems and interpersonal theory to unravel the effects of moment-to-moment interactions on the long-term development of teacher-students’ relationships. Finally, it is important to recognize Georgiou and Kyriakides’ integration of school effectiveness and interpersonal theories, which resulted in a clear demonstration of the importance of interpersonal relations to educational effectiveness.

The combination and integration of different theoretical perspectives might support future progress and developments in the study of interpersonal relationships in education. The following section presents some examples.

A central problem in the study of interpersonal relationships in education is the question of causality versus reciprocity. Do interactions influence a relationship or

vice versa? Are student attitudes caused by teacher-student relationships, or do they help determine them? As Wentzel notes:

*From a theoretical perspective, advances in understanding teacher-student relationships require additional consideration of causal mechanisms and pathways of influence. The predominant approach to the study of teacher-student relationships is to assume a causal connection such that the nature and quality of relationships and interactions influence student outcomes. A consideration of alternative pathways, however, would add critical and important insights to the discussion of these relationships. For instance, models that address the potential impact of children's motivation and engagement on teachers' behaviour, and that identify motivational processes that lead to receptive as opposed to rejecting or neglectful behaviour on the part of teachers need to be developed to inform this area of research.*

For example, one might assume from the Riley, et al. chapter that disruptive student behaviour causes emotional feelings that lead teachers to respond aggressively. However, it is quite possible that aggressive teacher behaviours have caused students to disrupt lessons. It is attractive but dangerous to quickly resolve this quandary by assuming reciprocal associations. Dynamic systems theory has begun to provide a framework as well as statistical analytic tools that might ultimately disentangle the causal links between these and other variables (e.g., Mainhard et al., 2011).

Dynamic systems theory might also help to determine the strength of mechanisms relating attitudes, motivation and interpersonal relationships for students of different ages. A micro level examination might describe the relationship between these variables at one age, while the macro level analysis would focus on different ages. As Wentzel (this volume) states, establishing such associations is essential for understanding developmental changes in the importance of teacher-student relationships. Similarly, dynamic systems theory might inform our understanding of the cumulative effects that repeated positive relationships with many teachers have on students, especially with regard to a student's sense of school community and belongingness. As Wentzel (this volume) states: "The extent to which these more global beliefs develop out of interactions and relationships with single or multiple teachers, and reflect a student's ongoing history of relationships or a single but salient recent relationship are important remaining questions to address in this area of work".

Interpersonal and dynamic systems theory might further illuminate the importance of the social network context. Moolenaar notes that "... in a social network, individuals are embedded within dyadic relationships, and dyadic relationships are embedded in larger sub-groups of three, four, or more actors that eventually shape a social network. Even a social network itself is embedded in a larger social structure, for instance an organization, a community, or a country". Interpersonal theory provides an excellent framework to describe dyadic relationships that can then be depicted on all structural levels. When researchers

combine this interpersonal approach with dynamic systems and social network theories, it becomes possible to map the development of network structures on the micro and macro level.

On the other hand, the developmental perspective should increase the understanding of researchers who follow interpersonal, social network, school effectiveness and/or classroom management models. The developmental perspective has highlighted four relationship components: features of individuals (developmental history and biological factors), representational models of teacher and child (perceptions and emotions), information exchange processes (interactive behaviours), and external influences. These components influence each other in dynamic, reciprocal ways (Wentzel, this volume). In many studies, features of individuals and the processes of information exchange do not receive as much attention as required.

A final challenge for both developmental and interpersonal theorists is the difference in dimensions that describe relationships embodied in these two perspectives. Whereas interpersonal theory identifies two dimensions – variously known as Control and Affiliation or Warmth and Influence – developmental researchers often use three: Closeness, Conflict and Dependency. In this instance the two theoretical frameworks are clearly at odds and this issue must be resolved in order to progress.

## REFERENCES

- Aldridge, J. M. & Fraser, B. J. (2008). *Outcomes-focussed learning environments: Determinants and effects*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Anderson, L. M., Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. (1980). Dimensions in classroom management derived from recent research. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 12(4), 343-356.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monograph*, 4, (1, Pt. 2).
- Bidwell, C. E. & Yasumoto, J. Y. (1999). The collegial focus: Teaching fields, collegial relationships, and instructional practice in American high schools. *Sociology of Education*, 72, 234-256.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss. *Attachment*, vol. 1. New York: Basic Books.
- Bretherton, I. (1987). New perspectives on attachment relations: Security, communication and internal working models. In J. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infant development* (pp. 1061-1100). New York: John Wiley.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological systems theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development* (Vol. 6, pp. 187-250). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed., pp. 993-1028). New York: Wiley.
- Bryk, A. S. & Driscoll M. (1988). *The high school as community: Contextual influences and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Carson, R. C. (1969). *Interaction concepts of personality*. Chicago: Aline.
- Cavanagh, R. F. & Waugh, R. F. (Eds.) (2011). *Applications of Rasch measurement in learning environments research*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Creemers, B. P. M. & Kyriakides, L. (2008). *The dynamics of educational effectiveness: A contribution to policy, practice and theory in contemporary schools*. London/New York: Routledge.

## INTRODUCTION

- Daly, A. J. & Finnigan, K. (2010). A bridge between worlds: Understanding network structure to understand change strategy. *Journal of Educational Change*, 11, 111-138.
- Dorman, J. P. (2003). Cross national validation of the What Is Happening in This Class questionnaire using confirmatory factor analysis. *Learning Environments Research*, 6, 231-245.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom Organization and Management. In C. M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, third edition (pp. 392-431). New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Doyle, W. (1988). Work in mathematics classes: The context of students' thinking during instruction. *Educational Psychologist*, 23, 167-180.
- Doyle, W. (2006). Ecological approaches to classroom management. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 97-125). New York: Erlbaum.
- Dryer, D. C. & Horowitz, L. M. (1997). When do opposites attract? Interpersonal complementarity versus similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 592-603.
- Duke, D. L. (Ed.) (1979). Editor's preface. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), *Classroom management* (78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Eccles, J. S. & Midgley, C. (1989). Stage-environment fit: Developmentally appropriate classrooms for young adolescents. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education*, vol. 3 (pp. 139-186). New York: Academic Press.
- Estroff, S. D. & Nowicki, S. (1992). Interpersonal complementarity, gender of interactants, and performance on word puzzles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 351-356.
- Fraser, B. J. (1994). Research on classroom and school climate. In D. Gabel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on science teaching and learning* (pp. 493-541). New York: Macmillan.
- Gump, P. V. (1969). Intra-setting analysis: The third grade classroom as a special but instructive case. In E. Williams & H. Rausch (Eds.), *Naturalistic viewpoints in psychological research* (pp. 200-220). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gurtman, M. B. (2001). Interpersonal complementarity: Integrating interpersonal measurement with interpersonal models. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48(1), 97-110.
- Helmke, A. (2009). *Unterrichtsqualität und Lehrerprofessionalität. Diagnose, Evaluation und Verbesserung des Unterrichts* [Quality of instruction and teacher profession. Diagnostic, evaluation and improvement of instruction]. Seelze: Knallmeyer.
- Hollenstein, T. (2007). State space grids: Analyzing dynamics across development. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31(4), 384-396.
- Hoy, W. K. & Henderson, J. E. (1983). Principal authenticity, school climate, and pupil-control orientation. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 29, 123-130.
- Kiesler, D. J. (1983). The 1982 Interpersonal Circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. *Psychological Review*, 90, 185-214.
- Kiesler, D. J. (1996). *Contemporary interpersonal theory and research: Personality, psychopathology, and psychotherapy*. Oxford, England: Wiley.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kremer-Hayon, L. & Wubbels, Th. (1993). Principals' interpersonal behavior and teachers' satisfaction. In T. Wubbels & J. Levy (Eds.), *Do you know what you look like?* (pp. 113-122). London: Falmer Press.
- Kyriakides, L. B., Creemers, P. M., Antoniou, P., & Demetriou, D. (2010). A synthesis of studies searching for the school factors: Implications for theory and research. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(5), 807-830.
- Laible, D. & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Early socialization: A relationship perspective. In J. Grusec & P. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of social development* (pp. 181-207). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Leary, T. (1957). *An interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York: Ronald Press Company.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1990, June). *Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, Victoria.
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Mainhard, T., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, Th. (2011). Coercive and supportive teacher behaviour: Associations with the social climate within and across classroom lessons. *Learning and Instruction*, 21, 345-354.
- McCormick, R., Fox, A., Carmichael, P., & Procter, R. (2010). Researching and understanding educational networks. *New Perspectives on Learning and Instruction*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations – Formal-structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Moolenaar, N. M. (2010). *Ties with potential: Nature, antecedents, and consequences of social networks in school teams*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Moos, R. H. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments: procedures, measures, findings and policy implications*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ogawa, R. T. & Bossert, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31, 224-243.
- Pianta, R. C. (2001). *Student-teacher relationship scale*. Professional manual. Lutz, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B., & Stuhlman, M. (2003). Relationships between teachers and children. In W. M. Reynolds & G. E. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Educational psychology*, vol. 7. (pp. 199-234). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sadler, P. & Woody, E. (2003). Is Who You Are Who You're Talking to? Interpersonal Style and Complementarity in Mixed-Sex Interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 80-96.
- Sava, F. A. (2002). Causes and effects of teacher conflict-inducing attitudes towards pupils: A path analysis model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 1007-1021.
- Teddlie, C. & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. London/New York: Falmer Press.
- Thelen, E. & Smith, L. B. (1994). *A dynamic system approach to the development of cognition and action*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford/MIT Press.
- Thijs, J., Koomen, H. M. Y., Roorda, D., & Ten Hagen, J. (2011). Explaining teacher-student interactions in early childhood: An interpersonal theoretical approach. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32(1), 34-43.
- Tiedens, L. Z. & Jimenez, M. C. (2003). Assimilation for affiliation and contrast for control: Complementary self-construals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(6), 1049-1061.
- Tracey, T. J. (1994). An examination of complementarity of interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 864-878.
- Tracey, T. J. G. (2004). Levels of interpersonal complementarity: A simplex representation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1211-1225.
- Tracey, T. J. G. (2005). Interpersonal rigidity and complementarity. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 592-614.
- Walberg, H. J. (1979). *Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy, and productivity*. Berkely: McCutchan.
- Wasserman, S. & Galaskiewicz, J. (1994). *Advances in social network analysis: Research in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. (1967). *The pragmatics of human communication*. New York: Norton.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2004). Understanding classroom competence: The role of social-motivational and self-processes. In R. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior*, vol. 32 (pp 213-241). New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Wentzel, K. R. & Looney, L. (2007). Socialization in school settings. In J. Grusec & P. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of social development* (pp. 382-403). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Wubbels, T., Créton, H. A., & Hoymayers, H. P. (1985, March-April). *Discipline problems of beginning teachers, interactional teacher behavior mapped out*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago (ERIC document 260040).

## INTRODUCTION

Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Den Brok, P., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in the Netherlands. In C. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues* (pp. 1161-1191). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

## **STUDENT ORIENTED**

KATHRYN R. WENTZEL

## **2. TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS AND ADOLESCENT COMPETENCE AT SCHOOL**

### INTRODUCTION

There is growing consensus that the nature and quality of children's relationships with their teachers play a critical and central role in motivating and engaging students to learn (Wentzel, 2009). Effective teachers are typically described as those who develop relationships with students that are emotionally close, safe, and trusting, who provide access to instrumental help, and who foster a more general ethos of community and caring in classrooms. These relationship qualities are believed to support the development of students' motivational orientations for social and academic outcomes, aspects of motivation related to emotional well-being and a positive sense of self, and levels of engagement in positive social and academic activities. They also provide a context for communicating positive and high expectations for performance and for teaching students what they need to know to become knowledgeable and productive citizens.

Despite this consensus, there is much yet to learn about the nature of teacher-student relationships and their significance for motivating students to excel academically and behave appropriately. At the most general level, the conceptual underpinnings of work in this area tend to suffer from lack of clarity and specificity. For example, it is not always clear what scholars mean when they talk about 'relationships' between teachers and students. Similarly, motivational constructs are often vague and ill-defined (see Murphy & Alexander, 2000). In addition, explanatory models that provide insights into the mechanisms whereby teacher-student relationships have a meaningful impact on student outcomes are rare.

In light of these issues, this chapter highlights various perspectives on teacher-student relationships and motivation, including definitions of constructs and theoretical perspectives that guide current work in this area. A specific model of teacher-student relationships that focuses on relationship provisions in the form of emotional warmth and expectations for goal pursuit is presented, and suggestions for future directions for theory and research are offered.

## DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTUAL MODELS

*Defining Teacher-Student Relationships*

In the developmental literature, relationships are typically defined as enduring connections between two individuals, uniquely characterized by degrees of continuity, shared history, and interdependent interactions across settings and activities (Collins & Repinski, 1994; Hinde, 1997). In addition, definitions are frequently extended to include the qualities of a relationship, as evidenced by levels of trust, intimacy, and sharing; the presence of positive affect, closeness, and affective tone; and the content and quality of communication (Collins & Repinski, 1994; Laible & Thompson, 2007). Along each of these dimensions, relationships can evoke positive as well as negative experiences. Finally, relationships are often thought of in terms of their influence and what they provide the individual. In this regard, researchers have focused on the benefits of various relationship provisions such as emotional well-being, a sense of cohesion and connectedness, instrumental help, a secure base, and a sense of identity for promoting positive developmental outcomes (Bukowski & Hoza, 1989).

From a developmental perspective, relationships are believed to be experienced through the lens of mental representations developed over time and with respect to specific experiences (Bowlby, 1969; Laible & Thompson, 2007). Mental representations that associate relationships with a personal sense of power and agency, predictability and safety, useful resources, and reciprocity are believed to be optimal for the internalization of social influence (see Kuczynski & Parkin, 2007). These representations also provide stability and continuity to relationships over time. In this regard, early representations of relationships with caregivers are believed to provide the foundation for developing relationships outside the family context, with the quality of parent-child relationships (i.e., levels of warmth and security) often predicting the quality of peer and teacher relationships in early and middle childhood (see Wentzel & Looney, 2007).

Although stability and continuity are viewed as hallmarks of relationships, they also are viewed as dynamic; relationships undergo predictable changes as a function of development and the changing needs of the individual. For example, over the course of adolescence, children's relationships with parents improve with respect to overall positive regard and reciprocity; in early and middle adolescence, relationships with parents are marked by heightened negative affect and conflict; and adolescents experience discontinuities in the frequency and meaning of interactions with parents and the availability of resources from them (Collins & Repinski, 1994). Similarly, relationships with peers change with age. Whereas younger adolescents tend to form relationships within peer crowds and cliques, older adolescents tend to focus on relationships with a more limited number of friends (Brown, Mory, & Kinney, 1994). As children move through adolescence, they also view relationships with peers as the most important sources of intimacy, nurturance, companionship, and admiration (Lempers & Clark-Lempers, 1992).