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Abstract

Although children's experience of student-teacher relationships is inextricably linked to the social, emotional, cognitive and academic development of the child, the research methodologies employed to date to study children's perceptions of student-teacher relationship have been limited to rating scales and questionnaires. By developing interactive open-ended tasks designed to gain a more thorough understanding of what bright and gifted eight and nine year old children perceive about relationships between students and teachers, this study makes a significant methodological contribution to the body of research investigating the social and emotional knowledge used by participants in student-teacher relationships. Structured interview and story completion tasks were administered using an interactive teaching approach that allowed for dynamic responsivity and in-depth probing. The findings suggest that the participants were able to spontaneously describe their knowledge of student-teacher relationships in behavioural, interaction-oriented terms, and when in-depth interviewing was employed they also
demonstrated a rich knowledge of emotional components and dynamics inherent in teacher-student relationships. The centrality of emotions in learning, particularly as lived out and developed within student-teacher relationships is discussed in relation to educational practice and policy, as well as to directions for future research.
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CHAPTER ONE: CHILDREN’S PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT-TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS

Focus of the Study

The busy activity of a classroom has always captivated my attention, and has provided a great deal to think about. As a psychological consultant with an urban school board, I have had the privilege of observing teachers and students in their schools for over a decade. In the classroom the demands of the curriculum and learning outcomes, the limitations of the physical setting and the materials, and the expectations of the dedicated teachers are visible. There are other pressures impacting on the classroom that are not so readily visible. On a macro level, classroom learning is nested within an educational system and society at large, and both place enormous responsibilities on the day to day activities of the classroom. On a micro level, interpersonal relationships influence learning in the classroom. This is the domain I have chosen to explore.

From my experiences, I have developed great respect for the time and energy that students and teachers devote to working, sharing, and experiencing together. I am inspired by the continual efforts of students and teachers to make themselves understood to each other. Imagine a typical classroom scene that occurs day by day. Children have just entered their familiar classroom, in the morning, and settle into their desks. The day begins with announcements, and the activities for the day are outlined. The teacher teaches a lesson and provides instruction for an assignment. Twenty-five or more students are sitting quietly in their seats. Many students appear to be listening, and some may not. Some may ask questions, and some are called upon to answer questions. As the assignment is given, most students begin their work. Some students work cooperatively
in groups, while others work individually. A few children may receive redirection or repetition from the teacher.

On one level it is possible to make a general observation that a variety of interpersonal interactions are occurring and appear to be shaping the teaching and learning throughout the day. In fact, it has been cogently argued that we all live and learn in a social context consisting of interpersonal relationships and interactions (Donaldson, 1992; Keating, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978). The classroom environment has been studied often from the teacher's perspective (Brophy & Good, 1974; Good & Brophy, 1997). Teachers' perceptions are important, and these investigations are essential to our understanding. However, there is also a need to gather information from the students' perspective, to understand how the students experience classroom learning, and how they perceive the student-teacher interpersonal relationships.

Children's opinions are important and they are related to successful learning outcomes, but, their voices have not always been listened to or integrated with the opinions of other stakeholders in education. Children spend a great deal of their early developmental life in school (Oatley & Nundy, 1996; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Oustan, 1979), and there is evidence to suggest that young children are capable of formulating their own perceptions of the classroom environment (Fraser, 1986). In studies examining teachers' communication characteristics (Levy, Wubbels, & Brekelmans, 1992) and the classroom environment (Fraser & O'Brien, 1985), students' perceptions have been found to differ from teacher perceptions. Students' perceptions of the classroom climate contribute to academic achievement (Fraser, 1986; Haertel, Walberg, & Haertel, 1981, cited in Fraser & O'Brien, 1985; Levy, Wubbels, &
Brekelmans, 1992; MacAuley, 1990) and are also associated with engagement in learning (Connell & Wellborn, 1990; Ryan & Powelson, 1991). Children's perceptions, formulated over thousands of hours in the classroom, matter and should be heard.

Teacher, classroom, and school effectiveness investigations (Fraser, 1986; Good & Brophy, 1997; MacAuley, 1990; Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis & Ecob, 1988; Rutter et al., 1979) have made significant contributions to the understanding of associations between predictor variables and successful achievement and social outcomes. Research has also identified characteristics that mediate effective learning, such as the teacher's classroom management skills, the difficulty and amount of instruction provided, and the parent and teacher involvement in learning. The research needed now and the focus of this study considers the social and emotional aspects of interpersonal student-teacher relationships from the children's perspective.

The purpose of this investigation is to explore children's perspectives on the nature of the relationship between students and teachers. The goal is to capture rich descriptions of children's thoughts and feelings about student-teacher relationships, and from an analysis of the descriptions, explore the social-emotional dimension of the student-teacher connection from the learner's perspective. The results of this investigation provide information for better understanding the nature of good student-teacher relationships which can be used to inform policy and practice that can in turn have a positive impact on successful learning outcomes. Furthermore, it may be possible to identify some developmentally appropriate opportunities for social-emotional growth within the student-teacher interaction.
Review of the Literature

In a search of the literature pertaining to children's perceptions of student and teacher relationships no investigations directly addressing the relationship between the student and the teacher were found. Studies were found that examined children's perceptions of the classroom climate and teachers, which can be used as the beginning point for examining children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships. In the following sections I: (a) Present theoretical and empirical evidence related to children's perceptions of classroom climate and teacher characteristics, and (b) discuss the links with thinking and feeling, with a view to understanding the centrality of emotions in learning and in particular the student-teacher relationship.

Students' Perceptions of Classroom Climate and Teacher Characteristics

Children's perceptions of the classroom have been studied primarily by using questionnaire or rating scale techniques (Dorhout, 1983; Fraser, 1986; Moos & Moos, 1978), which were designed to gather information from middle and secondary school students. The exception is My Classroom Inventory (Fraser, 1986), which was developed for Grade 3 children. Students' perceptions of involvement, affiliation, teacher support, task orientation, competition, order and organization, rule clarity, teacher control and innovation (Moos & Trickett, 1974), classroom satisfaction, friction, competitiveness, difficulty, and cohesiveness (Fraser & O'Brien, 1985) have all been examined using these techniques. These studies are important because they provide some insight into children's perceptions of some classroom environment variables and teacher variables. Furthermore, the findings have provided an understanding of some social and
interpersonal variables that may be associated with academic success. However, the data are somewhat limited because they were generated from rating scales of predetermined variables.

In contrast to the rating scale methodology, Mergendoller and Packer (1985) studied Grade 7 students’ perceptions of teachers and classroom experiences, using interviews. The data from the study described students’ actual school experiences. Mergendoller and Packer found that the Grade 7 students talked about four areas when they were interviewed about their perceptions of teachers and class experiences. The four areas were: (a) academic work (e.g., quantity and difficulty of work), (b) instructional facility (e.g., quality of explanations and assistance), (c) classroom experience (e.g., discipline, tolerance, student self-management), and (d) personal characteristics of the teacher (e.g., temperament, temper, and relationship with students). Mergendoller and Packer found that the students were not just concerned with marks, lessons, assignments, and tests. These Grade 7 students were concerned with the social and interpersonal domain of their education. However, relationship was only one component of what they reported in the personal characteristics area.

Surveys of preferred teacher characteristics have also been conducted using samples of gifted middle and secondary students (Dorhout, 1983; Freeman, 1987; Porter, 1993; Wendel & Heiser, 1989). In these surveys, it was shown that the gifted students appreciated academically skilled and knowledgeable teachers who expected high quality work, but the students also expressed a preference for a teacher who was willing to engage interpersonally with students. The studies indicated that gifted students wanted their teacher to work with them rather than for them (Freeman, 1987), to show them
respect, creativity, enthusiasm, and care (Wendel & Heiser, 1989), and to support them (Porter, 1993).

Teacher authority is another characteristic that has been studied from the student’s perspective. Dunbar and Taylor (1982) examined children’s perceptions of elementary teachers’ formal authority (i.e., authority that is institutionalized by school roles and regulations), and informal authority (i.e., authority that is earned and recognized by students). They found that students’ perceptions of informal authority changed as a function of the students’ age. That is, teachers of first grade children did not need to earn their authority in order for students to comply with their requests, but teachers of sixth grade students needed to earn their authority in order for the sixth graders to comply with requests. The authors of the study suggested that formal authority had limitations, and that teachers needed to develop a base of informal authority. “He or she must win the pupils’ trust and liking and be perceived as caring and working hard for the pupils’ sake” (Dunbar & Taylor, 1982, p. 250). This could be interpreted as teachers needed to become involved in relationship with students in order to earn informal authority.

Babad (1990) examined students’ perceptions of the emotional support provided by teachers in each of two situations, one hypothetical and the other actual. She found that Grade 7 students believed that teachers gave more emotional support to a hypothetical, high-achieving student than to a hypothetical, low-achieving student. That is, in a hypothetical situation, they perceived that teachers provided emotional support differentially. In the actual situation, using self-report and direct evaluations to measure students’ perceptions of the emotional support provided by an actual teacher to high and low achieving students, no differential teacher behaviour was found. In the actual
situation, the children reported that the teacher treated everybody in the class the same way.

Although research designed to measure actual characteristics is theoretically more reliable than research involving hypothetical characteristics, in Babad's study (1990) the self-report and direct evaluation methods did not capture students' perceptions of differential teacher emotional support in the actual student-teacher context. One hypothesis is that the students' increased familiarity with the actual situation may have increased the complexity of the task. The students needed to integrate their past experiences and present information, in order to determine whether the teacher provided differential emotional support or not. Their past actual knowledge may have competed with the present information, altering the salience of the teacher's emotional support, or discounting the impact of high or low achievement. An alternative hypothesis could be that the children's emotions interfered with their cognitive appraisal of the situation. Perhaps the students had some bad experiences in the past, and they were hesitant or unable to perceive the differential emotional support in the actual situation. For example, perhaps students' perceptions were influenced by their own past experiences of high and low achievement. Babad's (1990) findings need to be interpreted carefully, but the results suggest that the children may perceive differential teacher emotional support only when task demands are simplified and salient, as in the hypothetical situation. Therefore, it appears that the students' perceptions of teacher emotional support may be contextually bound, situation specific and complex in determination.

From the studies reviewed, there appears to be support for the claim that children identify some social and emotional aspects of teachers and classroom situations. This
conclusion is supported by studies that have used a variety of research methods to elicit children's perceptions, including closed-end rating scales (Fraser, 1986; Fraser & O'Brien, 1985), open-end interviews (Mergendoller & Packer, 1985) and comparisons of a hypothetical situation versus an actual situation (Babad, 1990). Although these studies provide a beginning point for understanding children's perceptions of the social and emotional aspects of classroom experiences, there is much that remains to be understood of children's perceptions of the relationship between students and teachers.

In these studies, the child has often been viewed as a passive recipient of interpersonal interactions initiated by the teacher. This does not match my experiences or common sense. I have observed children to be actively involved in creating relationships with teachers. I have rarely seen a child who is passive and unresponsive to teacher interaction. This raises the question of whether or not children themselves contribute to the interpersonal characteristics of the teacher and the classroom. The child's contribution to this relationship needs to be addressed.

Deci and Ryan (1991), Ryan and Powelson (1991), and Connell and Wellborn (1990) have studied children's relationships with significant others, including children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships. Their perspective encompassed more than children's perceptions of teacher's characteristics. These studies concerning student-teacher relationships were based on a model of motivational processes that integrated individual difference variables (psychological needs) and situational variables (contextual resources available to provide for psychological needs). Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, and Ryan (1991) suggest:
(a) that people are inherently motivated (out of three basic needs—*fundamental psychological needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence*) [italics added] to internalize and integrate within themselves the regulation of uninteresting activities that are useful for effective functioning in the social world and (b) that the extent to which the process of internalization and integration proceeds effectively is a function of the social context. (p. 328)

Deci et al. (1991) proposed that a person's psychological need for autonomy, relatedness, and competence is linked to his or her perceptions of the social and contextual resources (i.e., autonomy support, involvement, and structure) available in the environment. Furthermore, they claimed that motivation, performance, and learning are maximized when a learning context satisfies any or all of a person's basic psychological needs.

The operationalization of the psychological and social contextual variables byConnell and Wellborn (1990) allowed for an empirically testable formulation of children's perceptions of their relationship with the teacher. Rating scales were developed to measure children's perceptions of their own psychological needs and the educational contextual resources available to support their needs in the student-teacher relationship (Wellborn & Cornell, 1987). The scales were designed for children at the Grade 3 level.

Ryan and Powelson (1991) reviewed empirical support for their hypothesis, which was that the psychological needs of autonomy and relatedness were linked. Ryan, Stiller, and Lynch (cited in Ryan & Powelson, 1991) found that children's perceptions of the contextual resources (i.e., structure, autonomy support, and involvement) facilitated positive relationships with teachers. Ryan and Powelson (1991) concluded that the self-
perception of one's need for "relatedness" with significant others is rooted, at least in part, in one's sense that the other person respects and supports one's autonomy rather than attempts to control it.

Children's perceptions of the contextual resources for involvement and autonomy support have also been empirically linked to engagement in learning and motivation. Anderson, Manoogian, and Reznick (1976) found that when preschool children were denied the interpersonal involvement that they desired, they lost intrinsic motivation. Grolnick, Ryan, and Deci (1991) and Grolnick and Ryan (1989) found that children were more motivated and self-determined when they perceived that their parents and teachers were more involved with them and more supportive of their autonomy.

Deci et al. (1991), Connell and Wellborn (1990), and Ryan and Powelson (1991) have made significant contributions to our understanding of children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships. They have gone beyond gathering data on children's perceptions of the classroom characteristics and teachers' interpersonal behaviours and have attempted to integrate children's perceptions of the teacher's interpersonal characteristics with children's perceptions of their psychological needs. They have also specified the social and psychological interaction within the boundaries of the educational setting. They have demonstrated that children's perceptions of the interpersonal, contextual resources (e.g., autonomy support, structure, and involvement) are associated with engagement in learning and success in academic achievement.

Connell and Wellborn's (1990) motivational theory placed more emphasis upon the developing person than the social environment. They believed that the social context provided the resources for the developing person, not that the social environment shaped
a "passive" person. This position fits with my experiences. I see children actively contributing to relationships with teachers daily. Children lead and direct when they want to explore something. Think of the child who asks questions to extend or elaborate his or her comprehension of a concept; or think of the child who redirects the focus of the topic to include something that he finds relevant or more interesting. I have observed children actively promote their relationship with their teacher, encouraging the teacher to respond to their needs. The teacher follows by responding to the contribution that the child has made. Unfortunately, I have also seen children who refuse to respond, and they too are actively contributing to the relationship by rejecting the teacher and the lesson. Teachers and children are actively collaborating in co-creating a learning environment.

At this point, the picture that is emerging of children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships is somewhat more complete, because there is evidence to support the position that children are active participants in the student-teacher relationship. Nevertheless, the social and the emotional processes of interaction between the child's developing self-awareness and the contextual resources remain relatively unexplored.

Connell and Wellborn's (1990) approach uses rating scales to measure the children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships, and this requires that the children's views fit the preconceived notions of the authors. Therefore, the measures may create artificial limits on the children's reported knowledge. Lewis (1987) has claimed that the student-teacher relationship is significant only to the extent that it is embedded in a common social-emotional experience for the student and the teacher. Therefore, the challenge is to develop ways of thinking about and examining the cognitive-emotional fugue (Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Sullivan, & Michalson, 1984) within the context of
education. Other paradigms need to be added to the emerging representation of children's perceptions of the social and emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships.

The Social Construction of Emotion in the Context of Education

From my experiences observing student and teacher interactions, and from my review of the literature thus far, it can be argued that the social and emotional aspects of teacher-student relationships from the children's perspective still need to be investigated. Imagine the classroom that was introduced at the beginning of the chapter. As an observer, I could assume that this is what a productive classroom environment is supposed to look like, the teacher instructs and the children work on assignments. It appears that the students are responding to the demands of the teacher and the assignment. The students are behaving as expected. But what does behaving consist of? There is a need to unpack the students' behaviour. Their actions can be observed, but what are the children thinking and feeling? What are they thinking and feeling about the teacher? Are their perceptions influencing their problem solving and task completion and possibly their self-image as suggested by Lewis (1987)?

In this section, I will briefly provide a historical perspective on the hypothesis that socialization and emotions are inextricably linked to cognitive development, before addressing new ideas and procedures from literature on the social construction of emotions. The social-construction-of-emotion approach views children as people growing through their interactions with others by virtue of complex interconnectedness of thoughts and feelings.
Historically, educational research and practice have focused primarily on cognitive development and academic achievement as aspects of education. Only recently, the social and emotional aspects of thinking and learning have been recognized as integral components of education (Damasio, 1994; Goleman, 1997; Keating, 1996; Lewis, 1987; Matthews & Keating, 1995; Oatley & Nundy, 1996; Weiner, 1990a), even though the basis for doing so was established decades ago by L. S. Vygotsky. Vygotsky (1978) emphasized both the importance of social interaction between an adult and a child and the influences of heredity and a “passive” environment, in his conceptualization of cognitive development and intelligence. In a prologue to the English Edition of Vygotsky’s collected works, Jerome Bruner wrote:

Vygotsky’s conception of development is at the same time a theory of education
...his educational theory is a theory of cultural transmission as well as a theory of development. For “education” implies for Vygotsky not only the improvement of the individual’s potential but the historical expression and growth of the human culture from which Man springs. (Vygotsky, 1987, pp. 1-2)

In Vygotsky’s (1987) work, Emotions and Their Development emotion is described as an integral component of all human mental functioning. He concluded that research had moved thinking about emotions “…from the hinterlands to the forefront of the human mind, no longer treating them as an isolated ‘state within a state,’ but including them within the same structure as the other mental processes” (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 336). Vygotsky’s work is important, suggesting the need for detailed studies of the integral connections among thinking, feeling, and development.
Berger and Luckmann (1966) argued that schools provide socialization experiences that are established and maintained by routines. They recognized that socialization experiences contain emotional features, and they proposed the idea that emotions are typically rational and controlled during socialization experiences in schools. It can be argued that emotions are not minimized within education, but rather that they are integral components of education, and that they have the potential to influence the child’s academic success and development (Oatley & Nundy, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978). Children’s social-emotional development takes place in student-teacher relationship experiences within educational settings. At school, children learn social norms for interaction, social conventions concerning how things are done, and moral considerations, such as fairness and justice. The hypothesis that social and cultural messages are introduced to children as they learn in classrooms, and that these messages have the potential to have an impact on the children’s social and emotional development, has received compelling support (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1996; Keating, 1996; Matthews & Keating, 1995; Oatley & Nundy, 1996).

Keating (1996) asserted that humans need relationships to survive because of an inherent social nature. The education and socialization of children depend on stimulating interactions between adults and children. The need for relationships and affiliation has been hypothesized as a motivational factor in education (Weiner, 1990a), and emotion is a primary means of relating to another person (Oatley & Nundy, 1996). We must consider the claim that the emotional aspects of education should not be minimized, but rather recognized, thought about, and understood as essential social-emotional components of
rather recognized, thought about, and understood as essential social-emotional components of education. Moreover, these emotional factors are nowhere more obvious than in student-teacher relationships.

The notion that some emotions are learned and socially constructed through interaction with others needs to be explored, within an educational context. Gordon (1989), Saarni (1990), and Dunn (1992) all embed social and emotional development in relationships. Dunn and Brown (1991) claimed that learning to regulate the expression of emotion is not done in isolation, but rather self-regulation of emotional expression develops in children’s relationships with others. In addition, Gordon (1989) and Saarni (1990) suggested that emotions are regulated by social norms that set limits on acceptable emotional expressions in specific situations and relationships.

Saarni (1990) and Gordon (1989) are social constructionists who contend that emotions are socially and cognitively constructed in relationship. Gordon described the social foundations for the cognitive construction of emotions. He viewed emotion as part of culture. An emotion takes on meaning according to the culture’s beliefs, vocabulary, and regulations. Emotional competence, according to Gordon, referred to the concept that children formulate their understanding of emotions through day to day interactions and their emotional knowledge emerges as they adapt to the demands of social situations. Gordon contended that increased social interaction expanded the child’s emotional range of functioning, but also differential exposure to emotional expressions influenced the child’s direct experiences or indirect learning about an emotion. Saarni (1990) viewed children as actively involved in the creation of their emotional life.
It is widely accepted that social, emotional and cognitive development are closely connected. Research in the area of child development examines the nature of the connections between social, emotional and cognitive development. Dunn (1988) has hypothesized that learning can be fostered by emotionally arousing social interactions, where children become more attentive to the other person’s behaviour and this contributes to their thinking about the encounter and to remembering it. She found that children showed their most advanced reasoning when their “own self-interest” was threatened. For example, she has shown that children as young as 3 years old verbally reasoned through problems to understand what was happening in a social situation rather than crying, hitting or demanding. Similarly, Fischer, Shaver and Carnochan (1990) proposed that positive and negative emotions are connected (a) to cognitive appraisals of changes in situations that are of importance or interest to the person and (b) to action tendencies that shape behaviour. Different emotional experiences contribute to different developmental pathways according to Fischer et al. (1990). Case, Hayward, Lewis and Hurst (1988) also claimed that social, emotional and cognitive development are connected. They proposed that the emotion system and cognitive system are somewhat separate but also linked, in that changes in one system are associated with changes in the other. For example, they claimed that the child’s stage of cognitive development influences the types of emotions that will be experienced, and children’s exposure to emotional experiences and the time that they spend in the emotional situations influence their cognitive development. While there are somewhat differing views on the nature of the connections between emotional, social and cognitive development, there is clear
evidence that emotions are integrally involved in shaping social and cognitive development.

In summary, the hypothesis that socialization and emotions are inextricably linked to cognitive development has received empirical and theoretical support in the field of human development but it has not made a significant impact in the field of education. Lewis (1987) described feeling and thinking as a fugue, where both are inseparable elements of a continuous stream of behavior. However, Oatley and Nundy (1996) suggested that it is almost as if emotions have been "exorcised" from the educational context. In addition, they hypothesized that emotional functioning was of primary importance, not secondary importance, to cognitive processes in education, and they warned that by ignoring the influence of emotion in learning, the understanding of cognitive processing would be distorted.

Weiner (1990a) reviewed the history of motivation research in education, and he agreed that social and emotional components of education have been neglected. He believed that educational motivation must be considered within its social and emotional context, and that a larger framework than the self must be brought into the motivational equation. In Weiner's own research, he has attempted to link thinking and feeling within the context of education, based upon attribution theory.

Weiner (1983, 1990a&b) hypothesized that people are motivated to understand, master and predict how events occur. Attributions are thoughts that are constructed to make sense of events we experience in the world. Weiner's (1985, 1992) attribution theory suggested that achievement and social events could be analyzed according to the properties of internal or external locus of causality, stability, and controllability. On the
one hand, an attribution can be conceptualized as a socially created structure, a structure that is built through interaction and communication with others. On the other hand, an attribution can be construed as an individual interpretation and construction of the event, that may be a reflection of past experiences, desires, and wishes.

Cognitive representations of causality have been linked to emotions in Weiner's attributional theory of motivation. Specifically, Weiner (1990a) hypothesized that generalized motivational principles could develop that would transfer to other situations, that is, "...there will be mapping between the structure of thought, discrete emotional experiences and the motivational messages of these experiences" (Weiner, 1990a, p. 621). Although Weiner (1992) has theorized that achievement and affiliation events can be analyzed according to causal properties, and there is evidence demonstrating the links between attributions and emotional sequelae, how do attributional structures develop and what do attributions look like in children?

Weiner (1990b) claimed that, as children evaluate events, outcome-emotion and attribution-emotion processes develop. Cognitively-constructed emotions have been linked to outcomes and attributions, according to Weiner, Kun, and Benesh-Weiner (1980). They found that young children used outcome dependent emotions more frequently than attribution dependent emotions. Outcome dependent emotions were associated with positive or negative events that generated feelings of happiness or sadness. Attribution dependent emotions occur when an outcome is particularly troublesome and there is a search for a deeper level of understanding. For example, in order to better understand, master, and predict the outcome, a person may reflect on all
Weiner and colleagues have made a significant contribution to my understanding of how children construe interpersonal relationships. Their studies (Weiner, Graham, Stern & Lawson, 1982 and Weiner & Handel, 1985) demonstrated that children between the ages of 5 and 12 perceive interpersonal events and the social and emotional aspects of the events. Weiner and colleagues have also effectively demonstrated that children attempt to make events meaningful by constructing causal structures (i.e., connecting events with outcomes, attributions and emotions). The descriptions of children actively contributing to the relationship by participating in an interpersonal interaction seem to fit more with my experiences. For example, I have often witnessed students attempting to make sense of a situation by creating causal structures. They struggle to explain their perception of what happened, how it happened, what they contributed and what they think others contributed. They talk about effort and differentiate between the various contributions of their peers. However, the slice of reality that Weiner and colleagues examined consisted of attributions and emotion concerning a single event. The associations appear to be linear, and behaviour in real situations is never that simple. Relationships are not created in a series of clear-cut events. Student-teacher relationships are complex and dynamic. The people in the events have histories of past successes and failures. A person's goals or desires always influence attributions. Emotions also colour an event. There will be give and take between the student and the teacher, on an emotional level within the event. Attributions explaining academic and social successes and failures will always involve the social-emotional states of the participants.

A richer and more complete description of student-teacher relationships is essential. Research needs to build upon Weiner's foundation, by widening the window of
A richer and more complete description of student-teacher relationships is essential. Research needs to build upon Weiner's foundation, by widening the window of observation from children's perceptions of a single event to their understanding of a complex set of events and experiences (including the social and emotional aspects) that constitute an interpersonal relationship. It is possible to locate social and emotional processes within student-teacher interactions in the context of the classroom.

The social and emotional aspects of relationships within an educational context. A "relationships approach" to the study of how individuals affect and are affected by the society in which they live has been advocated by Dunn (1993). Relationships are the interpersonal contexts within which childhood development takes place. Bronfenbrenner (1989) and Hinde (1992, cited in Dunn, 1993) stressed that the links between a relationship and the broader social and cultural contexts as well as between a relationship and the unique individual differences of the interacting persons need to be recognized.

Previous studies of student-teacher relationship have been criticized because they have not taken into account social context dynamics and all participants' perspectives. In a theoretical paper, Johnson and Miller (1993) criticized student-teacher relationship studies because they have been seen as unidirectional. They advocated studying student-teacher relationships bi-directionally. Hinde (1992, cited in Dunn, 1993) also emphasized that social connections need to be examined bi-directionally. Dunn and McGuire (1992) noted a tendency to use sociometrics to identify behaviours or characteristics of relationships, however, they suggested that these methods did not capture the processes that are central to relationships.
a variety of dimensions, such as connectedness, involvement, complementarity, shared humour, shared control, intimacy, and shared positive emotions. Dunn articulated some of the details that needed to be taken into consideration when describing relationships. Descriptions of relationships had to be sensitive to developmental changes, because the nature of the relationship might not be stable over time, as children grow in their social knowledge. Descriptions of relationships should consider the idea that both partners co-create the qualities of the relationship. While children observe and respond to behaviour directed toward them, Dunn asserted that aspects of each person’s individual personality, such as temperament, could contribute to the quality of relationships.

Dunn (1993) concluded that in thinking about relationships research should move away from the search for characteristics that typify the qualities of a person’s relationships, and instead describe the nature, structure, dynamics, and demands of children’s relationships with others. She suggested that rather than trying to identify a trait such as secure attachment or social competence, which a child hypothetically carries from relationship to relationship, researchers should think about and describe: (a) the specific aspects of a relationship as they were expressed in the interaction, (b) for specific children, (c) at a specific stage of development.

Researchers should consider and appreciate the richness and complexity of relationships and the subtlety of the children’s understandings (Dunn, 1993). The pressure to search for generalized reactions and emotions in any interpersonal context, which can trivialize the human experience, needs to be balanced with equal emphasis given to attempts to understand the complex social and emotional landscape of student-teacher relationships.
Summary of the Social Construction of Emotions Within Student-Teacher Relationships

An analysis of the literature reviewed here suggests a need for a comprehensive framework to study the bi-directional, social-emotional interactions between students and teachers from the child's perspective. When student-teacher relationships are conceptualized as interactions between individuals, occurring within contextually rich social parameters, then we can turn to developmental, social constructionist research paradigms to assist us in thinking about children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships. The two approaches that have examined the interconnections between thinking and feeling from a developmental perspective are attribution theory and the social-construction-of-emotions framework.

In the first, Weiner applied attribution theory to the study of children's perceptions of relationships. However, this approach has some limitations in describing the contextually rich details of children's social-emotional knowledge and the processes that children use to form student-teacher relationships. For example, children's attributional thinking has been investigated experimentally within well-defined contextual boundaries of a single interpersonal event, but rarely in a natural or a contextually complex setting. In the second approach, the social construction of emotions within relationships helps us identify the social-emotional connections that are associated with the demands of day to day student-teacher interactions.

It is quite possible that children possess more social-emotional knowledge and capacity than has been revealed by the current research on student-teacher relationships. The framework for examining children's understanding of student-teacher relationships
must be expanded to incorporate interpersonal and situational complexity if we are to understand the social and emotional dynamics operating on the learning process.

Conclusion

Learning experiences can be conceptualized as social, emotional, and cognitive and as taking place in the context of interpersonal interactions. Cognitive development is inextricably linked with the social and emotional aspects of children’s learning experiences within interpersonal interactions (Keating, 1996; Oatley & Nundy, 1996; Vygotsky, 1987). Children live and learn in an interpersonal world (Dunn, 1993; Kassin & Pryor, 1985; Shotter & Newson, 1982; Keating, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978) and emotions develop in interpersonal relationships (Gordon, 1989; Saarni, 1990). The experiences a child has with educational learning tasks, actions and objects are rarely encountered in isolation, but rather in relationship. Therefore, the social-emotional domain has a role in education (Oatley & Nundy, 1996; Weiner, 1990a,b, 1992).

Children’s perceptions of teachers, classrooms, and schools matter. There is considerable evidence that indicates that children’s perceptions of the teacher’s interpersonal behaviours and the classroom climate characteristics contribute to academic success and engagement in learning (Connell & Wellborn, 1990; Fraser, 1986; Fraser & O’Brien, 1985, MacAsuley, 1990, Ryan & Powelson, 1991).

The methodologies employed to date to study children’s perceptions of teacher and classroom characteristics have not been sufficiently complex to capture much of the relevant data on the nature of the student-teacher relationship. The goal of many of the past studies was to identify predictor variables that promoted academic success, because academic success has been deemed a primary goal of education (Education Improvement
Commission, 1998). In contrast, there has been less focus on the social and emotional aspects of the student-teacher relationship and education. Social learning and social development have not been primary goals of research on education. Studies to date have provided results on children’s perceptions of discrete teacher behaviours and interpersonal characteristics, but children’s perceptions of their own role in the student-teacher relationship have not been integrated, nor have contextual variables been integrated with interpersonal variables. Thus, the potential emerges to go beyond identifying teacher and classroom characteristics, in the study of children’s perceptions of student-teacher relationships.

Teachers need to be aware of their influence, not just on a child’s academic and cognitive growth but also on the child’s social and emotional growth. Take for example, a common occurrence that takes place in a classroom. A teacher structures choices so students can make meaningful decisions and the teacher encourages them and supports them to exercise their autonomy. The children’s learning experience in this interaction is integrally connected to aspects of socialization within our culture and to aspects of emotional development. The social messages of what is valued in our society (i.e., decision making, responsibility, self-regulation) are implicit in the student-teacher interaction, in something as simple as providing children the opportunity to make decisions. The children are learning that decision-making is valued and likely that they are good people because they are taking the responsibility to make the choices. The emotional impact of academic and social success or lack of success in this respect has the potential to powerfully influence the child’s subsequent attempts and eventually impact on the development of their self-concept and their future learning.
On the basis of my practical experience, it appears that describing children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships in complex situations will better illustrate what actually happens in classrooms. We can capture, analyze and describe the interactions of students and teachers and we will understand how they impact on the children. From these descriptions we will have a better fit between what the research has found to date and what is actually happening in classrooms.
CHAPTER TWO: METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

Introduction

I started to explore the phenomenon of student-teacher relationship by talking to 8-year-old boys and girls in a Grade 3 class about their experiences. Through pilot interviewing, it became apparent that some 8-year-old children had difficulty communicating their ideas about relationships independently and some children needed to be prompted or taught concepts in order to formulate and/or verbally express their experiences. Without conducting additional assessments of language functioning and social perceptions it was not possible to determine whether the variability in their verbal expressions were related to their linguistic competence or social maturity or to actual differences in their perceptions of the experience. These observations led to the decision to work with a sample of children who were considered bright, gifted, and verbal. (This sample of children could be considered to have at least average competence in language functioning). Working with children high in verbal ability allowed for a focus on the children's perceptions of the relationships between students and teachers, and reduced the variability introduced by differences in the children's skills in expressing themselves verbally.

In addition, during the pilot interviewing, it appeared that the children responded to questions about relationships that were contextualized within a story (i.e., where aspects of the student-teacher interactions were specified), better than they were able to answer open-ended verbal questions. These observations led to: (a) developing a structured interview protocol, which consisted of both open-ended questions and more directed questions; (b) creating a situated learning activity, by identifying meaningful
settings, events and characters; and (c) designing an interactive method, probing for clarification and verification where needed.

These preliminary interview findings shaped the method of the study in many ways including the sample selection, research design and activities. Each of these is described below.

Participants

Participants were recruited either through a proposal to a research committee with an urban board of education or through a newsletter and presentation to the Association for Bright Children (ABC) of both Hamilton and Halton, two urban regions in Southern Ontario. The parents of participants first received a letter, to request their consent for the participation of their child in the study. Contact with parents was then made over the phone, at an ABC meeting or through an ABC newsletter. Both written parental consent and a student agreement to participate in the study were obtained (see Appendix A).

The sample was unique with respect to several characteristics. The 15 children who participated were 8 or 9 years of age (mean age = 8.81 years, range = 8.01-9.9). Two females were 8 years old and two were 9 years old. Seven males were 8 years old and four males were 9 years old. The sample size was adequate to engage in the proposed in-depth study. The children were considered to be intellectually bright or gifted, according to parental report. Parental perceptions were supported by school evidence, in that all participants were receiving additional educational resources within the school system, ranging from special class programs for identified gifted children to withdrawal programs for enrichment opportunities. All the participants were born in Canada and English was their first language.
Design

The research design is based on a holistic-inductive view of children’s perceptions of student-teacher relationships. According to Patton (1980), a holistic framework assumes that a description of the context of the phenomenon is essential to understanding the phenomenon itself, in this case the student-teacher relationship. Furthermore, Patton claimed that it is insufficient to study variables or dimensions in isolation. Thus, the present study used a qualitative methodology, providing a framework within which participants could respond in a way that represented accurately and thoroughly their perspective about student-teacher relationships. The design enabled the exploration of each child’s perceptions of the relationship between teacher and student using multiple measures. Therefore complex, multiple trait, and bi-directional data were derived from the child’s perspective.

Interactive Situated Learning Model

An interactive model was developed to explicitly introduce concepts of student-teacher relationship to the child. The children were initially given the opportunity to generate their own responses and to spontaneously express what they knew about student-teacher relationships. The interactive procedure also allowed for in-depth probing when needed for clarification.

Orientation Procedures

Each child was interviewed individually, in a home setting. All of the children except for three were seen in their own homes. Rapport was established with parent(s) and children before initiating the procedures. Each child participated in the study individually, alone with the examiner in a quiet, private room. The child and the
examiner were seated at a table. All interviews were audio-taped. Each child participated in one session lasting 2 1/2 to 3 hours, with a short snack break. All data were collected between the months May and August of the same school year.

The children were given an introductory description of the research activities. The children were informed that the information they provided would not be shared with their parents, teacher, or school. The children were encouraged to take their time to reflect on what they knew before responding and to rephrase information to ensure understanding. For each participant, the following activities were administered in the same order, that is, the warm-up activity, the structured interview, and the interactive story completion task.

The self-report scale (see Appendix B) was administered as a warm-up activity to orient the child to the topic of student-teacher relationships as well as to introduce some concepts and language for expressing emotional qualities and contextual resources of student-teacher relationships. The children's perceptions of their need for an emotional connection with the teacher and their experiences of the contextual resources available to meet these needs were measured using an adaptation (i.e., three items were added) of the Relatedness to Teacher Scale and the Contextual Resources Scale developed by Wellborn and Connell (1987). The self-report data were not used in the study because multiple measures were not used to evaluate the children's perceptions of their actual relationship with their teacher. A preliminary summary of the data was gathered (see Table C1 in Appendix C), but was not seen as relevant to the focus of the study as it took analytical form.
Data Collection Procedures

The study used two methods to gather data on the children's perceptions of students relationships with teachers. The procedures were the structured interview of the children, attending to their perceptions of how students and teachers get along together, and the story completion task of their perceptions of how hypothetical students and teachers interact.

Structured Interview

The individual structured interview protocol (see Appendix D) was designed to allow the participants to identify the characteristics of a good student-teacher relationship. The children's representations of a good relationship may or may not have been a reflection of their current or an actual student-teacher relationship, and they had the potential to generate a more generalized representation of a "good" student-teacher relationship that may have been a reflection of their experiences. The children responded spontaneously with their self-generated ideas. After their ideas were exhausted, prompts were given and the children were allowed to endorse any additional items.

The children responded verbally to three research questions: (a) "What do students do to get along with teachers?"; (b) "What do teachers do to get along with students?"; and (c) "What are signs that a student and a teacher are getting along well together?" All interviews were audio-taped. The children also created a pie chart to graphically describe the idea that these characteristics together comprised a good student-teacher relationship. Each child created three pie graphs to correspond to each question, depicting the components of a good student-teacher relationship and the importance of
each component. The first pie graph showed what a student does to get along with a teacher, the second illustrated what a teacher does to get along with a student and the third represented the characteristics of a good student-teacher relationship.

The children appeared to have some difficulty responding by graphing the items on a pie chart. They had difficulty fitting their evaluation of each item onto a pie graph. Spatial organization difficulties were apparent. At times children had extra space left in the chart, or they ran out of space. Some children thought of important items after they had already constructed the chart with other items. Other children appeared to fill space with redundant items, and some children had trouble ordering the items to reflect the importance of the item. Therefore, further analysis of the size of each piece of the pie graph, as an indication of the importance of the item was abandoned.

**Story completion tasks**

The story completion tasks were the most interactive (see Appendix E). The story completion tasks were designed as the principle means of examining the child’s perception of student-teacher relationships. Hypothetical characters were developed to control salient features of teacher and student behaviour. I decided against the use of actual classmates and actual classroom scenarios for three reasons: (a) to reduce the potential for breach of confidentiality; (b) to make critical features salient and proximal within the context, rather than embedded in an actual context of complex situational and personality features; and (c) to allow the children the opportunity to de-centre from their own needs and situation if they chose. The hypothetical teachers and students were portrayed by Playmobil figures and classrooms were represented with Playmobil classroom furniture.
In the story, three hypothetical teachers (i.e., Ms. Wilson, Ms. Andrews, and Ms. Thomas) were presented. The three teacher profiles were female to control for gender and represented the contextual resource characteristics of: (a) structure -- the consistency of behavior management; (b) involvement -- the devoting of time to students; and (c) autonomy support -- the explicit planning and goal-setting.

The story begins in each class with the teachers greeting the students and then giving instructions to their classes about the morning’s activities. For example, the introduction to Ms. Wilson’s class follows.

One day children, just about your age, arrived at school. The teachers, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Andrews, and Ms. Thomas, greeted the children at the door saying something to each student like “Hello” and “Good morning” and “How are you?” and “You look great.” (Make students walk in. Have participant help.) We are going to look in on each classroom and see what is going on.

Let’s look in the first classroom. After putting away their coats and bags, the class was seated (stand teacher in front of class and seat the children, have child help), Ms. Wilson announced “Remember, yesterday I told you that we would be going to the surprise presentation in Mr. Jones’ classroom. His class has invited us because they know that you would enjoy their surprise. [What do you think the surprise is? (Let child respond.) It’s a surprise so we won’t tell the students, ok?] Ms. Wilson went on.

“Well, I just changed my mind. It just dawned on me that all your language work needs to be done correctly before recess and then you can go. The assignments are difficult today so you will really have to work hard.”
Now, the children in this class usually had no trouble with reading or writing, all of them were good in language, but if students were not finished, Ms. Wilson told them that they would go to complete their work in the library. Ms. Wilson sat down to do some marking (seat the teacher).

An opportunity to have a surprise later in the morning was offered by all three hypothetical teachers but the delivery differed for each. Two teachers were directive and presented the surprise as a reward that was contingent upon work completion but both of these differed in terms of: (a) consistency, and (b) seeking and involving student input. The students in the first classroom were expected to obey the teacher’s (Ms. Wilson) demands, which changed from one day to the next, for no apparent reason other than that the teacher said she “changed her mind”. The students in the next class were given an explicit rationale for the second teacher’s (Ms. Andrews) instructions, which were grounded in a consistent, familiar classroom routine. Furthermore, the second teacher opened the discussion to input from students. Both classrooms had the potential to be productive working environments, but the first teacher expected obedience and the second teacher explicitly encouraged involvement with students. The third teacher (Ms. Thomas) had a very different approach. She exemplified the two characteristics mentioned above, (i.e. consistency and openness to student input). In addition she encouraged student autonomy in decision making. She allowed and assisted the students to make their own choices about how and when they would get the morning assignments completed, and whether or not they wanted to attend the surprise activity. She offered students time to set their own goals, plan their own agenda and she discussed their planning, organization and work completion in regular individual conferences.
The children's perceptions of the class and teacher interactions were probed at this point in the story, in each classroom setting. First, the children's predictions of what would happen next were revealed with an open-ended question: "Tell me what will happen next?" Then more direct and specific questions were used to inquire about the participant's perceptions of the thoughts and feelings involved: "What was the class thinking?" "What were they feeling?" "What was the teacher thinking?" and "What was she feeling?" The children were encouraged to engage in role play with the Playmobil figures, to reflect before responding, and to use the words and the voices that they believed the children or teachers would use.

Interactions between individual hypothetical students and the three teachers occurred next in the story. In each class there were two boys who were having problems completing the work due to difficulty attending to task or being stuck on a hard question. The hypothetical student profiles were developed because they were salient and familiar difficulties that children typically encounter in classroom experiences. For example, the following prompt was used to describe a student who was stuck on a difficult question:

Now I'm going to tell you about Billy. Billy usually has no trouble with language assignments and concentrating on his work. Today however, he is stuck on a really difficult question. He keeps reading the question over and over but can't figure out an answer to write down. He wants to go to the surprise but he is really having trouble getting the work done because it is very difficult.

The factors which were explicitly controlled in the student-teacher interaction scenarios included: (a) the hypothetical students' language ability, (b) difficulty of the task, (c) desire to receive the positive incentive, (d) gender of the student experiencing
difficulty (Burgner & Hewstone, 1993), and (e) reasons for work completion difficulty. Using Weiner's (1990b) attribution theory, these variables have the potential to be analyzed according to components of causality, stability and controllability by 8- to 9-year-old children.

Due to the complexity of the story, the following features were included. Playmobil classroom furniture and figures of the teachers and the students were used. Comprehension probes were inserted at points in the story to check for understanding and to redirect if necessary. Reminders were added to reduce the memory and attentional demands.

The interactive method allowed for exploration of the child's perceptions of the hypothetical teachers' and students' thoughts and feelings during these scenarios. First, an open-ended question was asked to reveal the children's predictions, that is, “What will happen next?” Then more direct, specific questions were used to elicit the child's thinking about the thoughts and feelings of the students and teachers, that is, “What was the student thinking and feeling?” and “What was the teacher thinking and feeling?”

The story concluded after recess, before the surprise activity, in each of the hypothetical classrooms. The following is a description of the prompted story conclusion for Ms. Wilson's class.

Let's see how the story ends in Ms. Wilson's room. Remember Ms. Wilson told the class that they had to get all their work done before they could go. Remember she changed her mind from the day before. She did not give the students a choice whether they wanted to go or not. Their language assignment was hard that day. Remember the two students who were having difficulty and wanted to go. George
had a hard time concentrating and Billy had difficulty getting the hard work done (show the two boys).

Next the children were asked to provide the following information. The children were asked an open-ended question to predict how the story would end in each classroom: How does the story end in this classroom? They were also asked what the students and the teacher were feeling and thinking.

Second, upon completion of the stories in each classroom, children rated each of the hypothetical teachers on a rating scale designed to measure their perceptions of the teacher's provision for autonomy support, involvement, and structure. Third, the participants were also asked which of the three teachers they preferred and why. Fourth, the children described how the other teachers would have to change in order to be like the teacher they preferred. The data gathering redundancy was planned for verification and linking purposes.

Familiarity checks were built into the data collection, asking the children whether they were familiar with or knew students or teachers who were like the characters. Familiarity checks were designed to help understand the child's experiences and whether the characters were real to them. During the pilot interviewing, social perspective-taking sentence structures were attempted. However, the children's language seemed formal and not natural. Furthermore, the more formal sentence structures may not have been an indication of whether the children de-centred from their own perspective to describe another person's point of view. The children may have used the sentence structure to comply with the task. Therefore, the respondents used their own verbal expressions, and familiarity checks were incorporated to determine whether or not the respondents knew
a student or a teacher with the described characteristics, from their own knowledge and experiences.

Data Analysis Procedures

Qualitative research aims to capture what actually takes place and to provide a great deal of careful description (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Patton, 1980; Rothe, 1993; Van Manen, 1990). The intent of collecting descriptive data is to describe fully and completely what the child's perspective is and not what the child's perspective should be. The data are primarily verbal, detailed descriptions of events, situations, characters, and interactions. The responses are not systematic or standardized. They are lengthy and capture the children’s points of view without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of categories. The purpose of these descriptions is to take the reader into the setting.

The holistic-inductive analysis begins with specific observations of the data, until the researcher comes to understand the patterns that exist in the data. Categories or general patterns emerge directly from the open-ended observation of the data. Content analysis procedures endeavour to make sense of the data without imposing preexisting expectations on the participants' perceptions. The inductive approach to data analysis is in contrast to a deductive experimental approach which requires specification of main variables under investigation, and specification of hypotheses before data is collected. In a qualitative study, the important dimensions emerge from the study without presupposing what those important dimensions should be.
Patton (1980) explained that the holistic-inductive approach should be considered as a model, and in applied research there are practical techniques and procedures that have an impact on a pure holistic-inductive approach. In this study, the data collection was a mixture of naturalistic inquiry and verification techniques. Patton (1980) explained that it is possible to mix qualitative and quantitative analyses, and to convert detailed qualitative descriptions into quantitative measures. Some descriptive quantitative methods were used to organize the patterns of responses that emerged from the data.

Analysis of the Structured Interview

The audiotapes of all interviews were transcribed, and then the contents were analyzed. The contents were evaluated separately for each structured interview question. For each question, all items were listed verbatim. This procedure was performed in order for the researcher to become familiar with the language the participants used to describe the student-teacher relationships. Items were grouped according to recurring action phrases, consisting of common verbs and nouns. By working back and forth between the raw data and the lists of items, the recurring patterns emerged. Recurring themes were then grouped according to common foci. Themes were then discussed with the thesis supervisor and committee members.

The children’s verbal responses were examined in three ways. First, the themes and foci that emerged from each of the structured interview questions were compared. Second, responses were classified either as “spontaneous” if they were self-generated by the participant, or “prompted,” if they were endorsed by the participant after the prompts. Analysis of spontaneous versus prompted responses was planned prior to data collection,
to obtain an indication of whether the children had their own ideas of what constituted
good student-teacher relationship, in comparison to what they would recognize or
endorse after prompts were provided. Second, the children’s responses were classified as
either “generalized,” if they consisted of impersonal and de-centred information, or
“personalized,” if they contained information suggesting that the child identified
experimentally with it. The second dimension of generalized versus personalized was not
planned a priori, but the distinction emerged directly from the data.

Analysis of the story completion task

As with the structured interview activity, the content of the story completion task
activity was transcribed verbatim for each participant, in order for the researcher to
become familiar with the children’s descriptions of the hypothetical student and teacher
relationships. After reading the transcripts, recurring patterns were analyzed.

A variety of data analysis techniques were used to identify the themes and to
answer the research questions concerning the children’s perceptions of the student-
teacher interactions. Comparative analyses and process analysis were utilized to focus
and organize the data. Qualitative vignettes were used to illustrate the children’s
perceptions of interactions and the associated thoughts and feelings. Quantitative
descriptions were also derived directly from the qualitative data to compare and contrast
themes that emerged directly from the data.

The comparative analyses aimed to identify similarities and differences in the
children’s perceptions of the relationships in each of the hypothetical classrooms.
Comparisons were made of the following data: (a) the children’s familiarity with the
hypothetical teachers, (b) the children's preferences for the hypothetical teachers, and (c) the children's ratings of contextual resources available in each of the class settings.

The process analysis aimed to elucidate the variations and adaptation of the students and teachers within each hypothetical classroom context. The process analysis was considered a useful strategy for investigating the dynamics of the student-teacher relationships in terms of interactions and the social-emotional aspects. The process evaluations required a detailed description of the operation of each of the student-teacher relationships, in order to unravel what happened in the relationship, and to search for major patterns.

To conduct the process analysis descriptive data were gathered during three key scenarios in each classroom's story, and the transcripts were reviewed for recurring behavioural, emotional, and attributional themes. The first point of data collection was the point at which the participants were asked for their predictions of what would happen next to the class in each classroom after the teacher had introduced the assignment, and what the class and the teacher were thinking and feeling. These class-teacher perceptions provided the background. They were considered important because they provided a full description of the situational and classroom contexts before examining the student-teacher interpersonal interactions that were embedded in each classroom. The second point of data collection was at the time the children were asked for their predictions of what would happen next in the individual student-teacher interactions, and what the student and teacher were thinking and feeling. The third point of data collection was when the children were asked for their predictions of the story conclusion in each classroom, and what the class and the teacher were thinking and feeling.
The comparison and process data were systematically synthesized using process comparison matrices. The matrices were created to identify the conditions that shaped the participants' perceptions of teacher familiarity and preference. The matrices emphasized how the perceptions were formulated from student-teacher interactions, emotions and attributions, rather than stressing the perceptions themselves.

Research Questions

The primary research question was: How do bright and gifted 8- and 9-year-olds experience the social and emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships? In order to examine this, more specific research questions were developed to guide the administration of the research activities and the analyses of the data. Research questions were designed for both data collection procedures. For the structured interview these were: How do the children perceive students and teachers getting along together, and what do the children describe as characteristics of a good student-teacher relationship? For the hypothetical story completion tasks these were: What are the salient features of the children’s descriptions of the student-teacher relationships? What emotions were ascribed to the teacher and what emotions were ascribed to the students? Did emotions change during interactions? Are emotions linked with thinking about outcomes and/or attributions? Are there repeating patterns of events, thoughts, and feelings?

A verification process was planned as part of the data collection. Redundancy was explicitly built into the interactive model to address internal validity. Searching for links, comparisons, and contrasts in the children’s perceptions, using multiple sources and multiple methods, was explicitly planned to address whether there was consistency in the
The verification of the findings was essential in determining if the research questions provided an adequate exploration of the children's perceptions of the social and emotional aspects of student and teacher relationships.

In summary, this research is designed to explore the child's perceptions of the social and emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships. The goal is to provide rich descriptions of children's expressed thoughts and feelings. The analysis of the children's perceptions identifies elements of the children's perceptions, in order to understand the nature of the student-teacher relationship as they see it. The characteristics of the children's perceptions need to be clarified and from this the linkages, connections or areas of overlap can be observed.
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

Structured Interview Results

The ideas that the participants generated for each of the three structured interview questions were listed verbatim. Examples of typical interviews are provided for each question, and a full set of the responses from all participants is found in Appendix F. The structured interview data are organized in tables to highlight the themes and foci that emerged directly from the transcripts, for each structured interview question. Finally, data supporting the consistency of the children’s perceptions and themes of good student-teacher relationships are presented.

Things a Student Can Do to Get Alone With a Teacher

The children generated a total of 105 responses to the question “What can students do to get along with a teacher?” (Appendix F). An excerpt from an interview with one of the participants is provided as an example of what the children said.

Child- Well, by cooperating and by well, they don’t have to talk a lot, that they can work and get it done on time.

Researcher- We are going to make a list. Do you want to make the list or do you want me to print the list while you talk?

Child- I’ll list them.

Researcher- Number 1 you said was cooperating.

Child- Cooperating. Is that how you spell it?

Researcher- Unhuh and #2 you said don’t talk a lot.

Child- Ok.
Researcher: And what was the other one that you said? Get your work done?
Child: Finish your work on time...Ok
Researcher: Can you think of anything else that helps a student get along with a teacher?
Child: Listen to what they say.
Researcher: Unhuh listening. Anything else?
Child: You could...pay attention so you know what to do when she is explaining. Ok pay attention.
Researcher: Anything else? Would you like me to give you some examples to see if you think these are important?
Child: Well I think I have one more.
Researcher: Ok. What would that be?
Child: Ok. How would I say it? Well if you were sitting at your desk listening, doing your work...but no. If you were sitting at your desk doing your work and somebody was trying to talk to you, you just say “Can you please go because I am trying to do my work.” and then the teacher will be pleased with you.
Researcher: Unhuh. So would that be trying to get along with others?
Child: Well get along with classmates.
Researcher: Get along with classmates. So you would tell them...
Child: Yeah. Getting along with classmates. Ok what else?
Researcher: You might think it is important for students to listen which you already said, to behave. Is that what you mean by cooperating or is cooperating different?
Child: Well, what I meant by cooperating was don't fool around. Cooperate with the teacher. Get along with each other.

Researcher: Ok.

Child: Behaviour

Researcher: Behaviour

Child: Behave

Researcher: so Behave means what?

Child: Well don't fool around. Don't act up.

Researcher: and cooperating means …

Child: Get along with the teacher.

Researcher: Other ideas are concentrating which you already said, trying hard.

Child: Where do I have concentrating?

Researcher: Concentrating, paying attention, try hard, get work done. You've already said that. Finish your work, get good marks, be smart, and you already said getting along with the teacher and students. What about treating others fairly or with respect, or expressing your thoughts and feelings freely. What do you think?

Child: Ok. Expressing your feelings.

Researcher: Expressing your feelings.

Child: There isn't much room left.

Researcher: Any others?

Child: Treating others fairly.
Researcher- Unhuh

Child- Can I go over there 'cause there is not enough room there. (for printing)

Researcher- Sure you can, sure you can. Do you have any other ideas?

Child- Ok. Um... Don't concentrate on other things that you are not supposed to be concentrating on.

Researcher- Unhuh, so focus on your school work?

Child- Focus on your school work.

Researcher- Ok.

Child- Focus on your work.

Researcher- Ok what we are going to try and do is make a pie out of all these things and we are going to try and cut the pie into different size pieces that show how important each one of these are. Can you cut the pie to show how big of a piece is cooperating? Show me how big a piece you would make for cooperating. How important is that? Where would you cut? That is how important #1 is. How important is #2?

Child- Well you have to talk a bit.

Researcher- Unhuh. How important is #3?

Child- A lot.

Researcher- Do you know what? Can you put numbers in so we know how important each one is? Ok. How important is #4 listen to what they say? And how important is #5 pay attention?

Child- I made #3 too big.
Researcher- Do you want to get an eraser?
Child- Yes please, I made #3 too big. I won't have enough room.
Researcher- Let me find the eraser.
Child- Ok thank you. I will just erase it all so I can put it in.
Researcher- So you can fit all of your pieces in.
Child- Yeah.
Researcher- Because you have a lot of pieces.
Child- Is the line pencil for the circle?
Researcher- Yeah it is.
Child- Ok so I better make it line.
Researcher- Do you want to start back at the #1?
Child- Yes please.
Researcher- How big a piece are you going to make for #1?
Child- Well not as big as that because, like, it depends on the size. That might be big compared to the rest. Cooperating, #1.
Researcher- Don't talk a lot, #2.
Child- I'll make it that big.
Researcher- Number 3, finish your work on time. That is still a big one in comparison to all the rest.
Child- Yeah but it is smaller than that.
Researcher- Listen to what they say, um, pay attention #6 is Get along with classmates.
Child: Important.
Researcher: Number 7 Behave #8 Express your feelings. That is a little slice.
Child: 'Cause you want to keep them private if you can.
Researcher: Is that ok, to keep them private?
Child: Yeah. Because you don’t want anyone else to know. You feel that people will laugh and you just want to keep it to yourself.
Researcher: You think others might think it is funny and?
Child: Yeah.
Child: I guess the rest will have to be 10.

The themes that emerged from the list of 105 responses for the first structured interview question fall into two categories, an Academic Behaviours Focus and a Social and Interpersonal Behaviours Focus (see Appendix F). Themes were categorized as an Academic Behaviours Focus when they were clearly academic and schoolwork related. Themes were categorized as a Social and Interpersonal Behaviours Focus if they were not academic or schoolwork related. Table 1 describes each theme and the number of children that endorsed each theme. Each of the foci are described below the table.
Table 1
Themes Generated from Participants' Responses for Things a Student Can Do to Get Along With a Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Behaviours Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration/Listening e.g., listen to the teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Completion e.g., finish your work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort e.g., try hard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement e.g., get good grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/Interpersonal Behaviour Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal e.g., share stuff with friends</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable e.g., behave</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful e.g., help clean up</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Inappropriate e.g., don't throw snowballs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness e.g., say what you think and feel freely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous e.g., have a sense of humour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers of children out of 15 who responded with this theme.

The Academic Behaviours Focus represented 39% of all responses mentioned, when the participants were asked, "What do children do to get along with their teacher?"
The children mentioned that students try to concentrate and listen, complete assignments,
and work hard. It was noteworthy that signs of excellent achievement, such as high marks, good grades and intelligence were not included in the lists of things that students said they do to get along with teachers. None of the children mentioned academic achievement spontaneously, and only one child endorsed the item after it was offered in a prompt.

The Social and Interpersonal Behaviours Focus represented 61% of all responses mentioned. These behavioural themes did not have anything to do with academic achievement, work completion, or attention to tasks. Instead they described what might be conceptualized as basic social and interpersonal relationship skills. Most commonly, the children identified behavioural rules of appropriate or inappropriate actions as salient components of how students get along with teachers. The items were presented as either positive behaviours, for example, “try hard to be good” and “behave”, or as the absence of negative or inappropriate behaviours, for example, “don’t fight” and “don’t get in trouble”. Interpersonal behaviour items were gathered into a separate theme, and these items were mentioned by 80% of the children. Twenty-six Interpersonal Behaviour items were mentioned or endorsed in total. The Interpersonal Behaviour theme was distinguished from the Positive Behaviour theme because an interpersonal component was evident in the former but not in the latter. An interpersonal perspective was determined when the children explicitly mentioned another person, for example, “respect the teacher,” “share with friends,” or “treat others as you would want to be treated.” Interpersonal Behaviour responses emerged spontaneously for eight children and after prompting for another four children.
Things a Teacher Can Do to Get Along With a Student:

A total of 88 responses were generated by the participants in response to the second structured interview question, “What can a teacher do to get along with a student?” In order to actually see a child’s responses that emerged within the interview, an excerpt from a structured interview with one of the participants is included. The entire list of items that the children developed are located in Appendix G.

Child- They can explain. Number 2 could be don't give them work that is too easy, well, give them their average.

Researcher- Give them work that they are able to do?

Child- Give them possible work.

Researcher- Ok.

Child- so the teacher can give them possible work. Don't change any periods...

Researcher- Like don't take away certain periods to do something else.

Child- Yeah like we have gym every Tuesday, Thursday, Friday. We haven't had it in, like, 4 weeks.

Researcher- The gym periods got changed.

Child- Well, we haven't had them because we had to do something different I guess. That is only because of Math. Math tests.

Researcher- Don't change periods.

Child- Don't take away periods.

Researcher- Why? Does that make it hard on kids?

Child- Well, because we are looking forward to and he says "No gym" and we are all lined up and stuff.
Researcher- And he says “No gym.”

Child- And we are not talking or anything. We are just in line, and he says math test.

Researcher- Oh, oh, so you don’t think that is very fair.

Child- No, that is not fair.

Researcher- Ok. What else can a teacher do to help get along with students?

Child- They can always try to be fair to the children. Being fair.

Researcher- Would you like some suggestions?

Child- Ok.

Researcher- I’ll give you some examples. For instance you might think it is important for teachers to provide clear instructions. You said that right at the top. You might think it is important for teacher to act in a predicable way. Do you know what predictable means?

Child- Appropriate.

Researcher- Almost, it is more like consistent. A way so you know what to count on or what to expect. So it’s like your idea about the periods. You are thinking that you are going to have gym and so the teacher...

Child- You expect so you get all ready for it and then he says “No.”

Researcher- So predictable means that he does what he says he is going to do. Like you are supposed to have gym periods and then he does it. He gives you gym period. So you have got that idea too. It might be important for the teacher to try to get along with others.
Child- Being fair.

Researcher- Or to respect students' ideas, or encourage students for their effort.

Or it might be important to expect high standards.

Child- Respect ideas.

Researcher- Is that like listening to students and trying to understand students ideas?

Child- Yeah.

Researcher- It might be important for teachers to be funny. It might be important for teachers to like children.

Child- Yeah. Being funny. Mr. ___ is always really funny. He can make a joke out of anything, everything.

Researcher- So that good sense of humour really helps in getting along with a student?

Child- Yeah.

Researcher- Can you think of anything else or are we ready to make a pie?

Child- I think that there is one more that I can think of.

Researcher- Ok.

Child- Being strict, so that children can, that they can't have any excuses for not doing their work. Being strict. I think that is important for a teacher.

Researcher- Important for a teacher.

Child- 'Cause if they let the children do anything that wouldn't be fair because... because if the teacher isn't strict then they could party all day in the classroom and that wouldn't be right because they would get a bad mark.
Researcher- They wouldn't know then about what was appropriate behaviour
Child- No.
Researcher- How to work hard because the teacher never really told them where that where the limit was.
Child- Because there are some teachers in the world that do that and that isn't fair to children or their parents.
Researcher- Have you ever had a teacher that is like that?
Child- We had a really nice teacher but she still was really strict.
Researcher- That is a good combination. To be nice to kids.
Child- Fair, nice and strict. She was really strict but that was good. She would say “Finish your work” but then you could read or do something like that.
Researcher- But to finish your work first was important.
Child- Yeah.
Researcher- But then when she was strict then the kids knew what to do.
Child- Ok so let's start.
Researcher- Ok how big a piece was #1? Should we make a dot in the middle?
Child- Number 1 would be. I'm sure that's not big enough #1 for me. It is pretty important. Give them possible work. They don't always have to. Like it could be possible but hard just the same. That is good. That's too big.
Researcher- Think that is too important?
Child- No.
Researcher- Do you need to erase it?
Child- That doesn’t have to be that important.

Researcher- Oh dear. Don’t worry about that. (broke the eraser)

Child- I am sorry if I did it.

Researcher- That’s ok.

Child- That is more like it. Respect ideas. I think that teachers should always respect ideas and say “How did you do this?” or “Are you sure that that would be possible?” or “How long would it take?” Being funny I think that is important that the teacher can get along with the students. Strict and funny like that.

The following themes emerged from an analysis of the items that the children generated in response to the second structured interview question. The themes fit within two foci of Academic Behaviours and Social and Interpersonal Behaviours. These two foci were again distinguished as academic and schoolwork related, or not academic and schoolwork related. Table 2 describes each theme that emerged and the number of children who endorsed each theme.
Table 2
Themes Generated from Participants’ Responses for Things a Teacher Can Do to Get Alone With a Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Behaviour Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Expectation e.g., explains work well</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and Interpersonal Behaviour Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous/Fun e.g., always have time to do fun things</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal e.g., know us by being with us</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback e.g., give a ticket to the treasure box</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful with work e.g., showing them how to do the work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful socially-emotionally e.g., help if hurt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Respectful e.g., be fair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes Children e.g., to like children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Negative Feedback e.g., don’t yell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent e.g., act in a predictable way</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers of children out of 15 who responded with this theme.*
The Academic Behaviours Focus consisted of one theme, representing 16% of all responses mentioned for this question. Items fell in the Academic Behaviour Focus because the children explicitly mentioned that the behaviours were schoolwork related, e.g., “explains the work well.”

The items included in the Social and Interpersonal Behaviour Focus were not related to academic work. This focus consisted of 84% of all responses to this question. The most commonly mentioned themes were “Humour and Fun,” and “Interpersonal Behaviours,” where the children’s responses explicitly included another person. In addition, an interpersonal perspective was stated or implied in both the Helping themes. For example, the children spontaneously mentioned that a teacher “helps” students, e.g., “helps them talk if they get hurt” or “helps with problems.” In all cases, social interaction was either implicitly embedded into the action or explicitly stated by including the recipient of the action.

**Signs That a Teacher and Student Are Getting Along Together**

Eighty-seven responses were produced in total by the fifteen participants in response to the third structured interview question, “What are signs that a student and teacher are getting along together?” The following passage from an interview with one child provides an example of how the children actually talked. The full set of items that were mentioned by all the children is contained in Appendix H.

**Researcher:** This is asking. What are the characteristics of a good student-teacher relationship? What are the signs that a student and teacher get along together? What are the signs that they are getting along well together?
Child: They are laughing and smiling together.
Researcher: Yeah.
Child: How would I say that?
Researcher: A lot of the kids that I see just say that. That they laugh together and they smile together.
Child: Ok, laugh and smile together. Well another one is if they just talk together, communicate together. Is that how you spell communicate?
Researcher: Unhuh.
Child: Communicate together.
Researcher: What are some other signs that you might see?
Child: Playing together.
Researcher: Unhuh.
Child: Or playing together, challenging each other. Ok.
Researcher: Do you want suggestions?
Child: Giving extra work when they are done.
Researcher: Unhuh.
Child: Because maybe they want more to do because they finished what they started.
Researcher: So the teacher is able to get other things together.
Child: Giving extra work.
Researcher: Do you want some other ideas?
Child: Ok.
Researcher: Some of the ideas that you might think are important are that they walk together at recess time. That might be a sign that you see or that they make special things for each other like the child might make something at home and bring it in or another might be that they celebrate special occasions together like each other’s birthdays or something like that.

Child: Special occasions, occasion?

Researcher: 2 c’s l s

Child: And what was that one that you said exchanging gifts.

Researcher: Anything else or are you ready to make a pie?

Child: I think I am ready to make a pie.

Researcher: Ok how big a piece for #1? Number 2, talking to each other, playing together, giving extra work.

Child: That is important to me.

Researcher: #5 walking together, 6 celebrating special occasions.

Child: I think it is important.

Researcher: Exchanging gifts.

Child: Well, what I mean by gifts but exchanging thoughts and ideas. They should be gifts.

Researcher: What about when children make a picture or something like that at home and take it in?

Child: Like gifts.

Researcher: Unhuh.
Child: Do you ever do something like that?

Researcher: No.

Child: Well, once we do something in art when we did it we finished it we make one for him.

Researcher: Hum.

Child: I think that is the most important.

Three meta-foci related the children's responses to the structured interview question, “What are the signs that a student and a teacher are getting along together?” The meta-foci were Joint Student and Teacher Actions, Individual Student Actions, and Individual Teacher Actions. The meta-foci were formed through distinguishing themes where the children’s responses indicated that the student and teacher were actively engaged in the behaviour together from themes where the student or the teacher were engaged in the behaviour individually.

From Table 3 it can be seen that joint student-teacher action themes were generated most frequently by the children. Joint student-teacher action responses represented 64% of all responses for this question. Individual student action items represented 28% of all items, and individual teacher action items represented 8% of all items.

Social and interpersonal themes were included more frequently within each meta-focus in comparison to academic themes. As seen in Table 3, only social and interpersonal themes were generated for the student-teacher action meta-focus and teacher action meta-focus. Only two schoolwork-related themes (i.e., work completion and getting good grades), were mentioned for the student actions meta focus.
Table 3

Themes Generated from Participants' Responses for Signs that a Student and Teacher Get Along Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Student-Teacher Action Meta-Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Interpersonal Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Together e.g., walk together at recess</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk/Listen to each other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate/Give things e.g., make things for each other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy/Smile e.g., smile at each other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other e.g., spend time together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love/Care/Friendship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play e.g., play games together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Inappropriate Behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Themes n% 

Student Action Meta-Focus

Social and Interpersonal Focus

Social Perspective e.g., share stuff with your friends 5 33.3
Exhibit Positive Behaviour e.g., behave 3 20.0
Helping e.g., help clean up 2 13.3
No Inappropriate Behaviour e.g., Don't throw snowballs 1 6.7

Academic Related Focus

Work Completion e.g., finish your work 5 33.3
Achieve e.g., get good grades 1 6.7

Teacher Action Meta-Focus

Social and Interpersonal Focus

Helpful 4 26.7
Positive Feedback e.g., give a ticket to the treasure box 1 6.7
No Discouraging Behaviour e.g., don't yell 1 6.7
Fun/Humour e.g., always have time to do fun things 1 6.7

* Numbers of children out of 15 who responded with this theme.

Triangulation of Children's Perceptions of Good Student-Teacher Relationships

Consistency data were gathered in three ways. First, the foci from each of the structured interview questions were compared. Second, the number of items the children
Evidence that the children perceived the student-teacher relationship in terms of social and interpersonal behaviours more than academic behaviours. From the content of the three structured interview questions, it appears that the children used detailed social behaviours more than academic-related behaviours to describe the signs of how a student and a teacher get along. Table 4 summarizes the contrast between academic themes and social and interpersonal themes, from the children’s perspective.

Table 4
Signs of a Good Student-Teacher Relationship: Academic Themes and Social and Interpersonal Themes Generated by Bright and Gifted 8-9 year old Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Social/Interpersonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Things Students Do</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things Teachers Do</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things They Do Together</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence that the perceptions were self-generated. There was some variability in the spontaneity of response from the children. All participants were able to generate some ideas independently. Most of the children contributed over half of their ideas spontaneously, and one child gave only spontaneous responses. Specifically, 12 out of 15 children responded with 50% or more of their items spontaneously to "Things a student can do." Eleven out of fifteen children responded with 50% or more of their items spontaneously to "Things a teacher can do" and 9 out of 15 children responded with 50% or more of their items spontaneously to "Signs of a good student-teacher relationship." In addition, for the third question, individual student and teacher action themes were offered with more spontaneity than joint, student-teacher themes (i.e., 66.7% and 100% respectively, compared to 43%).

Evidence that responses were based on actual personal experiences. The children's responses seemed to be well-learned, well-rehearsed, and even sophisticated at times. They responded consistently with many ideas that appeared almost as routines and rules for conduct at school, for example, children "behave" or "don't throw snowballs"; teachers "help with problems," and "treat others as you would want to be treated."

Occasionally, some of the children deviated from a generalized language structure by elaborating on an item. They supplemented their response by adding an example of something they had witnessed or personally experienced. Specifically, one child expanded on items on the first structured interview question, five children on the second and seven children on the third. This "personal experience" phenomenon was interesting, because it showed that the children were capable of providing reflective, meta-cognitive responses that appeared de-centred from themselves, but also that the children were able
to move beyond the impersonal task demand and describe actual events that formed their ideas.

Summary of Structured Interview Results

Four findings that emerge from the analyses of the structured interviews are:

1. There was a high degree of consistency in the children's descriptions of the student-teacher relationships. During the structured interviews, the children described student-teacher relationships in behavioural events or action-oriented terms, demonstrating their knowledge that both students and teachers are actively involved in creating good student-teacher relationships. They did not view students as passive respondents to teacher requests or environmental conditions. The fact that the children described relationships in terms of behavioural actions, (i.e., helping, doing, making, knowing, behaving) may be a reflection of the task demands, the children's social development, or the children's organization of thoughts about relationships with teachers. The responses did not contain explicit emotional, or attributional content. There were some actions which implied a positive emotion, for example, "smiling," but it was noteworthy that the children said "smiling" rather than, perhaps "...smiling because they are happy." The absence of emotional content in their behavioural descriptions is also evident.

2. The children responded spontaneously. They independently expressed their understanding of student-teacher relationships. Spontaneous recall may reflect: (a) comfort or familiarity with expressing their own thoughts, (b) desire to engage and share ideas with an adult, (c) experience in student-teacher relationships and knowledge about
student-teacher relationships, and (d) knowledge about student actions, teacher actions, and student-teacher joint actions.

3. During the structured interviews, it was noted that typically the children responded in a generalized way, which appeared to indicate de-centring from their own perspective. However, their abstract responses were in contrast to occasional personalized responses. The shift in response style from generalized to personalized answers during the structured interview was of interest. The fact that only one child personally "identified" with responses during the first task, may be an indication of initial hesitation to give personal responses. This calls into question whether the answers, which were expressed in more rote terms as well-rehearsed ideas, were in fact higher order, generalized responses or whether perhaps they just failed to elicit enough comfort and interest for a personalized response. In any event, the expanded, personalized answers may be an indication of comfort with the situation, or of increased interest, familiarity, and investment in the response. Most importantly, the personalized responses showed that the children’s representations of good student-teacher relationships were partly, at least, based on actual experiences. Thus, the children’s personalized responses authenticated the generalized responses of student-teacher relationships.

4. From the content analysis of the participants’ responses to the three structured interview questions, student-teacher relationships were constructed as social and interpersonal activity and schoolwork-related activity. The children expressed many common themes centering on social and interpersonal behaviours and academic behaviours that connected the student and the teacher. There is evidence to suggest that
the children perceived the signs of a good student-teacher relationship in terms of social and interpersonal behaviours more than academic-related behaviours.

Taken together, there is consistency in the data. The children all considered social and interpersonal aspects and academic, schoolwork aspects of student-teacher relationships as important elements. Their responses were typically constructed of well formulated and spontaneously articulated student actions, teacher actions, or joint student and teacher actions. The children did not include emotional aspects of the relationship. Thus it appears that talking to children about signs of a good relationship or getting along only goes so far.

Hypothetical Story Completion Results

First the comparative analyses of the children's perceptions of preferences and familiarity with the hypothetical teachers are presented. Next the process analysis is reported, in order to unravel the children's perceptions. The process analysis reveals the conditions that shaped the children's perceptions of teacher familiarity and teacher preferences. The process analysis is organized in three sections according to the three key data collection scenarios: (a) the initial class-teacher scenarios, which provide a description of the classroom contexts; (b) the student-teacher scenarios, which depict detailed interactions during problem solving; and (c) the story conclusion scenarios, which describe how the story ends in each classroom. The children's perceptions specify the behavioural events of the student-teacher relationship and delve beneath the
interactions to elucidate the children's perceptions of the social-emotional features for each scenario.

**Comparative Analyses:**

**The Children's Perceptions of Hypothetical Teachers**

**Children's Perceptions of Hypothetical Teacher Familiarity**

The reality check data showed that the children's familiarity with the teachers' characteristics varied. Most children (93%) indicated that they knew a teacher like Ms. Andrews, the teacher who gave consistent instructions both days and indicated that going to the surprise was like a familiar class routine, who set clear, consistent expectations and followed through with instructions. The characteristics of Ms. Andrews were very close to the reality of the children's actual perceptions of experiences. In contrast, almost half (46.7%) of the children said that they knew a teacher like Ms. Wilson, who was inconsistent, a teacher who told the class that they would be going to a surprise presentation but changed her mind the next day, making attendance at the surprise contingent upon assignment completion. Over half (53.3%) of the respondents knew a teacher like Ms. Thomas, a teacher who allowed the students to plan and make their own decisions about attending the surprise and completing work, and who offered assistance through regular individual conferences. Thus, Ms. Andrews was the most familiar type of teacher.

**Children's Perceptions of Hypothetical Teacher Preferences**

Although the respondents described Ms. Andrews as the most familiar teacher, Ms. Thomas, who empowered students to make their own plans and decisions, was
identified as the most preferred teacher. The majority (86.7%) of children preferred Ms. Thomas. The children who preferred Ms. Thomas spontaneously expressed their reason(s) for this preference by ascribing action-oriented attributes and characteristics to Ms. Thomas. Table 5 provides the rationales spontaneously generated by the respondents.
Table 5

Spontaneously Reported Reasons for a Preference for Ms. Thomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>n²</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choices or Decision Making</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., “She will give you choices. That’s an easier way to learn.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Planning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., “Make it easier to get their own ideas to do their own work.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., “Cause she talks nicely and she is kind to the children.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., “She offered her help. She left out her plan and then she said the children’s plan.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness and Consistency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., if she changed her mind you could “count on her.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., She is “fun.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., “She lets you take home homework.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Numbers of children out of 15 who responded with this reason.

Emotional aspects associated with the children’s preferences for Ms. Thomas were only mentioned after explicit prompting. When the children were asked how they
felt about Ms. Thomas, they did not provide elaborate descriptions. All respondents indicated positive feelings in brief phrases such as "comfortable and happy," "happy," "good not bad," or "special."

For verification purposes, the children were asked how the other hypothetical teachers could change to be more like the teacher they preferred. The following excerpts illustrated the children's responses:

"Ms. Wilson could get a bit more... become a bit more helpful and once you say 'yes' you keep with your decision."

"Help the kids a lot and let them make their own decisions."

"The other teachers, this one could stop being ...(pointing to Ms. Wilson) stop being so strict and keep her plans. Yeah and this one (pointing to Ms. Andrews) could let the children finish up some other time."

"Listen to Mrs. Thomas' ideas. Ideas about how to be fair. Give them choices before time."

The children's ratings of the hypothetical teachers' provision of contextual resources substantiated their preference for Ms. Thomas. Total contextual resource scores (a measure of provision for involvement, structure, and autonomy support) showed that Ms. Thomas received the highest ratings by 86.7% of the respondents. In addition, 46.2% of the respondents who preferred Ms. Thomas clearly distinguished her from the other hypothetical teachers on the contextual resource scale of Autonomy Support.

Summary of Comparative Analyses

Ms. Andrews was the most familiar hypothetical teacher. However, the respondents clearly identified their preference for Ms. Thomas, after they had participated...
in the interactive situated learning experience. The consistency in the data confirmed the children’s spontaneously generated preference for Ms. Thomas’ characteristics of “supporting decision making,” “helpfulness,” “kindness,” and “fairness.” Furthermore the children felt happy and comfortable when empowered by a teacher to make decisions. Ms. Thomas was also identified as the hypothetical teacher who provided the greatest amount of involvement, structure, and autonomy support.

The comparative analyses of the children’s perceptions of the three hypothetical teachers provides insight into the dimensions that participants used to perceive student-teacher relationships. In the next section, process analysis data illuminate some of the conditions that shaped their perceptions.

Process Analyses:

Part A: Hypothetical Class-Teacher Interactions

As previously mentioned, the first scenario provides a rich description of the background of the three hypothetical classrooms. The children’s descriptions were used to unpack and try to understand what elements are most salient and how their opinions came about. The children’s perceptions of the situational and interpersonal contexts were analyzed for the events in each of the three classrooms and for the thoughts and feelings of the hypothetical teachers and classes.

The Children’s Perceptions of the Behavioural Aspects of Class-Teacher Interactions

The responses to the question “What will happen next?” asked after the introduction of hypothetical classes and teachers, were expressed as “schoolwork” themes. Work completion themes emerged in two of the three hypothetical classes. Specifically, the participants’ responses were voiced as “doing work,” “finishing work,”
or "not finishing work" in both Ms. Wilson's and Ms. Andrews' classes. In contrast, in Ms. Thomas' class, the responses were not related to work completion, and varied responses fell into the "Other" category. These responses were still school related however, for example, planning use of time, working on another project, and homework assignments. Appendix I contains an excerpt of the story completion task for this question.
Table 6
Respondents Endorsing Academic Work-Related Themes After Each Teacher Gave Instructions

Predicted Themes of the Hypothetical Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Do Work</th>
<th>Finish Work &amp; Don't Finish</th>
<th>Only Go to Other</th>
<th>Go to Surprise</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n²</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n²</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers of children out of 15 who predicted these themes.

A connection between the work completion theme and the surprise outcome appeared to be a highly salient feature for the respondents. From examining Table 6, we can see that the predictions for finishing work and not finishing work were reversed in Ms. Wilson’s class compared to Ms. Andrews’s class. One hypothesis that can be generated from this reversal may be that obtaining the “surprise” was not perceived as a likely outcome by Ms. Wilson’s class, but it was perceived as a possible outcome by Ms. Andrews’ class.
However, the respondents accurately perceived the absence of a connection between work completion and the surprise in Ms. Thomas' class. From the data presented in Table 6, we see that only two children directly made a prediction related to work completion, while none spoke of work incompletion. An additional five respondents predicted that the students would go to the surprise by choice. Six children mentioned other activities, such as "making their own plan," "choosing to do the assignment for homework," "doing their own thing."

The Feelings and Thoughts Associated with the Class-Teacher Interactions

In addition to the initial behavioural predictions for each class and teacher from this scenario, the children identified variables that influenced the "schoolwork" events. The surprise outcome and the attribution of fairness emerged as recurring themes in the children's stories. Emotional experiences were related to the surprise outcome and attribution of fairness.

After an explicit prompt of "What would the class and teacher be thinking and feeling?" the respondents explained the emotional experiences of the hypothetical students and teachers. Examples of the responses to this question are contained in Appendix I. The stories were fairly consistent across classrooms, i.e., the participants provided similar details. The transcribed data revealed positive emotions (e.g. "Happy" and "Good"), and negative emotions (e.g., "Unhappy" "Sad" "Worried" and "Mad") that emerged from the data. The emotions that the respondents identified for each of the hypothetical teachers appeared to be quite similar within each class setting, but different between class settings as seen in Table 7. Negative emotions were ascribed most often to
Ms. Wilson, and positive emotions were assigned most often to Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas.

**Table 7**

**Respondents Perceptions of Emotional Experiences for Hypothetical Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Experiences</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n(^a)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n(^b)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Numbers of children out of 15 who perceived each type of emotional experience.

In addition, the respondents recognized when the classes of hypothetical students and teachers were not experiencing the same emotions, even though they were in the same situation (see Table 8). What is important in these data is the respondents' understanding of the experience of the situations. It is also very important to recognize that the differences in the participants' perceptions between the class settings are real. The percentage differences noted in Table 8 are markers of what could be different and
deeply embedded differences in relationship knowledge that exist on many levels for both the classes and the teachers.

Table 8
Respondents Indicating Similar or Different Emotional Experience Themes for the Hypothetical Classes and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Similar</th>
<th>Different</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+Emotions</td>
<td>- Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n^*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers of children out of 15 who identified similar or different emotional experiences.

Table 8 showed that 73.3% of the respondents described Ms. Wilson and her class as experiencing different emotions in this situation. The different emotions could be of the same or different valence. Furthermore, the children added details about the characters' feelings in the situations, displaying their awareness of outcome-emotion and
attribution-emotion links. Illustrative excerpts of emotional content within class-teacher interaction describe these connections. Some participants described the students as “mad” or “unhappy.” They linked student anger and sadness to either an outcome (e.g., “some students wouldn’t be able to go”) or a characteristic of Ms. Wilson (e.g., she “changed her mind”). The following excerpt illustrated the different negative feelings of the class (e.g., frustrated and unhappy) and the negative feelings of Ms. Wilson (e.g., mad). The emotion-outcome link to work completion and the emotion-attribution links to work difficulty and unfairness were spontaneously generated by the participants and were evident in the following excerpt.

Researcher- What do you predict is going to happen next?
Child- I think some of the kids might be a little frustrated.
Researcher- Think so? Tell me what the students and teacher are thinking right now? What are they thinking or feeling?
Child- Um sort of unhappy.
Researcher- Unhuh. Why would they be unhappy?
Child- Because they were expecting to go like right there, but now they know they have to do their work first. And it is getting really difficult.
Researcher- Unhuh. How is their teacher feeling right now too?
Child- Huh, mad?
Researcher- Sorta mad? Huh. Why do you think she would be that way? Why would she be mad ____?
Child- I don’t know.
Researcher: What would she be thinking about?

Child: Um that they are clearly upset.

Researcher: She'd be thinking the kids are upset?

Child: And that they are saying things about her that it is no fair and they don't like her.

Researcher: Is that what would be making her mad?

Child: Yeah.

Other respondents mentioned negative, insecure feelings for the hypothetical students in Ms. Wilson’s class. One child described the negative emotion of the students as “feeling iffy, ashamed and sad.” The following excerpt from Ms. Wilson’s room, highlighted the uncertainty about the outcome and the feelings of insecurity.

Child: I predict that someone isn't going to get their work finished.

Researcher: What is going to happen?

Child: He won't be able to go.

Researcher: How will that student be feeling?

Child: Terrible.

Researcher: Yeah, why?

Child: Because he won't be able to go to.

Researcher: What is terrible? What kind of feelings are terrible?

Child: Sad. Ashamed. That's about all.

Researcher: How would the teacher be feeling?

Child: I don't know.
Researcher: OK. We will try out the story and see what is going to happen.

What are the other students feeling in the class at this point, right now? They know the teacher changed her mind. They must get all their difficult work done.

Child: They are feeling kind of iffy about it.

Researcher: Kind of iffy?

Child: Will they be able to go or not.

Some respondents also linked feelings of insecurity to attributes of the situation and the students, such as their lack of control and weak ability, respectively. For example, Ms. Wilson changed her mind and this left the students unsure about either (a) what else may possibly change (e.g., “Students are thinking what else might change and the teacher is feeling guilty and a little mad because she forgot about the assignment”) or (b) their own ability to meet the expectation in order to go to the surprise (e.g., “students feel bad because they think they are not smart and the teacher thinks she changed her mind and they can’t go yet”). Either way, attributions of lack of control or weak ability left the hypothetical scenario described as discouraged, pessimistic, and helpless in the situation in Ms. Wilson’s room.

Some of the children spoke about Ms. Wilson’s lack of awareness, for example, not knowing that the students were “unhappy” about having to get their work done. Two children spontaneously said that she was “unfair.” Ms. Wilson was described by other children as “happy,” because the students were all working or because she thought they did not really have to go to the surprise at all. One child mentioned that Ms. Wilson would be feeling “sorry,” because she just “popped” the work on them and another said she may feel “guilty.”
In contrast to the negative emotional experiences attributed to Ms. Wilson’s classroom, most of the children told stories of shared positive emotional experiences for the hypothetical classes and teachers in the other two classrooms (see Table 8). Emotional experience similarities between the class and teacher in Ms. Andrews’ and Ms. Thomas’ classes were indicated by feelings of happiness or pride and thinking that they could get the work done and go to the surprise. While these emotional experiences appeared to be uncomplicated, emotion-outcome links, the children also provided attributions for the positive emotional experiences. For example, in Ms. Thomas’ room, the students were described as happy or excited, because they were given some autonomy (e.g., they had a choice, or could make their own decisions, or they could take it home for homework if they did not finish). Spontaneous descriptions of “helping” behaviour were also mentioned in Ms Thomas’ room. In Ms. Andrew’s room, three children elaborated spontaneously, by noting that she was a “fair” teacher and that she would help the children, in spite of the fact that “fairness” had not been specified in the story.

The word “fairness” was not used frequently by the children, but it was mentioned spontaneously by a few respondents. This may indicate that it was not high in their consciousness, even though they may be talking about it in other words. The children may be processing the concept of fairness. To help them develop the concept of fairness it was probed directly, challenging their understanding of this concept.

**Emotions and the Attribute of Fairness in Class-Teacher Interactions**

The attribute of “fairness” was mentioned by some children spontaneously during the story, and therefore it was probed and analysed in greater depth. First, all the children
were asked if they thought each teacher was fair and why. The data are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9
Respondents Endorsing Fairness for Three Hypothetical Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n²</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n²</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers of children out of 15 who endorsed fairness and unfairness.

The respondents differentiated between Ms. Wilson, Ms. Andrews, and Ms. Thomas according to fairness ratings. All but two participants' fairness ratings for Ms. Andrews and all ratings for Ms. Thomas were positive, indicating that the respondents thought both teachers were fair. In contrast, 66.7% of the children indicated that Ms. Wilson was not fair, because "she changed her mind" or "she may not let them go to the surprise." For these children, unfairness appeared to be associated with instability, inconsistency, and external control. The additional 33.3% of the children who thought Ms. Wilson was fair, provided rationales for their opinions. For example, it was "...OK to work and then go to the surprise," and "They know they need to work."
Further inquiries were made to investigate how the students would respond in the event that they perceived unfairness in Ms. Wilson's class. Over half (64.2%) of the children stated that the students should initiate a conversation with Ms. Wilson if they thought she was unfair. The remaining children were unsure of whether they would talk to Ms. Wilson about their perception of unfairness or not.

Some of the reasons for wanting to talk about their perception of unfairness were: (a) that it was important to share thoughts and feelings, (b) she may not be aware of the student's opinion or of "what she is doing," (c) "so she knows what kids are feeling," and (d) so she would "stop doing it" and "help." While these data indicated that students wanted to talk about their perception of unfairness, the qualitative data on the emotional experiences of the students showed that this was not an easy thing to do. The participants described the hypothetical students as shy, nervous, scared, angry, or upset. The following excerpt describes the participants' perceptions of difficult and mixed emotions for a hypothetical student and Ms. Wilson, in the context of perceived unfairness.

**Researcher:** If a student in this class thought the teacher was unfair, should that student tell the teacher that they don't think this is fair?

**Child:** Yeah.

**Researcher:** Why?

**Child:** So she would know what she is doing so that she might stop.

**Researcher:** Yeah? So you think that she might not realize what she has done?

**Child:** How would that student be feeling about that?

**Child:** Proud about himself or herself inside.
Researcher: “Unhuh. Can you tell me more?

Child: They would probably feel like a gleaming light inside of them, because they told something that the teacher didn’t know and they would probably think they were pretty smart because they told the teacher what she was doing. When they would feel proud of themselves when they went up. They were probably frightened at first but then they just went up. He or she went up.

Researcher: So they should do that. How would the teacher be feeling?

Child: Ashamed of herself.

Researcher: Anything else?

Child: Unfair. She might feel disappointed in herself.

Only a few children (21.4%) indicated that they would not tell Ms. Wilson if they thought she was unfair. One child reasoned, “You might get in trouble.” Two others mentioned that they would not tell Ms. Wilson, because “the teacher gets upset and mad.” Two children (13.3%), opted for possibly telling Ms. Wilson (e.g., “Maybe. You should, but you don’t want to because you hurt her feelings and [she will] be mad.”) These responses may be interpreted as an example of the complex interplay of emotions that the children perceived as active in the student-teacher relationship, and may in fact be more representative of most people’s real (vs. hypothetical) behaviour.

Summary of Class-Teacher Interactions

The children described the class-teacher interactions in behavioural action-oriented themes of schoolwork routines, for example, work completion expectations. With the interactive situated learning procedures, the respondents used their behavioural knowledge to explore the emotional content of the interactions. The respondents
described a recurring theme of negative emotional experiences for the class and teacher in
the situation where work completion expectations changed, that is in the context of Ms.
Wilson’s class. The respondents described two types of negative emotions for Ms.
Wilson’s class; an angry/unhappy class or an insecure class. They tended to attribute
these emotions to external sources, such as characteristics of the teacher (e.g.,
inconsistency, insensitivity to students or unfairness), and the anticipated outcome (i.e.,
anticipation of outcome failure). Some respondents also attributed these emotions to
internal sources, such as a personal sense of lack of control or inability to meet the
expectation.

In contrast to the negative emotional experiences for students in Ms. Wilson’s
context, the children described positive emotional experiences for the hypothetical classes
and teachers (i.e., Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas), when work completion expectations
were predictable. The children identified both emotion-outcome links (e.g., perceptions
of work completion and going to the surprise were related to emotions) and emotion-
attribution links (e.g., perceptions of decision making, competence, helping, and fairness
were associated with emotions). In general, the positive emotional experiences that were
described in the stories were briefer and somewhat less complicated.

Taken together, analysis of these data reveals that the participants used salient
features of the story to differentiate between the experiences of the teachers and
classroom characteristics. The children linked emotional experiences to the outcome and
attributions, as well as to student and teacher actions. These data indicate that the
participants perceived the student-teacher relationship in these contexts in behavioural
terms, consisting of action-oriented, emotional, and attributional terms.
Process Analyses:

Part B: Hypothetical Student-Teacher Interactions

In this scenario, the hypothetical teachers interact with individual students who are experiencing problems with a difficult question or settling to work. The process analysis depicts the student-teacher interactions on the behavioural level as well as the feeling and thinking levels.

The Children's Perceptions of the Behavioural Aspects of Student-Teacher Interactions

After each hypothetical student was introduced, the children were asked to predict what would happen next for each student and teacher. Excerpts of the hypothetical student-teacher interactions are found in Appendix J.

Consistent patterns emerged from the responses. First, most respondents (86.7%) predicted that in each classroom, the student and teacher would engage in an interaction. Second (as shown in Table 10) the respondents predicted that the hypothetical students would initiate the interaction more frequently than the teacher, regardless of the student's problem. The participants perceived that it would be the student's turn to act. Clearly, the evidence suggested that students do not give up at this point and would seek to engage the teacher to solve the problem.
Table 10

Initiation of Student-Teacher Interaction: Respondents Ascribing the Initiation of Interaction to the Hypothetical Student or Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator of Problem Solving</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n^a</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuck student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuck student</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuck student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Numbers of children out of 15 who ascribed initiation of interaction to the hypothetical student or teacher.

Next, the protocols of student-teacher interactions were examined to determine what types of interactions occurred. Helping interactions were described repeatedly by
the participants. Table 11 shows that the children spontaneously described "helping" student-teacher interactions to resolve the problem in all three class settings.

Table 11

| Helping Theme of Student-Teacher Interaction: Respondents Describing Student-Teacher Helping Interactions in Each Class by Type of Student Difficulty |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Context | Stuck | Excited |
| | n | % | n | % |
| Ms. Wilson | 9 | 60 | 9 | 60 |
| Ms. Andrews | 12 | 80 | 11 | 73.3 |
| Ms. Thomas | 11 | 73.3 | 8 | 53.3 |

*Numbers of children out of 15 who described helping interactions in each context.

Table 11 also indicates that the respondents described helping interactions most often in Ms. Andrew's room. Furthermore, Table 11 shows that helping interactions occurred in both problem situations and did not appear to be related to the type of problem the student was experiencing, in any of the classroom contexts. The following vignette illustrates how a participant perceived the problem-solving interaction between a student and the teacher in more detail. A student, who was stuck on a question in Ms.
Andrew's class, initiates a request for help "...if he tries and doesn't get it. He is feeling kind of happy and sad, because he is really stuck. His teacher helps him by giving him the answer and she is happy because she helped." In a few stories, children elaborated by adding another sequence, as when Ms. Wilson changed her mind again, or Ms. Andrews allowed a student to stay in for recess to finish.

Not all predicted interactions were "helping" interactions. In Ms. Wilson's room, other interaction responses that did not involve helping were: (a) she tells the student to "take it for homework and to just sit in the library," (b) "Ms Wilson yells," (c) she tells him "settle down," or (d) she tells him he "has the wrong answer." Also in Ms. Wilson's class, some respondents indicated there was no interaction at all, e.g., the student "cheats" or "goes to the library." In Ms. Thomas' room, a few children described other ways to solve the problems of being stuck or too excited, without teacher interaction. For example, five stories indicated that the student could decide to do the assignment for homework.

Next, the participants were asked if the hypothetical student and teacher thought that the student would be successful after the student-teacher interactions. Even after the respondents described many "helping" interactions in each class, they still perceived a difference in the hypothetical student's and teacher's perspectives for outcome success. Table 12 shows that the respondents perceived that the students were pessimistic about outcome success, while the teachers were optimistic, in all three settings. For examples please see Appendix J.
Table 12
Student-Teacher Interaction: Respondents Predicting Outcome Success from the Hypothetical Student’s and Teacher’s Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Success</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>Student Perspective</td>
<td>Teacher Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n^a</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuck student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuck student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuck student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Numbers of children out of 15 who predicted outcome success.

Some of the children described the discrepancy in behavioural action-outcome and behavioural action-attribution terms. Students in Ms. Andrews’ and Ms. Wilson’s classes were thinking they would not be able to finish because, for example, they had to finish many more questions and they thought they were just at the beginning, or the work was
hard. In contrast, teachers were generally perceived to be thinking positively, that the student would get done because, for example, she thought she had helped or offered help and so now the student could finish. Also, some respondents reasoned that, the teacher relied on prior knowledge that he was good in language and rarely has difficulty.

The Feelings and Thoughts Associated with the Hypothetical Student-Teacher Interactions

The children identified students' and teachers' emotions within the interactions, after they were given prompts such as “What is (name of the student or teacher) feeling and thinking?” The participants' verbal responses were self-generated. I then extracted the emotional experience content from the responses (see Appendix J). The emotional experiences data were collapsed across student problems (stuck and excited) for each class setting, because as previously found, the respondents did not differentiate the student-teacher interactions based upon the type of student difficulty. Moreover, the participants predicted that the hypothetical student and teacher would engage in interaction in all three settings.

The participants' perceptions of the emotional experiences were analyzed in four ways. These were: (a) the emotional content of hypothetical students, (b) the emotional content of hypothetical teachers, (c) the mutuality of emotional experiences for hypothetical students and teachers, and (d) the emotional content changes during interaction. The following results are organized according to these four areas.

Emotional content for hypothetical students. The data were analyzed for recurring patterns of emotional experience. The emotions that the participants described fit into two categories of positive and negative emotions. For example, “Happy” and “Good”
were categorized as positive emotions and "Angry," "Nervous," and "Sad" were categorized as negative emotions. For a list of the emotions that were generated see Appendix K. The data analysis of emotions showed some variability. The respondents perceived that the hypothetical students in the three classrooms experienced a wide variety of emotions as they struggled with their difficult work and interacted with their teachers. Table 13 highlights a comparison between the hypothetical students' positive and negative emotional experiences, in each setting.

Table 13
Respondents Perceptions of Positive and Negative Emotional Experience Themes for Hypothetical Students in each Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td>4  13.3</td>
<td>26  86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td>12  40</td>
<td>18  60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td>16  53.3</td>
<td>12  40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Frequency (out of a possible 30 student-teacher interactions) of hypothetical stuck and excited students emotional experiences.

From a comparison of positive and negative emotional experiences for the hypothetical students, one major finding appeared. The students in Ms. Wilson's class
were distinguished from students in the other classes. Forty percent of the respondents described the hypothetical students in Ms. Andrews' class as feeling "happy" or "glad," and 53.3% of the respondents described the hypothetical students in Ms. Thomas' class as feeling "happy" or "glad." In contrast, only 13.3% of the participants described the students in Ms. Wilson's class as "happy" and 86.7% described them as "angry," "sad," or "nervous".

The respondents explained that the positive emotions of students in Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas' classes were associated with outcomes and attributions. Specifically, in Ms. Thomas' room, they could "decide" when to work, where to work, or to take the work for homework. Two excerpts, from Ms. Thomas' room, illustrate that the positive emotional experiences were linked to outcome success and attributions of control and intelligence, for both the hypothetical teachers and students.

The first excerpt clearly demonstrates that the respondent linked Ms. Thomas' and the students' positive emotional experiences to the outcome of going to the surprise, rather than to work completion or an attribution about the student or the teacher.

**Child:** Change their mind and take their homework and take it back to school.

**Researcher:** Tell me how would he think that up? What would he say?

**Child:** 'Cause he is smart.

**Researcher:** What would he say?

**Child:** Ms. Thomas, I want to change my mind. I want to take the work home and see the surprise.

**Researcher:** And what would Ms. Thomas say in this class?
Child: Oh. Good.
Researcher: Would she say maybe "you've made a good plan?"
Child: Unhuh.
Researcher: Why would he want to take it home?
Child: So he could see the surprise.
Researcher: So he could see the surprise? OK now does K think he is going to get his work done before recess?
Child: No.
Researcher: No? Does he think he is going to see the surprise?
Child: Yeah. But he'll get it done tonight.
Researcher: How does he feel about that?
Child: Good.
Researcher: He feels good about that? How does his teacher feel?
Child: Good.
Researcher: Does she think he is going to get done before recess?
Child: No.
Researcher: But how does she feel?
Child: Good, because he is going to go see the surprise.
Researcher: Would there be another reason why K or Ms. Thomas are feeling good?
Child: No.

The next excerpt shows the link between the positive emotional experiences and attributions of control and supported decision-making. The respondent demonstrates
awareness that the hypothetical student could make his own decision and that Ms. Thomas would support that autonomy. The choice “to work in another location” was not a class routine. Therefore, the student was in control of “the choice to work in another location” and this was linked to positive emotional experiences for the student and teacher in the situation.

**Researcher:** What would he do then?

**Child:** Just ask the teacher.

**Researcher:** And what would happen what would she say?

**Child:** She’d say, “Look in your planner. See if it says something.”

**Researcher:** Like if you’re excited … so you know you have to go work out in the hall. Something like that?

**Child:** Maybe… well No… Maybe. You can change your day plan around and you can go work out there and…

**Researcher:** And how would she feel about that?

**Child:** She’d feel glad.

**Researcher:** And how would he feel about that?

**Child:** Glad.

In contrast to the positive emotional experiences of the students in Ms. Andrews’ and Ms. Thomas’ classes, 86.7% of the students in Ms. Wilson’s room were feeling angry, sad, bad, nervous, or having mixed negative emotions, such as sad and mad. The children also used words like “terrible,” “confused,” “left out,” and “depressed.” Two vignettes illustrated the attributions that the respondents made about the student, the teacher, the outcome, and the task in Ms. Wilson’s room.
First, a “stuck student” in Ms. Wilson’s room is described as “depressed” when he goes to ask for help, because “he has to get this done otherwise he won’t go. Everyone is doing well and the teacher doesn’t know there is a problem. She doesn’t know she might be over there helping him.” The child goes on to explain that instead, the teacher can “see he is having a little difficulty and come over and ask him if he is having difficulty and then offer to help him.”

In the second example, a “stuck student” is feeling “very bad” and he tells Ms. Wilson he is stuck and he “complains.” The teacher says, “Do it for homework and sit in the library.” The student is not allowed to go to the surprise. The student is still feeling “very bad” and the teacher “just doesn’t care” and says “Oh fine.”

When negative emotions were described in the student-teacher interactions for all three settings, the respondents appeared to describe “low-level” frustrating and challenging negative emotions, as opposed to “high-level” disruptive and angry negative emotions for the hypothetical students. A few pieces of evidence supported this statement. The respondents described the students as ‘interacting’ with the teachers, trying to work through the dilemma together and not giving up in anger or fear. In addition, the emotional content described in Appendix K shows that only a few of the children thought that hypothetical students were “angry.” Instead many were described as experiencing anxiety, sadness, not feeling good, guilt, shame, sorrow or mixed emotions of worried and sad. The situations appeared frustrating and challenging for the hypothetical students. The following vignette describes the tension in the situation.
The "stuck student" in Ms. Andrews' class was trying harder to answer the question, when Ms. Andrews said, "Think harder." The student was worried and sad because he might not get the surprise, and Ms. Andrews was worried and sad because he might not get done.

**Emotional content for hypothetical teachers.** An analysis of the children's perceptions of the emotional experiences of the hypothetical teachers reveals a pattern that is similar to the emotional experiences of the hypothetical students: They distinguished Ms. Wilson from Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas. Ms. Wilson was rarely (in only 13.3% of the interactions) described as experiencing positive emotions during the interactions. Some children (43.3%) felt that Ms. Wilson was "angry," "annoyed," "mad" or was having mixed negative emotions of "sad and mad." Her actions were described as "not helpful" and "yelling." The respondents attributed Ms. Wilson's anger to what she thought about her students' behaviour and the outcome, not to her own actions. For instance, she was mad about students' behaviour such as "talking" or "copying" and not finishing the assignment.

While Ms. Wilson was portrayed as typically angry, Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas were portrayed as happy. Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas were never described as mad (with the one exception of Ms. Thomas' reaction to the excited student), and instead both teachers were described with positive feelings such as happiness, goodness and pride. In Ms. Andrews' room, the good feelings were attributed internally and externally and linked to helping interactions, for example "She was feeling great because she helped a kid." and in Ms. Thomas' room, because the student accepted help. Both teachers were also described by the participants as "happy" because of the surprise
“outcome” and attributions of “competence” in the student (e.g., “that the student would get finished.”) Ms. Thomas’ happiness was also associated with an attribution of supporting students in making their own decisions, for example, “She thought a student had a good idea or made a good choice.”

Evidence of mutual emotional experiences. Table 14 was designed to show the frequency with which the respondents described the hypothetical student and teacher experiencing similar or different emotions during interaction. The ‘no data’ column indicates that either there was no emotional data reported for one of the characters or the emotional content was reported at different points in the interaction and thus mutuality at the same point in the interaction could not be assumed.
Table 14

Mutual Emotional Content of Student-Teacher Interactions: Frequency of Respondents

Describing Themes of Emotional Experience Similarities or Differences in Hypothetical Student-Teacher Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Similar</th>
<th>Different</th>
<th>No Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Emotions</td>
<td>- Emotions</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n^a %</td>
<td>n^b %</td>
<td>na %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td>8 26.7</td>
<td>6 20</td>
<td>14 46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td>16 53.3</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>19 63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td>14 46.7</td>
<td>2 6.7</td>
<td>16 53.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency of emotional experience similarities is not substantially different across the classes (totals of 46.7% in Ms. Wilson’s class, 63.3% in Ms. Andrews’ class, and 53.3% in Ms. Thomas’ class). Approximately half of the student-teacher pairs were described as sharing “similar emotional experiences” during the interaction. However, Table 14 does show that the children perceived more similar, positive, emotional experiences for the hypothetical student and teacher during interactions in Ms. Andrews’
and Ms. Thomas’ classes and more different emotional experiences during interactions in Ms. Wilson’s class. Emotional experience similarities may be interpreted as signs of reciprocity, mutuality, responsivity, understanding, and/or empathy in the student-teacher relationship.

Emotional experience differences were more prevalent in Ms. Wilson’s room in comparison to the other two class settings, as shown in Table 14. Forty percent of the participants described the hypothetical students and teachers as experiencing different emotions. In all three class settings, when the hypothetical student and the teacher were experiencing different emotions, the student was described as mainly experiencing negative feelings. In these cases students typically were described as nervous, sad, left out, ashamed, guilty, or depressed. The respondents also discriminated among the teachers’ emotional experiences. Ms. Wilson was described as grumpy, annoyed or mad, while Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas were neutral or happy.

The following excerpt demonstrates the complexity of the emotional experiences in situations of differences and similarities. In the vignette, Ms. Wilson is described as “angry” and the student as “sad.”

Researcher: Unhuh. What is going to happen between George and Ms. Wilson?
Child: Have a conversation.
Researcher: They are going to have conversation. How would it go? What would they say? What would George say? What would Ms Wilson say?
Child: Ms. Wilson would probably say I saw you talking to your neighbour. Stuff like that.
Researcher- And then what would George say?
Child- Oh well. Who cares.
Researcher- Why would he say that?
Child- He likes talking to his neighbour.
Researcher- Oh and how is he feeling? How would he be feeling if he was saying that?
Child- Pretty sad.
Researcher- Unhuh. Anything else?
Child- No.
Researcher- What would happen next? What would Ms Wilson say next?
Child- Nothing.
Researcher- How would she be feeling? How would Ms. Wilson be feeling?
Child- Angry because he was talking to his neighbour.
Researcher- Angry for talking to his neighbour. OK. Um How did...
Child- You go stand up in the corner with the toys.
Researcher- How did she look?
Child- Like this. (Child makes an angry face.)
Researcher- Really tight in the face, and how did George look? (Child makes a sad face.) Like his eyes were all droopy and sad.
Child- Yeah.

Taken together, the data indicate that participants perceived the hypothetical student and the teacher as not necessarily experiencing similar emotions, even though they were in the same context. Differences were more prevalent in Ms Wilson’s setting.
The vignettes suggest that the respondents were aware that the students and teachers can have different perspectives, involving actions, emotional experiences, and attributions.

**Emotional content changes during student-teacher interaction.** Dynamic interplay between the thoughts and feelings of the hypothetical student and teacher were described in a few of the children's stories. Four children described a change of emotions during a hypothetical student-teacher interaction.

Three vignettes below illustrate the children's perceptions of links among emotion change, helping interaction and outcome predictions, i.e., a negative emotion associated with a request for help, then a helping interaction connected with positive emotion and a prediction of outcome success. The first two examples describe emotions changing from negative to positive. The third example is somewhat more complicated, and shows how negative emotions can change to another negative emotion during interaction.

(a) The "stuck student" in Ms Andrews' class was feeling "discouraged" at first, but was "happy" after he asked for help, because he thought the right thing to do was to ask the teacher and he would now get done.

(b) The "ashamed" student in Ms. Thomas' class felt "better" after he asked and received help from the teacher, and he predicted that he would finish what he had planned to do.

(c) The stuck student in Ms. Thomas' class is feeling "guilty" and this is attributed to "other people say he has to concentrate harder." His teacher says "Joe, it is true you can do it. All you have to do is concentrate." She is feeling "determined in herself." Then Joe starts to feel "not so happy" because "he
thought he could do it before recess.” His teacher is “happy” because she believes in his competence (e.g., “he can still get it done”).

An analysis of the first two vignettes shows that the emotional changes seemed to be linked to teacher helping actions and outcome prediction changes. An analysis of the third vignette is more complicated, because it offers many possible interpretations. The hypothetical student’s emotional experience changed from one negative emotion to another. The emotional change in the third vignette may reflect either the fact that the hypothetical student did not directly ask for help, or that the teacher’s comment may not have been perceived as helpful. The teacher may have been giving mixed signals of determination and happiness. Determination may be a reflection of a teacher forcing herself to espouse the positive outlook. The teacher’s feeling of determination may be interpreted as less than genuine optimism or happiness. The emotional change may also reflect the participant’s view of the student’s “guilt.” The negative emotion-attribution of “guilt” for being stuck on a hard question was rephrased by the participant as “guilt” for not concentrating. The external, uncontrollable, attribute of “question difficulty” was ignored by the respondent, and instead an internal, possibly controllable attribute of not concentrating was substituted. Concentration may have been included, because it was considered to be something the student could control. In fact, the respondent reported that the teacher said he could get it finished, implying he had control of his concentration.

Summary of the Hypothetical Student-Teacher Interactions

The hypothetical students, teachers, and class settings provided the situated learning contexts for the bright and gifted 8- to 9-year-old children to display their knowledge of the social-emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships. The
respondents described behavioural, action-oriented interactions and the associated emotional experiences embedded in classroom stories.

A common behavioural pattern emerged from the content analysis of the children's stories. Most children described the hypothetical students as able to engage in some sort of problem solving with the teacher. In all three class settings, when a hypothetical student was experiencing difficulty, the majority of the children described student-teacher “helping” interactions. Over half of the children began the hypothetical student-teacher interactions with student-initiated requests for assistance, and this did not appear to vary according to the hypothetical context. However, even though “helping” interactions were very prevalent, the children perceived a discrepancy between the students’ and the teachers’ predictions for outcome success, in all three classroom settings. The children described the students as generally pessimistic and the teachers as optimistic about outcome success. This is a clear indication that the children perceived the concept of outcome differently for the students' and teachers' perspectives.

With prompting, the children were able to identify and describe emotional experiences from the hypothetical student's and teacher's perspectives. The content of the children's social-emotional knowledge was complex, involving emotions that were linked to actions, outcome predictions, and attributions, for both the hypothetical students and teachers. While there appeared to be some scatter in the understanding of emotional experiences described by the children, some common trends did emerge. There was evidence that the children were aware of the following emotional aspects: (a) Positive emotional experiences for both the student and teacher were recognized, and they were more often associated with consistent class routines and structures (Ms. Andrews) and
with supporting students in making their own decisions (Ms. Thomas); (b) Positive emotional experiences for both the hypothetical student and teachers were associated with outcome success, helping action-oriented behaviour, and attributions of competence, autonomy support, and control; (c) Negative emotional experiences for both the student and teacher were associated with inconsistent expectations and lack of control (Ms. Wilson); (d) Negative emotional experiences for both the student and teacher were associated with predictions of outcome failure in all three settings and attributions of teacher insensitivity, not caring, and off-task student behaviour; (e) Negative emotions in the classrooms were at a challenging frustration level but not a disruptive behaviour level; (f) Students and teachers were not necessarily experiencing the same emotions within the interaction, in the same context; (g) More shared positive emotional experiences were described in the context of Ms. Andrews’ and Ms. Thomas’s classes and more different as well as negative emotional experiences were described in the context of Ms. Wilson’s class; and (h) A few children showed that they understood that emotions could change during the dynamic interplay of actions, emotions, and thoughts, between the hypothetical student and teacher.

Taken together, these data suggest that when the children describe their knowledge of student-teacher relationships in behavioural, interaction-oriented terms, they are not expressing the full extent of their knowledge about student-teacher relationships. The children demonstrated that they had extensive and differentiated emotion-outcome and emotion-attribution knowledge about student-teacher relationships. Thus, an analysis of the three stories showed that the respondents’ knowledge about the
student-teacher relationships appeared to permit an integration of the meanings of actions, emotional experiences, and attributions.

Behavioural level, action-oriented knowledge is limited. Action-oriented knowledge alone did not differentiate between student-teacher interactions in each of the settings. Most respondents described student-initiated helping interactions in all three settings and even after receiving help, some students thought they would not be successful in achieving the outcome. When the respondents were prompted to add the emotional content to the interactions, they differentiated among the settings, employing emotional knowledge of what the students and teachers were feeling and why they were having these experiences. Thus, not only did these children, ages 8 and 9, know that interactions were linked to emotions and attributional cognitions in the relationship, they were able to describe different, varied emotional experiences for both the teachers and students in interaction. Furthermore, it appears that emotion-oriented knowledge is associated with action-oriented knowledge, and with this depth of knowledge the children were able to differentiate between the three classroom settings.

It appears that to understand the social-emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships from a child’s perspective, there is a need to delve beyond behavioural knowledge and consider the rich emotional knowledge that children possess. Children can in fact discriminate many of the important emotional features in student-teacher relationships. This was evident in all the data on the children’s complex perceptions of the student’s emotions, the teacher’s emotions, emotional changes, and the mutuality of emotions. Such discrimination requires the synthesis of actions, emotions, and cognitions, but while they were able to do so with help, the children did not accomplish
this independently or spontaneously. These 8- and 9-year-old children were capable of accessing their social-emotional knowledge within familiar contextual boundaries in a hypothetical (safe) situation, using their social-behavioural knowledge, as well as the adult-child interaction of the guided situated learning activity. The interactive, situated learning approach challenged and supported the children to go beyond their social-behavioural knowledge in order to uncover what they knew about the emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships.

Process Analyses:

Part C: Story Conclusions in the Hypothetical Classes

In the concluding scenario, the hypothetical teachers interact with the class. Again, the process analysis includes considerations of the class-teacher interactions on the behavioural level as well as the thoughts and feelings that are associated with the actions.

The Children’s Perceptions of the Behavioural Aspects of the Story Conclusion

The participants generated behavioural, action-oriented content when they were asked to describe how the story ended in each classroom. The data were reviewed and similar themes emerged for each hypothetical class (See Table 15).
Table 15

Respondents Describing Themes of Academic Work-Related Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Finish &amp;</th>
<th>Not Finish</th>
<th>Homework</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wilson</td>
<td>7 46.7</td>
<td>3 20</td>
<td>5 33.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Andrews</td>
<td>7 46.7</td>
<td>4 26.6</td>
<td>1 6.6</td>
<td>3 20</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Thomas</td>
<td>3 20</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 13.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 40</td>
<td>4 26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers of children out of 15 describing story conclusions.

Seven respondents (46.7%) reported that the students in Ms. Wilson's class finished their work. These seven respondents reported that the hypothetical students and Ms. Wilson were happy and feeling pretty good at this point because they were going to go to the surprise. Three children explained that Ms. Wilson changed her mind again, allowed the students who didn’t finish to go, but these students would have to finish the work later or take it for homework. The other 33.3% of the participants ended the stories with variations on “not all the children got to go.”

Not all emotions and attributions reported for this class were mutual. Some of the children explained that the hypothetical students in Ms. Wilson’s class were nervous, confused, aggravated, sad, and frustrated. One child said that a student who could not go
to the surprise would feel “sad and left out, mad, ashamed, put down, humiliated.” In
contrast, Ms. Wilson was perceived as happy by most children, because of either the
outcome success or an attribution that she felt that she had taught most children. There
were two interesting exceptions. One child struggled to find a word to describe Ms.
Wilson’s emotion as something between annoyed and angry. Another child said Ms.
Wilson was happy, but she was “covering up her dislike for the children” and the fact that
“she didn’t want them to go and they probably won’t go.”

In total, 75% of the stories ended positively for students in Ms. Andrews’ class.
Nearly half of the participants ended the story with all the children finishing their work
and going to the surprise. One other child said that Ms. Andrews gave the rest of the
assignment for homework so that they all could go. Another 20% of the respondents
explained that the students finished, but they “decided not to go” or “asked for extra
work” to do in the library. Emotionally, most of the children explained that the students
and Ms. Andrews were happy, but there was also some sadness reported. There was no
anger, shame, or humiliation. In a few stories, Ms. Andrews was “sad and happy because
she wished they all would go” or she was “sad because she had to stay back with Fred.”
The following vignette demonstrates how one respondent metaphorically described the
sadness the class felt as “a hole in the class”:

Child: “Good. Some people got to go see the surprise, but she was sad about
those other kids who didn’t get to see the surprise.”

Researcher: And tell me about the kids. What are the kids thinking?

Child: “Yay! we get to go to the surprise,” but Fred didn’t get to go to the surprise
because he didn’t get the question right.
Researcher- How did he feel about that?
Child- Sad.

Researcher- How did the other kids feel about that?
Child- Sad, 'cause there is a hole in the classroom.

Researcher- What do you mean?
Child- Sad 'cause Fred is not there.

In Ms. Thomas' class the emotions were not as varied. The participants' conclusions were almost all uniformly positive. The majority (86.6%) of the respondents described harmonious stories where emotions were described as happy for both the class and the teacher. There were variations on the concluding events, and this was likely a function of the increased decision making ability of the students in this room. For example, two of the respondents said the students went to the surprise after finishing their work, eight had students take work for homework according to the plan or a revision of their plan, and one child had the students go to either the library or surprise, whichever they chose. Ms. Thomas was happy because of the outcome success and decision-making.

Summary of Story Conclusions

The story conclusions were told in behavioural action terms that described mainly outcome successes for the classes. The first two classes were perceived as successful in terms of going to the surprise, and the third class was perceived as successful in terms of student decision making. The children recognized emotions that were associated with the behavioural features and the outcomes which had an impact on the class as a whole and on individual students.
Teacher Familiarity and Teacher Preference Matrix

The children’s perceptions of the student-teacher relationship events were systematically organized in a matrix. This heuristic framework was designed to highlight the similarities and differences of the children’s perceptions for the most familiar (i.e., Ms. Andrews) and the most preferred (i.e., Ms. Thomas) teachers as well as the least preferred and least familiar teacher (i.e., Ms. Wilson), on the action, thinking, and feeling levels. Table 16 shows that the respondents perceived many student-teacher relationship similarities between Ms. Andrews’ class and Ms. Thomas’ class. However, one difference was consistently reported. In Ms. Thomas’ class there is evidence that the children carried the theme of student autonomy throughout the three scenarios. Student decision making differentiated the familiar teacher from the preferred teacher in the respondents’ perceptions of the teachers. The respondents linked the hypothetical students’ and teachers’ emotions and actions to the opportunity for decision making.
Table 16

Participants' Process x Preference and Familiarity Ratings Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Ms. Wilson</th>
<th>Ms. Andrews</th>
<th>Ms. Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar or preferred</td>
<td>Most familiar teacher</td>
<td>Most preferred teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class-Teacher Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Ms. Wilson</th>
<th>Ms. Andrews</th>
<th>Ms. Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teacher directing</td>
<td>students work for surprise</td>
<td>students decide what to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Emotion</th>
<th>Ms. Wilson</th>
<th>Ms. Andrews</th>
<th>Ms. Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Emotion</th>
<th>Ms. Wilson</th>
<th>Ms. Andrews</th>
<th>Ms. Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positive, negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Thoughts</th>
<th>Ms. Wilson</th>
<th>Ms. Andrews</th>
<th>Ms. Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not smart, changed her mind</td>
<td>work, go to surprise, fair</td>
<td>make their own decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Thoughts</th>
<th>Ms. Wilson</th>
<th>Ms. Andrews</th>
<th>Ms. Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>finish work, no need to go</td>
<td>working, go to surprise</td>
<td>surprise, good students, choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Teacher Interactions</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Student Emotion</th>
<th>Teacher Emotion</th>
<th>Student Thoughts</th>
<th>Teacher Thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students request help</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>unfair, hard work, not done</td>
<td>work completion, no surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students request help</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>go or not go to surprise</td>
<td>helping, go to surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students request help</td>
<td>positive and negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Conclusion</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Class Emotion</td>
<td>Teacher Emotion</td>
<td>Class Thoughts</td>
<td>Teacher Thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finish work or not, surprise</td>
<td>positive and negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>going to the surprise or not</td>
<td>go or not go to the surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finish work, surprise</td>
<td>positive and negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>decide to go to surprise/homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>go to surprise, homework, work</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>go to the surprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Summary of Story Completion Task Findings

In summary, the student-teacher relationship knowledge of the bright and gifted 8- to 9-year-old children in this study can be understood as accessible on different levels of awareness. First, the children independently and spontaneously described social behavioural knowledge, in action-oriented and interaction-oriented terms. However, this did not represent the full extent of their understanding of student-teacher relationships. Second, with interactive inquiry, the children generated descriptions of the social-emotional experiences that were associated with the dramatized student-teacher interactions. Third, the children were all responsive to the child-adult interactive teaching methodology which provided the opportunity to discuss their perceptions of the thoughts and feelings that are connected to the student-teacher interactions. It appeared that the contextual boundaries of the hypothetical student-teacher interactions and the interactive teaching together were conducive to eliciting the children’s knowledge of the emotions that are interconnected with the actions of relationships. Fourth, after the children described their perceptions of the social-behavioural and social-emotional experiences of students and teachers within the boundaries of the situated learning context, they expressed their familiarity and preferences for the teacher characteristics, from their own perspective. The bright and gifted 8- to 9-year-old children clearly found the teacher who was predictable, fair, and willing to be involved with the students as most familiar. However, the children strongly preferred the teacher who was not only predictable, fair and willing to be involved, but also provided the students with some autonomy and supportive strategies for planning and decision making.
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

What have we learned about how children perceive student-teacher relationships from the structured interview and story completion task activities? Clearly we have learned that children's perceptions of relationships can be examined in the context of interpersonal student-teacher interactions in academic settings. Relationships, according to these children, do not just consist of descriptions and endorsements of self-perceptions and perceptions of others. Relationships do not just consist of social skills. Instead, the children's knowledge about student-teacher relationships can be described in connections of actions, thoughts and feelings. Thus relationships are complex, from these children's point of view.

This study has revealed several consistent themes about student-teacher relationships. The children have shown that they have knowledge about relationships in terms of the actions, thoughts, and emotions of both the student and the teacher. The components that make up the relationship can be separated and examined. However, the components cannot be considered in isolation. They are all integral to the experience of student-teacher relationship. Actions and thoughts and feelings are necessarily embedded in the academic and social tasks of the student-teacher relationship, and together they culminate in the human experience of the relationship. The intention of identifying components was not to simplify the experiences of these children, generalize actions, categorize thoughts, condense the emotional qualities, or to make children's
responses more predictable. The intention was to look at the relationship in a complex way, as suggested by Dunn (1993).

The strengths of this study come from the method, procedures, and mostly the children. First, the interactive teaching methodology provided the opportunity to gather the children's perceptions and to probe for clarification when needed. The children's perceptions were not collected according to a checklist, rating scale, or questionnaire which could place artificial limitations on the children's perceptions. Instead, the methodology of this study emphasized the children's words and expressions to describe their perceptions. Patterns emerged directly from the data showing that the children do indeed see that social and emotional components are associated with learning in the educational context. Second, the situated learning procedures were effective in eliciting the children's perceptions. The procedures made the parameters of the student-teacher context clear. They consisted of hypothetical characters, with prescribed genders, interacting in a familiar, salient context, with a specific student-teacher dilemma. The children were able to draw upon their own experiences or representations of student-teacher relationships because the tasks, settings, and the characters were familiar to them. Third, the children that participated were a strength. More specifically the children's perceptions and their abilities to verbally express their understanding of student-teacher relationships were strong. The sample was somewhat varied in terms of gender, age, and years of schooling. There were more boys than girls who participated. The children ranged in age from 8 to 9 and they were in Grades 2, 3, or 4. (However, when the data from the three youngest boys and the three oldest boys were compared there were many similarities and no remarkable differences.) Still, it is possible that gender, years of
educational experience, and age are important variables that may influence children's perceptions and these factors deserve further study in relation to children's perceptions of student-teacher relationships. Although caution is advised in generalizing the results of this research, and further study and replication are needed, it is possible to consider some applications of the findings to other children in middle childhood who have experienced similar student-teacher relationship circumstances.

Main Findings

There were recurring themes in the structured interview and story completion task. The patterns in the data were indicators of consistency. There were four main findings that emerged. They were: (1) That the children describe student-teacher relationships in behavioural, action-oriented terms, (2) That children know about the emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships, (3) That interactive teaching is effective and needed to elicit the children's social-emotional knowledge, and (4) That the children preferred the teacher who provided students with autonomy support. These findings are discussed in turn.

Relationships are Constructed in Actions

First, as other investigators have shown (Keating, 1996; Weiner, 1992) the results of the structured interview, story completion task, and teacher preference inquiry demonstrate that children are aware that relationships are constructed in actions and interactions which are social activities. The analysis of the structured interview data revealed that the children's descriptions of signs of "good" relationships between students and teachers were in action-oriented terms. The children described both the teacher and the student as actively involved in creating the good relationship. This concurs with work
by Solas (1992), Dunn (1993), and Gordon (1989). For example, students put effort into
their work, listen, pay attention, help the teacher, and behave appropriately. Teachers are
humorous, they provide feedback to students, they help children, and get to know
children by being with them. The children described student or teacher social behaviours
spontaneously, and with prompting they generated shared, student-teacher interactions
that they saw as being signs of a good relationship. The behavioural descriptions did not
include social-emotional information; however, the children expressed their active
participation, involvement, and engagement, showing that children contribute to and
continue the relationship. According to these respondents, good student-teacher
relationships included interpersonal social behaviours (e.g., sharing with others) that were
expressed more often as well rehearsed, rule-based learning (e.g., don’t hit) than good
work habit instructional behaviour. According to these children, academic
competence or achievement behaviours were not necessary for a good student-teacher
relationship. These children saw the student-teacher relationship as celebrating, walking,
talking together. This may be a reflection of the participants and their history of
educational enrichment. Further study would be needed with children with different
educational experiences, such as academic failure, extra assistance, or special class
placement.

During the story completion task there was evidence that the children described
the relationship in action and interaction patterns that were structured as well learned,
interpersonal routines. The story sequences of interpersonal behaviour described the
children’s knowledge of both the relationships between the class and the teacher as well
as between the student and the teacher. These social interaction routines could be
construed as regulating both class behaviour and individual behaviour. For example, at the class level, the children described the class as engaged in on-task behaviour (e.g., getting their work done or making their plans) after receiving instructions from the teacher. At the individual level, the children described the students as engaged with the teacher in a helping interaction. The helping interactions were most often initiated by a request for help by the hypothetical student. This may be a reflection of the children's willingness, trust, and security to engage in relationship with the teacher, seeking help and initiating requests.

The results indicate that 8- and 9-year-old bright and gifted children conceptualized student-teacher relationships in social-behavioural terms consisting of interpersonal interactions and work habits behaviours within the context of the assignments. The children's perceptions of student-teacher relationship appeared to be only somewhat related to the existing research on children’s perceptions of teachers (Levy et al. 1992; Mergendoller & Packer, 1985) and classroom climate (Fraser, 1986; Moos & Moos, 1978). This may be related to the different methodologies employed and conceptual differences. The situated learning activity and the interactive methodology provided the framework to draw out the rich diversity of the children’s expressions, compared to rating scales that may be searching for quantifiable characteristics. It may also be an indication that the children’s perceptions of the concepts are somewhat different, that is, student-teacher relationships may be considered to be only one component of their perception of teachers. These results should not be interpreted as an indication that the children do not know about other teacher characteristics or classroom
climate features, but rather that they were able to focus narrowly and in-depth on the concept of student-teacher relationship behaviours.

It can be concluded that these bright and gifted 8- and 9-year-old children have behavioural knowledge of student-teacher relationships, which was expressed in action-oriented and interaction-oriented terms. The children were aware that students and teachers were both creators of the relationship.

**Relationships Have an Emotional Component**

The second major finding of this study is that relationships were understood to have an emotional component. The children described emotional experiences for hypothetical students and teachers and they linked actions with emotions and attributions. The children demonstrated the ability to take both the hypothetical student and teacher emotional perspectives, to the three different classroom contexts. Both positive and negative emotional experiences were described as integral parts of the student-teacher interaction and the classroom climate. They were able to discuss the emotional landscape of the relationship. However, emotional qualities did not stand alone. There was an interplay between actions, emotions and cognitions, interpersonally and intrapersonally. Specifically, they knew what the teacher and student were feeling and thinking within the contextual boundaries, and they knew about the similarities and differences in their perspectives.

Evidence to support the conclusion that these 8- and 9-year-old children knew about the links between behavioural actions, emotions, and attributions within the student-teacher relationship were found throughout the story completion task activity.
Weiner's (1985, 1992) attribution theory and Dunn's (1993) relationship approach provided a basis for understanding emotions in the student-teacher interactions. Some examples are provided.

The cognitive attribution of "fairness" was an important concept generated spontaneously by only a few children, and it was perceived by the children to be a very emotionally sensitive topic. When they were asked what to do if they thought a teacher was unfair, the children strongly endorsed initiating a conversation with the teacher. While they knew this "should" be the course of action "so the teacher would be aware of what they were thinking" and so she would know "what she was doing," they also knew this course of action was very difficult and that emotions would be heightened. They knew that initiating a conversation with the teacher would not only raise the anxiety level of the student, but the teacher might have an emotional reaction as well.

Negative affect was an active component of the student-teacher interaction, from the child's perspective. Negative emotional experiences differentiated the characteristics of Ms. Wilson from both Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas. Negative emotions in the classroom were prevalent in the stories about Ms. Wilson's class. Children were aware of low-level negative emotions in the classroom that contributed to a climate of tension, inadequacy, helplessness, or hopelessness. For example, the hypothetical students' emotions of sadness and anxiety were linked to predictions of outcome failure, and when a deeper explanation seemed necessary, the children were able to integrate attributional thinking to make sense of the student's difficult situation and Ms. Wilson's inconsistent actions.
Positive emotional experiences, for both the hypothetical students and teacher, were linked to the class-teacher and student-teacher interactions, most often in the classes of Ms. Andrews (i.e., structured with teacher-controlled, consistent expectations) and Ms. Thomas (i.e., structured with student autonomy support). The children attributed the feelings of “good” and “happy” to outcome success, and teacher helpfulness as well as an opportunity for “decision making” in Ms. Thomas’ class.

The data showed that some children were aware that the hypothetical students and teachers might not be experiencing the same emotions, even though they both took part in a shared interaction. The emotional discrepancies that the children perceived between the hypothetical students’ and teachers’ perspectives are consistent with the findings of Fraser and O’Brien (1985) and Levy et al. (1992). However, results from this study show that there are deeper layers present, than in the findings of Fraser and O’Brien (1985). For example, when the hypothetical students were doing their work after the assignment was given, Ms. Wilson was described as angry and grumpy, while the students were described as sad, anxious, and predicting outcome failure. In other stories in which the students were described as working, the children described Ms. Andrews as happy, while the student was not described as feeling hopeful about success. Ms. Andrews was feeling happy and the student was feeling sad and anxious. Evidence here indicates that the children perceive the same situation differently, and it also shows that the children were aware of emotional experience discrepancies. Therefore, even though the student and teacher are interacting, the children’s perceptions matter. We cannot assume that their perceptions and emotions match the teachers, even though they participated in the context together.
Finally, only a few children seemed to perceive that emotions could change during “helping” interactions. The fact that there were only a few stories which included emotional experience changes may reflect: (a) that the children did not believe that the emotional experiences could change within the given context, (b) that the children were not aware that emotions could change in the student-teacher interaction or (c) that even though the teacher was responsive to the student and helped him, the student still felt negative about another perhaps over-riding factor, such as outcome success.

This study is important because it provides evidence supporting some claims from theories of social cognition. The participants’ awareness of the social, cognitive, behavioural, and emotional components inherent in the actions and interactions of classroom learning, can be considered as support. First, the links between actions, emotions and cognitions that were made by the children may be considered as support for Glick’s (1978) theory of social cognition, that is, that children establish and maintain social knowledge from social behaviours, and for Weiner’s (1992) attribution theory, that is, that attributions are applicable to social situations. Attributions were constructed by the respondents to elaborate on their understanding of students’ relationships with teachers in interpersonal and work habit behaviours. The children described emotion-outcome and emotion-attribution links for both the hypothetical students and teachers. The children’s perceptions of the student-teacher relationship and emotional experiences may also be considered to support Berger and Luckmann’s (1966) position that school experiences are secondary socialization experiences, characterized by emotionally controlled learning. The children’s descriptions of the hypothetical students’ and teachers’ emotional experiences were not extreme or disorganized, and instead, the
emotional descriptions could be considered to have a rational quality. The descriptions of
anxiety, sadness, shame, or anger for the hypothetical students or teachers did not totally
disrupt the classroom, or inhibit students and teachers from interacting. Even when the
hypothetical student and teacher were experiencing different, uncomfortable emotions,
the learning situation appeared to be challenging, but not problematic. Specifically, the
children perceived that when the hypothetical teachers (Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas)
were thinking and feeling positively about predicted outcome success and the students
were thinking and feeling negatively about predicted outcome failure, the students did not
give up. This may be interpreted as a challenging situation where the hypothetical
students were perceived as not holding hope for themselves but where the teachers were
perceived as holding it for the students. The students carry on, at least according to the
stories of these 8- and 9-year-old children.

**Effectiveness of the Interactive Teaching Methodology**

The third major finding is that while these children understood complex social-
emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships, they did not provide emotional
information spontaneously. There was evidence that the child-adult interactive teaching
methodology which was employed in this study was effective in eliciting social-
emotional knowledge connected to the situated learning interactions.

The structured interviews and story completion task data yielded social-
behavioural "actions" and "interactions" that were evident in good student-teacher
relationships. However, as stated above, the children did not independently include
emotional knowledge. The children initially described interactions between the student
and the teacher in sequential turn-taking actions, for example, a student requested help
and the teacher helped. These interactions were within familiar contextual boundaries, and seemed to provide the opportunity for the children to go beyond their action-oriented perceptions and express their knowledge about the social-emotional experiences which are active in the student-teacher relationship.

Taken together with the second major finding, the data showed that 8- and 9-year-old bright and gifted children knew about the emotional aspects of relationship, but time must be dedicated to working this knowledge out with an adult guide. Explicit attention and prompting is needed to elicit it. During the story completion task, the emotional aspects of the interaction were not ignored or avoided. Instead, time was devoted, the children were challenged and supported to process and describe the emotional components of the story’s events (see Methods section for a fuller description of the prompting).

The children were able to communicate emotion-outcome and emotion-attribution knowledge, as well as complex emotional experiences involving mixed emotions and emotion changes when given the contextual boundaries. On the one hand, the interactive situated learning approach allowed for explicit prompting, which in turn revealed social-emotional knowledge that was not spontaneously recalled or independently given from their repertoire of social knowledge, although it may have been known and recognized. On the other hand, the interactive approach may have provided some new learning, building bridges between social behavioural or action-oriented knowledge and their social-emotional knowledge. It is possible that the story completion task activity might have been a learning experience for some of the participants, because it provided an opportunity to explicitly differentiate student-teacher relationship components by actions,
emotions, and attributions. While it is not possible to know how much of the children's contributions to the story were a reflection of their own representations and lived experiences, and how much was created or learned during the interactive story itself, there is evidence from the familiarity ratings of the teachers that the children could have used their own prior knowledge.

Nevertheless, with adult-child situated learning interaction, the children were able to expand on their action-oriented knowledge, to describe emotions associated with the spontaneously expressed social-behavioural patterns of relationship. In Vygotskyan terms, when guidance was provided, the 8- and 9-year-old children displayed their "actual" behavioural level, social knowledge of student-teacher relationships and demonstrated their "potential" level of development. Social-emotional knowledge of student-teacher relationships fell within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), because their emotional knowledge was accessible with the support and guidance of the adult-child interaction.

The children were "stimuable" for emotional knowledge associated with student-teacher interaction. The term "stimuable" is borrowed from speech pathology to help explain the accessibility of child's emotional knowledge. For example, a speech pathologist may assess stimuability to produce sounds that are not in the phonological repertoire. Therapy may be needed to teach the child to produce the sounds, or explicitly draw the child’s attention to the sounds in spontaneous speech and to reinforce the targeted sounds in day to day communication. A similar model of “stimuability” seems applicable to a child’s emotional knowledge, in order to describe the prompting or mediation needed to draw a child’s attention to his or her emotional knowledge or acquire
new distinctions in day to day situations. The social-emotional knowledge of student-teacher relationships for these bright and gifted 8- and 9-year-olds may be emerging and accessible with the guidance of adult-child interaction.

**Teacher Preference from the Interactive Situated Learning Methodology**

Children’s perceptions of student-teacher relationships can be examined in terms of children’s preferences, using the situated learning interactions. The participants in this study identified many satisfactory and familiar teacher characteristics. The children’s differentiation between the preferred teacher and the most familiar teacher turned on only one characteristic — autonomy support. The majority of these children preferred the hypothetical teacher who empowered students to plan and make decisions, within the context of teacher support.

The majority of the children (13 of the 15) said that they preferred a teacher (i.e., Ms. Thomas) who allowed students to make decisions and choices. Ms. Thomas did not make a reward (going to the surprise) contingent upon work completion, opening up opportunity for meaningful student decision making. This teacher embodied good teaching practices such as taking time for organizational tasks, facilitating planning, encouraging goal setting, and providing individual conferencing with students to support decision making. These characteristics, however, were not mentioned spontaneously when the children were asked why they preferred this teacher. Their preferences appeared to have been formulated, at least in part, from their own need to make decisions and for autonomy support as well as from the social contextual boundaries of the story, differentiating the hypothetical teacher characteristics.
At the outset of the story, the teacher characteristics were differentiated, the emotional aspects of the context were articulated, and preferences were formulated. While the children’s perceptions of teachers’ emotional and behavioural characteristics distinguished Ms. Wilson from Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas throughout the story, the children clearly differentiated Ms. Thomas from Ms. Andrews, on only one characteristic, that is, allowing students to make decisions. There were many other similarities between the children’s perceptions of the preferred and familiar teachers, including involvement, structure, stability, consistency, helping, fairness, listening, student and teacher interaction, and student and teacher emotional experiences. None of these characteristics distinguished Ms. Thomas from Ms. Andrews. The children’s perceptions and contextual ratings showed that these were desirable teacher characteristics and that these characteristics can co-exist with either decision making in the context of teacher supported daily planning (i.e., Ms. Thomas) or external reward, contingent upon work completion delivered in a context of consistent class routines (i.e., Ms. Andrews).

The preference for Ms. Thomas and decision making may be an indicator of the children’s emotional readiness and motivational eagerness for self-determination, to take responsibility for their learning. This was evident in the positive emotional experiences of the hypothetical students and Ms. Thomas. The teacher acknowledged that students could achieve successful outcomes by planning for task and time management, and with the teacher supporting their decision making, and without externally controlling the students’ goals (i.e., pairing a reward with work completion). One alternative hypothesis, is that when something desirable, for example, the surprise was available only under conditional circumstances, an element of uncertainty was created for the children, and this
was associated with feelings of anxiety and put more emphasis on outcome success. It
seems reasonable to suggest that when students were supported in planning and decision-
making, they were offered a share in the control of the situation and the surprise was
necessarily no longer conditional. Instead, it may have been perceived as an opportunity
to take some ownership and responsibility for the outcome. This is important because it
suggests that attributional thinking of self-determination and controllability of the
situation made by the respondents influenced their own emotions.

The children’s preference for decision making agrees with the findings of Ryan
and Powelson (1991). In addition, the children’s preference for emotional experiences of
happiness within the context of autonomy support, concurs with the teacher preference
findings of Porter (1993), Wendel and Heiser (1989), and Freeman (1987). This study
provides evidence that the understanding of children’s preferences for teacher
characteristics can be enriched by examining the links between student-teacher
interactions-emotions-attributions. The children’s reported preference for a teacher to
empower students to make decisions appeared to promote feelings of happiness
associated with outcome success and attributions of self-determination and controllability.
Anxiety, fear, sadness or anger from a threatened loss of privileges are removed from the
learning experience. Furthermore, although only a few children demonstrated an
understanding that emotions can change during interactions between a student and a
teacher it is important to recognize and address the possibilities for emotion changes.

From my practical experience, describing the complexity of children’s perceptions
of student-teacher relationships contributes a new understanding of the profound impact
of the children’s perception of student-teacher relationship on the children’s engagement
in learning activities, academic success, and the children’s social and emotional development. Approaching children’s perceptions of student-teacher relationships with the knowledge that emotions are socially constructed and dynamic within relationships provides the opportunity to examine the children’s perceptions comprehensively in terms of behaviours, thoughts, and feelings. The experiences of the students and the teachers are captured, analyzed, and described, and this results in a better fit between what the research has found to date and what is actually happening in student-teacher relationships.

Implications

This study represents a firm beginning in the development of themes and concepts regarding the nature of children’s perceptions of student-teacher relationships. Hypotheses for applied research and implications for educational practice can be generated. This study opens the door to the consideration that children’s perceptions of student-teacher relationship may not only influence engagement in academic learning and cognitive achievement, but also that these perceptions have a potential impact on the social and emotional development of the child, and potentially, the shape of our society.

The student-teacher relationship is formal and institutionalized in our culture. Almost every child must be involved in student-teacher relationships for at least 10 years. Student-teacher relationships provide socialization experiences for most children, and for some children this may be the child’s first encounter with an adult-child relationship outside of the family. This research acknowledges that school is not purely an academic achievement exercise. The participants in this study were aware that teachers and students create their learning environment. The children perceived learning as more than an academic achievement exercise. They perceived learning as a social activity, occurring
within relationship, consisting of primarily social and interpersonal interaction. From these children's perceptions, there is evidence that student-teacher interactions not only influence and serve to regulate children's social behaviours but that they also have the potential to impact on the children's social-emotional development.

Educational experiences and student-teacher interactions cannot be viewed as purely academic tasks influencing the child's cognitive development. The whole child is involved. The social-emotional aspects of learning cannot be ignored and they need to be considered as formative experiences in the child's life (Porath & Matthews, 1997).

Similarly, Wells (1997) emphasized that adult-child interaction within situated learning activities provides the context for identity formation. This study has demonstrated that social, emotional and cognitive aspects are seen as involved in learning. Growth occurs through student-teacher relationship in the context of academic and nonacademic tasks.

We need to talk to children. We need to listen to children. We need to support, engage and challenge children as they learn about themselves and others. Through shared activities the whole child is growing and learning.

Wells (1997) has argued, from a Vygotskian perspective, that not only does the individual child’s identity develop within contextually bound activities with others, but that on a broader level, society is constructed. Society is sustained and transformed by the shared activities that occur within relationships. The participants interact within a relationship which is embedded in multiple layers of society consisting of the classroom, school, educational system, and culture. Wells equated learning with transformation where participants are continually changing as they work together in specific situated
activities of problem solving and social activity. Thus on a slower time scale, changes or transformations may occur within these social structures.

**Applied Educational Research Considerations**

On the one hand, the results of this study can be considered robust. All the children were able to describe the social, behavioural, emotional, and attributional aspects of student-teacher relationships within contextual boundaries, with adult-child interaction. On the other hand, the results are also fragile, because the findings can only be interpreted in the context in which they were obtained. Different results might emerge if the context or if the adult-child interaction changed. The interactive situated learning approach was successful in stimulating the bright and gifted 8- and 9-year-old children’s social-emotional knowledge and this can be considered an important finding. Adult-child interaction and situated learning experiences for research purposes needs to be recognized.

It remains to be seen how other children perceive student-teacher relationships and how these relationships are related to motivation. Do other children this age perceive decision making as salient, preferable, and motivational? Do other children this age want to be challenged, to take some responsibility for their learning? Are other children this age “stimulable” for social-emotional aspects of student-teacher relationships? What are the influences of age, gender, and development on children’s perceptions of student-teacher relationships? There is a need to continue to develop the interactive, situated learning methodology with other samples of children, in different settings, with different adult mediation and situated learning boundaries.
Educational Practice Considerations

Teachers need to be aware that action-oriented discussions about relationships with children may be limited. Even though the children spontaneously and consistently talk about student-teacher relationships in action terms, this does not necessarily represent all that children know. The children in this study were able to use social-behavioural aspects of relationship to describe social-emotional aspects, and perhaps other children could as well.

Adults need to take the time to develop relationships with students through interactions and problem solving together (Paley, 1986). Some suggested strategies are as follows: (a) Provide structure and consistency by developing mutually understood class routines. These children explained a preference for a class structure where the teacher shared meaningful decision making with the students and they found this motivating; (b) Reflect on the messages teachers impart and how they are received. Students and teachers need time to self-evaluate and reflect on social-behavioural and emotional aspects of their interactions. Students and teachers may perceive situations and the emotional impact of the situation differently; (c) Elicit children’s feedback and integrate their input. Ask their opinions, let the children lead. Leave the exploration open-ended to see what dimensions the children choose to discuss; (d) During discussions, wait for children to retrieve the social aspects of an event and probe directly if needed, to help them articulate their perceptions. Prompt them to deal with the thoughts and feelings of others to better understand who they are, what they are like, why they think and act as they do; (e) Help them to process the social and emotional information, to compare, contrast, differentiate, to understand individual differences, using social-behavioural and social-emotional terms;
(f) Allow for emotional learning by not avoiding the situation or distracting the child from uncomfortable feelings. Work through them; (g) Develop shared problem solving stories to help children learn the connections between the beginning, middle, and end of challenging interpersonal situations, blending relationship knowledge of interactions, thinking, and emotions.

**Educational System Considerations**

First, the role of the child’s social and emotional learning in education has been overshadowed by the emphasis on academic achievement. Educators have necessarily focused on the development of cognitive processes and the acquisition of culturally valued academic achievements. Schools have been mandated to work in the realm of “academic” (linguistic and mathematical) achievement but not social and emotional development (Educational Improvement Commission, 1998). Education has been and continues to be dominated by the goal of preparing youth for the work setting or the academic setting—not empowering the child or youth for lifelong learning, working, interacting, and playing with others.

Second, within the field of education, cognitive development and social-emotional development have not been viewed as integral facets of the developing child (Oatley and Nundy, 1996). Education has been seen as rational cognitive processing of information, and emotions have been seen as behaviour to be controlled or regulated— as something separate from thinking. Emotions have been minimized when they have been recognized as functioning in the classroom. The goal of emotional self-regulation to optimize academic learning has been emphasized. Children are valued for their mastery of learning outcomes and their self-control of behaviour. Children are not simply learning
the curriculum when they go to school. Their success cannot be measured only in terms of their mastery of prescribed learning outcomes.

The notion that family experiences rather than school experiences have the greatest influence on a child's emotional development and academic progress (Good & Brophy, 1986) has been emphasized in education. This emphasis suggests that school experiences have limited influence on the social and emotional growth of the child (except perhaps to optimize academic achievement and to avoid disruption to classroom program delivery). This interpretation must be challenged. Children deserve to be viewed as part of a thinking and feeling world that exists beyond the bounds of the family.

The educational system needs to renew its commitment to educating a whole child, a thinking and feeling child, and not just the cognitive and academic facets of the child. The positive and negative emotional experiences of interpersonal relationships are integrally involved in shaping social and cognitive development and contribute to different developmental pathways according to Fischer et al (1990), Dunn (1988) and Case et al (1988). There is an urgent need to recognize the impact of student-teacher relationships on children's social, emotional, and cognitive development. As children learn the valued skills of the culture through student-teacher relationship, they are gaining not only academic achievement skills, but also a culturally accepted repertoire of social and emotional skills. Social and emotional learning cannot be separated from cognitive learning. They are inextricably linked.

Educators need to acknowledge that the behavioural, cognitive, social, and emotional aspects of the student-teacher relationship are essential to education. Learning
must be considered as the processing of behavioural-social-emotional-cognitive
information, where all strands of development are integrally connected in a complex way.

Educators need to consider the influential nature of the student-teacher relationship -- to
consider these educational experiences as formative experiences for students, teachers,
schools, systems, and society. Educators need time and resources to be as fully informed
as possible, to take the responsibility of educating the whole child.
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Appendix A

PARENTAL PERMISSION LETTER
ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Dear Parents or Guardians,

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto has many staff and graduate students who do research to learn more about children. This project is being conducted in fulfillment of a Ph.D. requirement.

At the present time we are interested in exploring what children know and can express about student-teacher relationships. Each child will be interviewed individually in one or two sessions. The children will be asked to complete a rating scale and participate in a brief structured interview as well as an interactive story completion task. The children will be supervised at all times.

The total time required from each student is 1 1/2 to 2 hours. All attempts will be made to schedule the appointments so they do not interfere with important class lessons but it is only fair to let you know that your son or daughter may need to complete missed work.

The results of this study will in no way affect the grades of your child's school work. It is hoped that this work will contribute to the future development of processes teachers can use to understand and address student needs in emotional, social and cognitive development.

All information will be handled with strict confidentiality. Only researchers will see the coded information and no responses can be directly connected to a particular student or teacher.

This research has been approved by a thesis committee and an ethics committee, however, the final decision regarding participation of each child must be made by the parent(s) or guardian(s). Your permission allowing your child to participate in this educational research would be greatly appreciated. Involvement in this study is voluntary and students' assent will also be obtained, informing them of what the research entails, privacy of information and their rights to withdraw at anytime if they wish.

Would you please complete the permission slip? We would appreciate receiving an answer even if you do not wish your child to participate, so we are certain that all parents, have in fact, received this request.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact me at (905) 945-8934.

Sincerely,

Prof. Peter Gamlin, PhD
Faculty Supervisor

Jo-Ann Reitzel, MASc
Graduate Student
PARENTAL CONSENT FORM
ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

PLEASE MARK ONE OF THE THREE RESPONSES, COMPLETE THE BOTTOM PORTION AND SEND THIS FORM BACK TO SCHOOL WITH YOUR CHILD.

_____ I have read the permission letter and I agree to have my child participate in the research exploring children's perceptions of student-teacher interactions being conducted in school, by Dr. P. Gamlin and Ms. J. Reitzel.

_____ I am willing to be contacted for any follow-up.

_____ I would like more information before giving permission for my child to participate in this study. Please call me at ______________. The most convenient time to reach me is ______________.

_____ I do not wish my child to participate in this study.

***********************************************************************************

Parent's/Guardian's Signature

Date

Name of Child

Date of Birth of Child
STUDENT'S ASSENT

I understand that I have been asked to participate in research studying what children know about getting along with teachers. I understand that I will be interviewed in private and everything I say will be kept private. I understand that my name will not be on any of the questionnaires. I will keep my answers private too.

I understand that there will be one or two interviews and what I say won't make any difference in my grades.

I understand that I do not need to answer any questions that I don't want to and I can finish early if I want to.

If I have any questions I can talk to you or ask my parent/guardian to call you.

I agree to participate in this study.

Child's signature __________________________

Interviewer signature __________________________

Date __________________________
### Self Report Orientation Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rate the following items by circling the one that is most true:

**Part A) When I'm with my teacher, I feel:**

1. **relaxed**
   - ALMOST
   - ALWAYS
   - SOME OF THE TIME
   - NOT VERY
   - OFTEN
   - ALMOST
   - NEVER

2. **ignored**
   - ALMOST
   - ALWAYS
   - SOME OF THE TIME
   - NOT VERY
   - OFTEN
   - ALMOST
   - NEVER

3. **happy**
   - ALMOST
   - ALWAYS
   - SOME OF THE TIME
   - NOT VERY
   - OFTEN
   - ALMOST
   - NEVER

4. **mad**
   - ALMOST
   - ALWAYS
   - SOME OF THE TIME
   - NOT VERY
   - OFTEN
   - ALMOST
   - NEVER

5. **important**
   - ALMOST
   - ALWAYS
   - SOME OF THE TIME
   - NOT VERY
   - OFTEN
   - ALMOST
   - NEVER

6. **unhappy**
   - ALMOST
   - ALWAYS
   - SOME OF THE TIME
   - NOT VERY
   - OFTEN
   - ALMOST
   - NEVER
7. bad
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER

8. ashamed
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER

9. thankful
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER

10. proud
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER

PART B)
I wish:
1. my teacher paid more attention to me.
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER

2. my teacher could spend more time with me.
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER

3. my teacher knew more about how I feel.
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER

4. I was closer to my teacher.
ALMOST    SOME OF    NOT VERY    ALMOST
ALWAYS    THE TIME   OFTEN       NEVER
5. I could talk about more things with my teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART C)
1. My teacher tries to control everything I do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. My teacher doesn't know me very well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. My teacher likes the other kids in my class better than me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. My teacher doesn't seem to have enough time for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. My teacher lets me decide things for myself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. My teacher cares about how I do in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. My teacher interrupts me when I have something to say.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. My teacher has plenty of time for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. My teacher doesn't make clear what they expect of me in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. My teacher likes to be with me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. My teacher is fair with me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. My teacher doesn't explain why we have to learn certain things in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. My teacher thinks what I say is important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. My teacher talks about the connections between schoolwork and things in my life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. My teacher isn't fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Some of The Time</th>
<th>Not Very Often</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
16. My teacher doesn't talk about how schoolwork is related to what I want to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. My teacher's expectations for me are realistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The rules in my classroom are clear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. My teacher's expectations for me are way off base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMOST</th>
<th>SOME OF</th>
<th>NOT VERY</th>
<th>ALMOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>THE TIME</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Preliminary Analysis of Self-Report Ratings

Interquartile range scores were calculated as positional measures of variability (see Table 1). Interquartile range scores are not sensitive to sample size and are not affected by extreme scores. The range score is the difference between the values at the 3rd and 1st quartiles. It is noteworthy that the Emotional Quality range score is large, indicating more scatter. The range scores for the Contextual Resources variables do not reveal wide discrepancies.

Table C1

Interquartile Differences of Self-Report Ratings (n=15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Interquartile Range Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Quality</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity Seeking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

The children were able to rate their social-emotional perceptions of relatedness and availability of contextual resources to meet needs.

The perceptions of emotional quality with teachers and contextual resources for teacher involvement, autonomy support and structure obtained from a rating scale, were not uniform for this sample of 8- to 9-year-old bright and gifted children.

Conclusions:

These scores need to be interpreted with caution. The variability in the children’s raw score perceptions of emotional quality and contextual resources may be a research design artefact. The ratings could be considered as a snapshot of their opinions of where they were at in their actual teacher-student relationship rather than an estimate of their perceptions in general.

The self-report data may suggest an initial picture of individual differences. There clearly were high and low ratings of emotional quality and these appeared to be associated with contextual resource ratings of Structure, Autonomy Support and Involvement. The children are aware of social and emotional aspects of their relationship with their actual teacher, and not all participants reported positive relations. This suggested that there are individual differences perhaps in what they know and how they feel in their actual relationship with their teacher.
Appendix D
Structured Interview

PREAMBLE This research begins with the understanding that all individuals are different. Do you think all people are different? (WAIT FOR AN ANSWER) Because everyone is different, we need to realize that some things that others do please us a lot while other things may please us less.

1. What do you think are the student characteristics that contribute to a good student-teacher relationship? What do you think are the things a student can do that helps with getting along with a teacher? (Listen for verbal responses) This is going to be a pie chart. Do you know what a pie chart is? (WAIT FOR AN ANSWER) Now, show on this pie chart, called Things a Student Can Do to Get Along with a Teacher, what the characteristics are and how important each one is by dividing the pie into different sized pieces depending on how important that piece is. Then label each piece of the pie. You might want to list the necessary things first and then decide how important each is. (PROMPT IF NEEDED >>> For example, you may think it is important for students to listen, behave, concentrate, try hard, get work done, get good marks, be smart, to get along with the teacher and students, to treat others fairly or with respect, to express thoughts and feelings freely.)

2. What do you think are the teacher characteristics that contribute to a good student-teacher relationship? What do you think are the things a teacher can do that helps with getting along with students? (Listen for verbal responses) Now, show on this pie chart, called Things a Teacher Can Do to Get Along with a Student, what the characteristics are and how important each one is by dividing the pie into different sized pieces depending on how important that piece is. Then label each piece of the pie. You might want to list the necessary characteristics first and then decide how important each is. (PROMPT IF NEEDED >>> For instance you might think it is important for teachers to provide clear instructions, act in a predictable way, get along with others, respect students ideas, encourage students for their effort, expect high standards, be funny, like children etc.)

3. What do you think are the characteristics of a good student-teacher relationship? What are the signs that a student and teacher get along together? Show on this pie chart, called Characteristics of a Good Student-Teacher Relationship, what the characteristics are and how important each one is by dividing the pie into different sized pieces depending on how important each piece is. Then label each piece of the pie. You might want to list the necessary characteristics first and then decide how important each is.

4. What advice would you give to a new student, coming into your class, on how to get along with your teacher?

5. What advice would your teacher give to a new student, coming into your class, on how to get along with her/him?
THINGS A STUDENT CAN DO TO GET ALONG WITH A TEACHER
THINGS A TEACHER CAN DO TO GET ALONG WITH A STUDENT
CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD STUDENT-TEACHER RELATIONSHIP
Appendix E

Story completion task activity

Materials: Playmobil figures of students and teachers, chairs, desks, chalk boards etc...

PART 1
Scenario 1 Child's perception of greeting and game

GREETING

One day children, just about your age, arrived at school. The teachers, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Andrews and Ms. Thomas, greeted the children at the door saying something to each student like "Hello" and "Good morning" and "How are you?" and "You look great." (make dolls walk in, have S help) We are going to look in on each classroom and see what is going on.

Ms. Wilson's Scenario 2-a children's perception of class management

Let's look in the first classroom. After putting away their coats and bags, the class was seated, (stand teacher in front of class and seat the children, have S help) Ms. Wilson announced "Remember, yesterday I told you that we would be going to the surprise presentation in Mr. Jones' classroom. His class has invited us because they know that you would enjoy their surprise. [What do you think the surprise is? (let child respond) It's a surprise so we won't tell the students, OK?] Ms. Wilson went on "Well, I just changed my mind. It just dawned on me that all your language work needs to be done correctly before recess and then you can go. The assignments are difficult today so you will really have to work hard.

Now, the children in this class usually had no trouble with reading or writing, all of them were good in language, but if students were not finished Ms. Wilson told them that they would go to complete their work in the library. Ms. Wilson sat down to do some marking (seat the teacher)

COMPREHENSION PROBE

Tell me back, what I just told you about the assignment, the surprise, Ms. Wilson and the students. (Correct & reinforce)

PREDICTION 2a-1

What do you predict will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and the students are thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the students would use.

STOP!!!!!! WAIT FOR A RESPONSE
(PROMPT FOR THOUGHTS OR FEELINGS IF OMITTED AND FOR THE OTHER CHARACTER(S) IF BOTH HAVE NOT BEEN DESCRIBED)

Tell me what the _______ is/are thinking/feeling (which ever was not given first).
And now tell me about what the _______ is/are thinking and feeling.
AUTONOMY/CONTROL (rating scale at end of Part 1)
1. How much control do the students think the teacher has in this class?
2. How much control do the students think they have in this class?
3. How much freedom do the children feel they have to make choices or decide things for themselves?

INvolvement (rating scale at end of Part 1)
4. How much do the students feel like their teacher cares about how they do in school?
5. How well do they think their teacher knows them?
6. How much time do they think their teacher has for them?
7. How much do they think their teacher tries to make students feel safe and secure in getting along with her?

Respect for Each Other (rating scale at end of Part 1)
8. How much do they think Ms Wilson respects them?
9. How much does Ms Wilson think the children respect her?

Listen to Each Other (rating scale at end of Part 1)
10. How much do they think she listens to them?
11. How much does Ms Wilson think they listen to her?

Structure (rating scale at end of Part 1)
12. How consistent do the students think she is?
13. How realistic do they think her expectations are?
14. How clear do they think the classroom rules are?
15. How much do they know about what to count on or expect?

Fairness (part of structure) (rating scale at end of Part 1)
16. How fair do they think this teacher is? Why?
(PROMPT IF NEEDED) Is her expectation fair, that they have to get all their work done before the surprise? Why? Is the way she explained her expectation fair? Why?

If a student in this class thought the teacher was unfair should that student tell the teacher that they don't think this is fair? Why? What would the student be thinking, feeling, saying?

Reality Check
Have you ever had a teacher like this one? Do you know students that think about teachers the way you described?

Ms. Andrews' Scenario 2-b children's perception of class management
Let's look in Ms. Andrews' classroom. After the bell rang and the class was seated, (stand teacher in front of class and seat the children, have S help) Ms. Andrews announced "Today is the day that we have been invited to the surprise presentation in Mr. Jones' classroom. His class has invited us because they know that you would enjoy their surprise. Do you remember what the surprise is? (let child respond and help recall of correct if not the same as given in scenario 2-a.) It's a surprise so we won't tell the students, OK?" Ms. Andrews went on "Remember I explained yesterday, while I want you all to be able to go, we agreed the presentation is like a free-time activity. Therefore, the language work should be done before you have free-time. Remember when we wrote our class routines together, we all agreed that anyone can earn free-time by completing work first. The assignments are difficult today so you will really have to work hard."
Now, the children in this class usually had no trouble with reading or writing, all of them were good in language. Ms. Andrews added that the students really had a choice whether they wanted to go or not. If they didn't have their work done they were choosing not to go and they could go work in the library. She finished her announcement by asking the children if they had any questions. Ms. Andrews answered the questions and sat down to do some marking (seat the teacher).

COMPREHENSION PROBE
Tell me back, what I just told you about the assignment, the surprise, Ms. Andrews and the students. (Correct & reinforce)

PREDICTION 2b-1
What do you predict will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and the students are thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the students would use.

STOP!!!!!!! WAIT FOR A RESPONSE
(PROMPT FOR THOUGHTS OR FEELINGS IF OMITTED AND FOR THE OTHER CHARACTER(S) IF BOTH HAVE NOT BEEN DESCRIBED)
Tell me what ________ is/are thinking and feeling (which ever was not given).
And now tell me about what the ________ is/are thinking and feeling.

AUTONOMY/CONTROL (rating scale at end of Part 1)
1. How much control do the students think the teacher has in this class?
2. How much control do the students think they have in this class?
3. How much freedom do the children feel they have to make choices or decide things for themselves?

INVOLVEMENT (rating scale at end of Part 1)
4. How much do the students feel like their teacher cares about how they do in school?
5. How well do they think their teacher knows them?
6. How much time do they think their teacher has for them?
7. How much do they think their teacher tries to make students feel safe and secure in getting along with her?

RESPECT FOR EACH OTHER (rating scale at end of Part 1)
8. How much do they think Ms Andrews respects them?
9. How much does Ms Andrews think the children respect her?

LISTEN TO EACH OTHER (Rating scale at end of Part 1)
10. How much do they think she listens to them?
11. How much does Ms Andrews think they listen to her?

STRUCTURE (rating scale at end of Part 1)
12. How consistent do the students think she is?
13. How realistic do they think her expectations are?
14. How clear do they think the classroom rules are?
15. How much do they know about what to count on or expect?

FAIRNESS (part of structure) (rating scale at end of Part 1)
16. How fair do they think this teacher is? Why?
Is her expectation fair, that they have to get all their work done before the surprise? Why? Is the way she explained her expectation fair? Why?

If a student in this class thought the teacher was unfair should that student tell the teacher that they don't think this is fair? Why? What would the student be thinking, feeling, saying?

REALITY CHECK

Have you ever had a teacher like this one? Do you know students that think about teachers the way you described?

Ms. Thomas Scenario 2-c children's perception of class management

Let's look in the third classroom. After putting away their coats and bags, the class was seated. Ms. Thomas announced “Today is the day that we have been invited to the surprise presentation in Mr. Jones’ classroom after morning recess. His class has invited us because they know that you would enjoy their surprise.” [Do you remember what the surprise is? (let child respond and help recall or correct if not the same as given in scenario 2-a.)] It's a surprise so we won’t tell the students, OK? Ms. Thomas went on “It is your choice to go or not. You need to know that there is some difficult language work this morning and some of you may choose to spend more time on it.” Now, the children in this class usually had no trouble with reading or writing, all of them were good in language. Ms. Thomas continued “Remember it is up to you to decide how you want to spend your time because in real life you need to take responsibility for your own work. Some of you may also have other assignments and projects that you are working on. You may have thought you would use your time this morning for this work. If you want, you can work in the library this morning after recess or take the work home tonight if you choose. Remember, I am here to help you and you can always discuss your questions with your language buddy but it is up to you to decide what you want to do.

Now we need to plan our morning time. I will tell you my plan. I will have 5 of our regular, individual interviews, so if it is your day please bring your self-evaluations, daily planner and work folders to interview today. I will also stay in the classroom for individual or small group help. If any of you feel you need this please just sign up on my daily planner. I’ll leave it out on my desk. At recess I have a short staff meeting and I will take students to the surprise in Mr. Jones’ room after recess. If you choose to work all morning, you are welcome to work in the library after recess.

Now, take 5 minutes and think about how you choose to spend your morning. Then fill out your daily planner showing what you will be doing, where you will do it and when you expect to have you work completed. I am here now to help you, if any of you are having difficulty making your decisions. Please leave your plan out on your desk or table so both you and I can refer to it or revise it if needed. Now, Questions? Do any of you have questions?

After answering questions, everyone made their morning plans and set to work.

Ms. Thomas began with the interviews.

COMPREHENSION PROBE

Tell me back, what I just told you about the assignment, the surprise, Ms. Thomas and the students. (Correct & reinforce)
PREDICTION 2c-1
What do you predict will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and the students are thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the students would use.

STOP!!!!!!! WAIT FOR A RESPONSE
(PROMPT FOR THOUGHTS OR FEELINGS IF OMITTED AND FOR THE OTHER CHARACTER(S) IF BOTH HAVE NOT BEEN DESCRIBED)
Tell me what _________ is/are thinking and feeling (which ever was not given).
And now tell me about what the _________ is/are thinking and feeling.

AUTONOMY/CONTROL (rating scale at end of Part 1)
1. How much control do the students think the teacher has in this class?
2. How much control do the students think they have in this class?
3. How much freedom do the children feel they have to make choices or decide things for themselves?

INVOLVEMENT (rating scale at end of Part 1)
4. How much do the students feel like their teacher cares about how they do in school?
5. How well do they think their teacher knows them?
6. How much time do they think their teacher has for them?
7. How much do they think their teacher tries to make students feel safe and secure in getting along with her?

RESPECT FOR EACH OTHER (rating scale at end of Part 1)
8. How much do they think Ms Thomas respects them?
9. How much does Ms Thomas think the children respect her?

LISTEN TO EACH OTHER (rating scale at end of Part 1)
10. How much do they think she listens to them?
11. How much does Ms Thomas think they listen to her?

STRUCTURE (rating scale at end of Part 1)
12. How consistent do the students think she is?
13. How realistic do they think her expectations are?
14. How clear do they think the classroom rules are?
15. How much do they know about what to count on or expect?

FAIRNESS (part of structure) (rating scale at end of Part 1)
16. How fair do they think this teacher is? Why?
(PROMPT IF NEEDED) Is her expectation fair, that they have to get all their work done before the surprise? Why? Is the way she explained her expectation fair? Why?

REality_check
If a student in this class thought the teacher was unfair should that student tell the teacher that they don't think this is fair? Why? What would the student be thinking, feeling, saying?

HAVE YOU EVER HAD A TEACHER LIKE THIS ONE? DO YOU KNOW STUDENTS THAT THINK ABOUT TEACHERS THE WAY YOU DESCRIBED?

Take a break if needed
Part 2
STUDENT-TEACHER INTERACTION SCENARIOS
MEMORY AID FOR MS. WILSON'S CLASS

We are going to look into Ms. Wilson's classroom first. Recall that she has changed her mind from yesterday and now told the class that they have to get all their language work done before recess or else they could not go to the surprise presentation. Also recall that she did not give them a reason for changing her mind except that it had just dawned on her that they should have all their work done first.

Scenario 3 Task difficulty/having difficulty completing
(Hold up a boy in Ms Wilson's class.)

Now I'm going to tell you about Billy. Billy usually has no trouble with language assignments and concentrating on his work. Today however, he is stuck on a really difficult question. He keeps reading the question over and over but can't figure out an answer to write down. He wants to go to the surprise but he is really having trouble getting the work done because it is very difficult.

COMPREHENSION PROBE
Now tell me what you know about Billy. (and then fill in any details missing).
REALITY CHECK
Do you know any children who are like ______? 
PREDICTION 3-1
What do you think will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and Billy would be thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the student would use. (PROMPT IF NEEDED) What should the child or teacher do? (IF NEEDED) What should the ______ do?

THOUGHTS, FEELINGS AND LOOKS
How did ______ look? How did the teacher look?
What was the child thinking? Use the words that ______ would use. Why? What was ______ feeling? Why?
What was the teacher thinking? Use the words that the teacher would use. Why? What was the teacher feeling? Why?
Could the teacher think or feel another way? How?
PREDICTION 3-2
Does ______ think he will get done before recess?
Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?

Scenario 4 Weak concentration/having difficulty completing
(Hold up a boy in Ms. Wilson's class.)

Now I'm going to tell you about George. George usually has no trouble doing language assignments but he often has trouble concentrating on his work. He is really excited about the surprise and wants to go but today, George is really having trouble concentrating and getting work done.

COMPREHENSION PROBE
Now tell me what you know about George. (and then fill in any details missing).
REALITY CHECK
Do you know any children who are like George?
PREDICTION 4-1
What do you think will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and George would be thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the student would use.

(PROMPT IF NEEDED) What should the child or teacher do? (IF NEEDED) What should the _____ do?

THOUGHTS, FEELINGS AND LOOKS

How did _____ look? How did the teacher look?
What was the child thinking? Use the words that _____ would use. Why? What was the child feeling? Why?
What was the teacher thinking? Use the words that the teacher would use. Why? What was the teacher feeling? Why?
Could the teacher think or feel another way? How?

PREDICTION 4-2

Does _____ think he will get done before recess?
Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?

MEMORY AID FOR MS. ANDREWS' CLASS

We are going to look into Ms. Andrews' classroom next. Recall that she has explained to the class both yesterday and today that they had a choice whether they want to go to the surprise presentation but if they want to go they need to complete all their language work first. If they choose to not go they could work in the library. Ms. Andrews also told the class that she thought this was consistent with their class rule that they could have free time activities after completing their work. Finally she offered the children the chance to ask any questions.

Scenario 5 Task difficulty/having difficulty completing

(Hold up a boy in Ms. Andrews' class.)

Now I'm going to tell you about Paul. Paul usually has no trouble with language assignments and concentrating on his work. Today, he is stuck on a really difficult question. He keeps reading the question over and over but can't figure out an answer to write down. He wants to go to the surprise but he is really having trouble getting the work done because it is so difficult.

COMPREHENSION PROBE

Now tell me what you know about Paul? (and then fill in any details missing).

REALITY CHECK

Do you know any children who are like Paul?

PREDICTION 5-1

What do you think will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and Paul would be thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the student would use.

(PROMPT IF NEEDED) What should the child or teacher do? (IF NEEDED) What should the _____ do?

THOUGHTS, FEELINGS AND LOOKS

How did _____ look? How did the teacher look?
What was the child thinking? Use the words that _____ would use. Why? What was the child feeling? Why?
What was the teacher thinking? Use the words that the teacher would use. Why? What was the teacher feeling? Why?
Could the teacher think or feel another way? How?

PREDICTION 5-2

Does think he will get done before recess?

Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?

Scenario 6 Weak concentration/having difficulty completing

(Hold up a boy in Ms. Andrews' class.)

Now I'm going to tell you about Fred. Fred usually has no trouble doing language assignments but he often has trouble concentrating on his work. He is really excited about the surprise and wants to go but today, Fred is really having trouble concentrating and getting his work done.

COMPREHENSION PROBE

Now tell me what you know about Fred. (and then fill in any details missing).

REALITY CHECK

Do you know any children who are like Fred?

PREDICTION 6-1

What do you think will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and Fred would be thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the student would use.

(PROMPT IN NEEDED) What should the child or teacher do? (IF NEEDED) What should the _______ do?

THOUGHTS, FEELINGS AND LOOKS

How did _______ look? How did the teacher look?

What was the child thinking? Use the words that _______ would use. Why? What was _______ feeling? Why?

What was the teacher thinking? Use the words that the teacher would use. Why? What was the teacher feeling? Why?

Could the teacher think or feel another way? How?

PREDICTION 6-2

Does think he will get done before recess?

Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?

MEMORY AID FOR MS. THOMAS' CLASS

We are going to look into Ms. Thomas' classroom last. Recall that she told the students it was up to them to decide how they wanted to spend their time and when they wanted to get their work done because in real life they need to take responsibility for their own work. She shared her plan with the students and gave them direction to make their own planning decisions. Recall that Ms. Thomas had also asked if there were any questions and she offered to help students who requested it. The students were usually all good at language and today the assignment was difficult.

Scenario 7 Task difficulty/having difficulty completing

(Hold up a boy in Ms. Thomas' class.)

Now I'm going to tell you about Joe. Joe usually has no trouble with language assignments and concentrating on his work. Today however, he is stuck on a really difficult question. He keeps reading the question over and over but can't figure out an answer to write down. He wants to go to the surprise but he is really having trouble getting the work done because it is very difficult.
COMPREHENSION PROBE
Now tell me what you know about Joe. (and then fill in any details missing).
REALITY CHECK
Do you know any children who are like ______?
PREDICTION 7-1
What do you think will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and Joe would be thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the student would use. (PROMPT IF NEEDED) What should the child or teacher do? (IF NEEDED) What should the _______ do?
THOUGHTS, FEELINGS AND LOOKS
How did ______ look? How did the teacher look?
What was the child thinking? Use the words that ______ would use. Why? What was _______ feeling? Why?
What was the teacher thinking? Use the words that the teacher would use. Why? What was the teacher feeling? Why?
Could the teacher think or feel another way? How?
PREDICTION 7-2
Does ______ think he will get done before recess?
Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?
Scenario 8 Weak concentration/having difficulty completing
(Hold up a boy in Ms. Thomas' class.)
Now I'm going to tell you about Mark. Mark usually has no trouble doing language assignments but he often has trouble concentrating on his work. He is really excited about the surprise and wants to go but today, Mark is really having trouble concentrating and getting work done.
COMPREHENSION PROBE
Now tell me what you know about Mark. (and then fill in any details missing).
REALITY CHECK
Do you know any children who are like Mark?
PREDICTION 8-1
What do you think will happen next? Tell me what the teacher and Mark would be thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that the teacher and the student would use. (PROMPT IF NEEDED) What should the child or teacher do? (IF NEEDED) What should the _______ do?
THOUGHTS, FEELINGS AND LOOKS
How did ______ look? How did the teacher look?
What was the child thinking? Use the words that ______ would use. Why? What was _______ feeling? Why?
What was the teacher thinking? Use the words that the teacher would use. Why? What was the teacher feeling? Why?
Could the teacher think or feel another way? How?
PREDICTION 8-2
Does ______ think he will get done before recess?
Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?
Scenario 9 Conclusion

At recess the children all had to go outside because the teachers had to go to a short staff meeting. After recess all the children went back to their rooms. It was time to take the children to the surprise presentation.

CONCLUSION MEMORY AID FOR MS. WILSON'S CLASSROOM

Let's see how the story ends in Ms. Wilson's room. Remember Ms. Wilson told the class that they had to get all their work done before they could go. Remember she changed her mind from the day before. She did not give the students a choice whether they wanted to go or not. Their language assignment was hard that day. Remember the two students who were having difficulty and wanted to go. George had a hard time concentrating and Billy had difficulty getting the hard work done. (show the 2 boys)

CONCLUSION IN MS. WILSON'S ROOM

Tell me how the story ends in Ms. Wilson's classroom. What does Ms. Wilson think the students are thinking and feeling? How does Ms Wilson think they look? What do the students think Ms Wilson is thinking and feeling? How do they think she looks? STOP!!!!!!!!!

Could she think or feel another way? How? What else could she do?

CONCLUSION MEMORY AID FOR MS. ANDREWS' CLASSROOM

Remember Ms. Andrews explained to the class that they could go to the surprise presentation if they had their work done. She mentioned that this was similar to their class routine of having free-time activities after work was completed. Ms. Andrews also let them have a choice whether they wanted to go and gave them the opportunity to ask questions. Their language assignment was hard that day. Remember the two students who were having difficulty and wanted to go. Fred had a hard time concentrating and Paul had difficulty getting the hard work done. (show the 2 boys)

CONCLUSION IN MS. ANDREWS' CLASSROOM

Tell me how the story ends in Ms. Andrews' classroom. What does Ms. Andrews think the students are thinking and feeling? How does she think they look? What do the students think Ms. Andrews is thinking? Feeling? How do they think she looks? STOP!!!!!!!!!

Could she think or feel another way? How? What else could she do?

CONCLUSION MEMORY AID FOR MS. THOMAS' CLASSROOM

Remember Ms. Thomas gave the students the control to make their own decisions about when they would get their work done and where because in real life they need to take responsibility for their own work. She had the students complete a daily plan and she shared hers with the class. Recall that the language assignment was hard that day. Remember the two students who were having difficulty and wanted to go. Mark had difficulty concentrating and Joe had difficulty getting the hard work finished. (point to the two boys)

CONCLUSION IN MS. THOMAS' CLASSROOM
Tell me how the story ends in Ms. Thomas' classroom. What does Ms. Thomas think the students are thinking and feeling? How does she think they look? What do the students think Ms. Thomas is thinking? Feeling? How do they think she looks? STOP!!!!!!! Could she think or feel another way? How? What else could she do?
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RESPONSE SHEET FOR TEACHER COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
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COMPARISON OF TEACHERS

PREFERENCE
Which teacher do you prefer? Why?
How does this teacher make you want to learn?
How does this teacher make you feel?
What would the others teachers have to do to change so they could be a teacher you did prefer?

RANKING OF THREE TEACHERS
Order each teacher on a line from "almost never or not at all true" to "almost always or very true". Mark where each teacher would stand on the line with a different colour marker. We will do one teacher at a time. For example, if I said Ms. Wilson gives hard work, you might mark the line like this. (demonstrate) Ms. Wilson gets blue, Ms. Andrews gets purple and Ms. Thomas gets orange. Each marker is labeled.

Involvement
1. _______ cares about how students do in school
2. _______ has plenty of time for students
3. _______ likes to be with students
4. _______ doesn't know students very well
5. _______ likes some kids in the class better than others
6. _______ doesn't seem to have enough time for students

Autonomy Support
7. _______ lets students decide things for themselves
8. _______ talks about the connections between schoolwork and real life
9. _______ thinks what students say is important
10. _______ doesn't explain why students have to learn certain things in school
11. _______ doesn't talk about how schoolwork is related to what students want to be

Teacher Structure
12. _______ provides rules in the classroom that are clear
13. _______ is fair with students
14. _______ has expectations that are realistic for students
15. _______ doesn't make clear what they expect of students in school
16. _______ is not fair with students
17. _______ has expectations for students that are way off base

Extras (validity checks)
18. _______ provides a secure student-teacher relationship
19. _______ listens to students
20. _______ is willing to accept student input or feedback
21. _______ takes control herself
22. _______ respects students' ideas and questions
23. _______ is consistent with students
Appendix F

Structured Interview 1 Raw Data: Things a Student Can Do

S#1

1. make things for her
2. know her more
3. be nice to her
4. don’t get in trouble
5. if it’s Valentine’s Day they could give her a card
6. give presents on Christmas
7. If she assigns one page of homework you could do two cause she always lets ya (do more homework)
8. sometimes if something bad happens we hug her
9. They can ask for help

* no prompt given

S#2

1. a sense of humour
2. Good working habits, more good working habits
3. Well sitting down and doing what you’re supposed to be doing not talking and everything um
4. doing what you should do at home
* prompt given
5. that students listen to teachers
6. or that they behave
7. that they try hard, that they get work done
8. effort effort

S#3

1. behave
2. Do your work?
3. Try hard.
* prompt given
1. to behave
2. to listen and respect the teacher
3. to try hard on your work
4. treat others as you would like to be treated
1. Listen to the teacher.
2. Get good grades.
3. Walk with her at recess.

4. Behaving yourself in class.
5. Listen to the teacher.
6. Do what she or he says.
7. Never ignore the teacher.
8. Share stuff with your friends.
9. If at recess someone falls you can help pick them up.
10. Concentrate.
11. Get your work done.
12. Try hard to be really good.

5. Cooperate.
7. Listen.
8. Talk to... Talk to your teacher.

6. Be nice.
7. Be good.
8. Be helpful.
9. Don't fool around.
10. Don't make her mad.
11. Be nice to the kids and she will be nice to you.
12. Don't throw snowballs at the other kids; neither rocks.
13. Talk to the other kids instead of hitting them.
8. If they punch you don't punch them back.

1. I think one of the main ones is behaviour
   Behaving, behaviour has to be pretty good or bad things happen
   like getting in trouble
2. Effort
   * prompt given
3. Usually a good effort gets things done so effort I'd say is the building block of achievement.

S#9

1. Well by cooperating and by well they don't have to talk a lot, that they can work and get it done on time.
2. Listen to what they say
3. You could pay attention so you know what to do when she is explaining?
OK How would I say it? Well if you were sitting at your desk listening, doing your work but no. If you were sitting at your desk doing your work and somebody was trying to talk to you just say 'Can you please go because I am trying to do my work' and then the teacher will be pleased with you.
   *prompt given
5. Where do I have concentrating?
6. OK Expressing your feelings. Cause you want to keep them private if you can

S#10

1. Help him/her get prepared for something coming up
2. Help her/him get things that she needs
3. Behave for her
4. Talk to her/him
5. Listen to her/him
6. Help other students
7. Try hard
8. Play fairly
9. Get along with other students
10. Concentrate

S#11

1. Getting your work done quickly and well,
2. Having good behaviour,
3. Getting along with other children in the class—not bugging them, not stealing stuff from
them not if she teacher tells you to mark the work off something that is already marked
perfect you don't give the wrong answer when it is right.
* prompt given
4. Expressing your own feelings
5. And getting along with the teacher.
6. Concentrating
7. Getting work done well

S#12
1. Helping her when she needs help if she was busy and needs something
2. Doing your work so she won't make you stay in at recess
3. Cooperation
*Prompt given
4. Getting along with you teacher. If she asks you to do something you should do that
for her. Help her if she needed you to help somebody.

S#13
1. Work harder
2. Pay attention
* prompt
- Almost all of them
3. Try to complete their work
4. make friends with the teachers and other students
**repeat prompt
5. expressing all the answers freely

S#14
1. Help tidy up.
2. You can sometimes assist to other people and you can read sometimes when she is
busy and um and
3. Help the kids
4. Listening
5. You can assist her by understanding and not going wild and things like that. not going
crazy
* prompt given
6. Behavior
7. Answering questions
8. Doing work quickly
9. Concentrating
10. Trying hard
11. Treating others with respect
12. Getting good marks
13. Expressing your thoughts and feelings freely

5=15

1. work harder
2. Helping her clean up
3. Don't fight with each other.
4. Help carry stuff.
5. Read stories to the class
6. Listen
7. Concentrate
8. Help each other
9. To try hard
Appendix G

Structured Interview 2 Raw Data: Things a Teacher Can Do

S#1

1. Be nice to the student.
2. Um see if he's a bit slow at working she could say it's OK because you have many talents and other people have other talents.
3. A teacher could be could help you if you are hurt and help you up like sometimes you can slide across the ground and you get like a big, like a hurt on the knee. She could help you get up.
4. If we're good the teacher will let us get have a ticket and we put it in a box and at the end of the week if we're very good we shake the box and take a ticket out of the box and we can get to win a prize.
5. She could um help teach them how and how good they are and that and she could teach them to be nice and to be patient and she could read stories to them and stuff.
6. She could um she could be nice and kind and she could like know us more by being with us more.
7. She's always friendly to them.
8. And she tells them that um she is always around if they need her.
9. One more She can she can act nice to the children and she can always have time to do fun things. Maybe like make up a play. We have 30 minutes like to practice and then we show her what we like.

S#2

1. Take some things as a joke
2. Take some things as a suggestion*

S#3

1. She can be like fair.
2. And listen to the kids.

S#4

1. They can be nice
2. Teachers can listen to children when they are talking
3. Respect students
   *prompt given
4. Um expect high standards
5. Say instructions clearly

şi5

1. Help the kids work
2. If a kid wasn't some...in the class today, if they were at the washroom like if he was at the washroom and didn't hear what to do something in class the teacher could tell them.
   - Tell them a second time
   * prompt given
3. um funny
4. Help them? -- Help them with their if they are trying to write a story.

şi6

1. Help with problems
2. Cooperation
3. Friendliness
4. Listening - Listening to the students' problems and then help with a solution
5. Don't yell
   * prompt given
6. Have a sense of humour

şi7

1. Helps the other kids when they need help.
2. Don't be too rough on the kids.
3. Don't laugh at the kids when they do something wrong.
4. Don't call them names.
5. If the kid are mean to her don't be mean back to them.
   * prompt given
6. To cheer kids up she could be funny
7. Give them another chance. - before sending them to the principal's office.

şi8

1. Just like the student has to be nice to the teacher, I think a teacher also has to be nice to the students.
2. Understanding things
   * prompt given
3. Clear instructions
4. To have a sense of humour
5. Respecting ideas - the students' ideas
1. Could be don't give them work that is too easy well give them their average
Give them possible work
2. Don't change any periods.
3. They can always try to be fair to the children. Being fair.
   *prompt given
   Being fair
4. Respect ideas
5. Yah Being funny. Mr. ___ is always really funny. He can make a joke out of anything
   everything.
6. Being strict. so that children can, that they can't have any excuses for not doing their
   work. Being strict. I think that is important for a teacher

S#10
1. Explains differently
2. Talk to them about something that might be bothering them
3. Let them help her
4. Talking to them about a problem or fight
5. Taking time to tell them something they might have missed
6. Instead of anger sort of a joke
7. Respecting their ideas
8. To set a good example

S#11
1. Letting the student express their feelings
2. Letting a student express or tell their side of the story in a problem.
3. Helping a student - explaining their work well
   *prompt given
4. To like children
5. And be funny

S#12
1. If is your bus time and you're not done your work she can say you can do it
   tomorrow
2. He/she help the kids when they need help
3. Let you play the game you missed last gym day after the student reminded them
   *Prompt given
4. Like the children the way they are. Not just for their work. To be themselves.
5. Help us learn.
S#13
1. Helping out - Sometimes on math or language
   * prompt given
   - Yah I think all of them
2. To like children
3. To be funny
4. She acts in a predictable way
5. To getting along with others - like instead of just getting along with one person getting along with ten people.
6. Respecting answers

S#14
1. She can help them by showing them how to do their work - Teacher can make your life change
   * prompt given
2. Going on field trips to help them research - reading to the class.
   * prompt given
3. Encourage students for their effort
4. Respecting their ideas
5. Sometimes we have joke time - Cause everyone wouldn't be happy. The school is the teachers being friendly and funny.

S#15
1. Make easier work
2. Help them (with their work)
3. Make school trips.
4. Read stories
   * prompt given
5. I like to be funny
6. How about ... the first one that you said.
7. To be a good teacher - To help them and um ... To talk to them if they are feeling sad
8. To give them crayons and pencils if they lose them
9. To be nice - like when they are down in the gym let them play. Fun games. One time we have it Tuesday and Thursday on Tuesday didn't let us go in the gym and on Thursday she just made us do all warm-ups.


Appendix H

Structured Interview 3 Raw Data: Signs of a Good Student and Teacher Relationship

S#1

1. Smile at each other
2. Talking to each other
3. Seeing each other more
4. And the teacher could know you more by
5. To do things with the teacher more - Like talk or play games
6. Recognize occasions um if he if the student says happy birthday to the teacher if it is her birthday and says something nice things about occasions that mean something to her.
7. If the student makes more things for her
8. If the teacher forgets to do something like yesterday she said she was going to assign page 23 and 21 and she forgot the assignment you could tell her. Help her remember.

S#2

1. They both laugh at things
   * prompt given
   - Talk about ideas, (pause) doing things together
2. Smile at each other
3. Talk about ideas -...like more than just work stuff like different things
   - sharing time idea
4. Do extra things with him/her
5. Wave to each other
6. To share more things with the teacher

S#3

1. The teacher doesn't get mad at them.
2. She asks them to help out. - With work ... to check kids work, she'll check theirs then the person can just go around to check anybody else.
3. She makes jokes with them sometimes.
4. They're well behaved.
5. She acts like she cares about them - She acts like she says.

S#4

1. They walk together at recess
2. Student is listening more to the teacher now
3. They bring things for the teacher.
4. Start smiling
5. Talking to the teacher more

S#5

1. Love
2. And friendship
3. Hum saying you're sorry if you break something
4. Helping them? Teacher helping kids
* prompt given
5. Celebrating each other's birthday
6. walking together at recess

S#6

1. Listening
2. Cooperating
3. Friendliness - being nice
* prompt given
4. Talk together

S#7

1. Good work.
2. Neat writing
3. Good drawings
* prompt given
4. Good relationship - not fighting and stuff like that.
5. Building good stuff out of blocks.
6. Making good arts. - painting drawing

S#8

1. Well if the student really likes to go to school
* prompt given
2. Child making things for the teacher That is one of them
3. Them doing things together?

S#9

1. They are laughing and smiling together
2. Well another one is if they just talk together, communicate together.
3. Playing together or playing together,
4. Challenging each other, OK
5. Giving extra work when they are done. Because maybe they want more to do because they finished what they started.
   *prompt given
6. Special occasions?
7. Well what I mean by gifts but exchanging thoughts and ideas.
8. They should be UI.

$#10$
1. Spend lots of time together
2. Talking together and joking a bit
3. Listening more
4. Likes to help the teacher
5. Asking more questions
   *Prompt given
6. Giving little gifts
7. Walking at recess
8. Saying something to her in the beginning and end of school

$#11$
1. Student not bugging the teacher - and the other way around
2. Students getting their work done quickly
3. Student not getting in problems.
   * prompt given
4. I think its like remembering special occasions
5. The walking together at recess

$#12$
1. Body language. Listen when she is talking and don't interrupt.
2. To do things when she asks you
   *Prompt given
3. Talking together
4. Walking with each other
5. Celebrating birthdays.

$#13$
1. Helping out almost all the time
2. Happy faces
* prompt given
M- Um all of them
3. The smile
4. Um walking together ... at recess time
5. Celebrating birthdays
6. Making things and bringing them in

S#14
1. If you do really well and they are talking a lot and - Yeah and if something that they
don't usually do. Like if someone answered. If say there was this student and he didn't
know much math and he got this really hard math question right and that means they'd
get along pretty good. Feel together. They are doing very well and they are getting ahead
and the teacher will feel very proud and her student will too.
* prompt given
2. Walking and talking together at recess
3. Visiting all the teachers
4. The smile
5. oh I have something. Bringing things in when they need it
   - whatever the teacher wants if it is like corn for a project or peanut butter for a bird
   feeder or something like that.

S#15
1. Helping each other
2. You see um you see when a person is taking down a bulletin board. That is what I
always do. Taking down bulletin board. I am the tallest in my class.
* prompt given
3. Smiling
4. Celebrating special occasions like birthdays
5. Walking together.
6. Talking together
7. Making something for each other
8. Caring for each other
Appendix I

Excerpts from Predictions of What will happen next and how the hypothetical classes and teachers are thinking and feeling

Excerpt from Ms. Wilson’s Class: Participant #2

Researcher- Now B what do you predict will happen next?
Child- Maybe some of the students will have their work done by recess and be able to go maybe one or two won’t so they can’t go.
Researcher- Tell me what the teacher and students are thinking and feeling. Try and use the words that they might use.
Child- Pardon?
Researcher- What are the students and teacher thinking and feeling right at this point? The teacher is probably thinking, um Well I forgot about your English assignment so you have to have it done. I didn't mean to forget. Something like that.
Researcher- And how would they be feeling? How would the students be feeling? The teacher might be feeling guilty or the teacher might be feeling well not necessarily angry but something like angry.
Researcher- Something like angry. Can you find a word for it? What would it be?
Child- Well she'd be more guilty than anything.

Excerpt from Ms. Andrews’ Class: Participant #2

Researcher- OK thanks for telling that back to me. What do you predict will happen next in Ms. Andrews’ classroom?
Child- Well probably most of them will have it most of the way done because she told them yesterday and if they don't have it done well probably all of them are going to get it.
Researcher- By telling them yesterday did she tell them the same story as today or did she do a change?
Child- The same story.
Researcher- So she has told them the same story. Tell me what the students and the teacher would be thinking and feeling in this classroom.
Child- The students would probably be feeling OK that's fine I can do that because you told me yesterday, and the teacher would probably be feeling well I think this is fair so do you think it's fair? something like that.
Researcher- Unhuh. OK.
Child- She wouldn't be feeling guilty.
Excerpt from Ms. Thomas' Class: Participant #2

Researcher: Terrific! What do you predict is going to happen next in this classroom?
Child: I think all of them are going to get their reading… their work done by the morning recess and then after the presentation they will probably work on their projects.
Researcher: Tell me what the teacher and the students in Ms. Thomas' class are thinking and feeling right at this point.
Child: I think the students are feeling that's OK that's fair I can do that and the teacher is probably thinking the same thing.
Researcher: What kind of words would the teacher be using? The same thing.
Child: She'd be thinking well you have a choice. If you want to do this that's fine or that that's OK. You can do what you want.
Researcher: And how are they all feeling now?
Child: Pretty good.
Appendix J

Excerpts of predictions, thoughts and feelings in student and teacher interactions:
Participant #9

Researcher: We are going to look into Ms. Wilson's classroom first. Recall that she has changed her mind from yesterday and now told the class that they have to get all their language work done before recess or else they could not go to the surprise presentation. Also recall that she did not give them a reason for changing her mind except that it had just dawned on her that they should have all their work done first.

Now I'm going to tell you about Billy. Billy usually has no trouble with language assignments and concentrating on his work. Today however, he is stuck on a really difficult question. He keeps reading the question over and over but can't figure out an answer to write down. He wants to go to the surprise but he is really having trouble getting the work done because it is very difficult.

Researcher: Now tell me please what you know about Billy.

Child: That he's really good in language and he has never had much trouble but he is stuck on a really hard question and he tried over and over and over but he couldn't get a possible answer to write down.

Researcher: Do you know any children who are like Billy?

Child: Ah me.

Researcher: Who are usually good but sometimes get stuck on some difficult work.

Child: In math.

Researcher: What do you think will happen next for Billy?

Child: He will probably notice that he can get a new idea and make out another idea out of that question then he can make an example of a dog or something. Then he can understand and get the correct answer.

Researcher: OK um Tell me what is going to happen between Billy and Ms. Wilson. Is anything going to happen between Billy and Ms. Wilson?

Child: Well Ms. Wilson could get upset because he was thinking and that could have been the 2nd question on the first page and he didn't finish it and she could get angry and Billy could just say Well I have to think because this is a difficult question. And she could say I thought you were super good in language.

Researcher: so how would Billy feel about that?

Child: Bad.

Researcher: Would he feel anything else?

Child: Well he would feel great and then low because he can't get the question.

Researcher: And did his teacher help him?

Child: No no

Researcher: She got angry with him didn't she?


Researcher: I need to tell you about ... I have one more question. Could this teacher think or feel another way?
Child: Yes
Researcher: How else could she think or feel?
Child: She could sit down and talk to him.
Researcher: She could Ok. Now
PREDICTION 3-2
Researcher: Does Billy think he will get done before recess?
Child: No
Researcher: Does Ms. Wilson think he will get done before recess?
Child: No
Researcher: I want to tell you about 1 other student in Ms. Wilson class before moving in
to the next classroom. George.
Child: There.
Researcher: I think that is a girl with the flip at the bottom.
Child: Oops sorry.
Researcher: Let's have a boy. Is that a boy?
Child: Yeah.
Researcher: George usually has no trouble doing language assignments but he often has
trouble concentrating on his work. He is really excited about the surprise and wants to go
but today, George is really having trouble concentrating and getting work done.
Now tell me what you know about George.
Child: That he is really good in language but he has difficulty concentrating on it.
Researcher: Do you know any children who are like George?
Child: Unhuh
PREDICTION 4-1
Researcher: What do you think will happen next for George?
Child: He will probably finish it.
Researcher: Do you think so? How is he going to do that?
Child: What was he stuck on a question?
Researcher: He is just having trouble setting down and concentrating.
Child: He can finish it. The only thing he has to learn is just concentrate and not worry
about anything else just finish it and then it will be done in time and then he can go.
Researcher: What is going to happen between George and Ms. Wilson?
Child: Ms. Wilson knows him I think and then she'll know "George, You have to
concentrate then you can go cause you're not stuck on anything."(using a teacher voice)
Researcher: OK would she do anything else to help him?
Child: She could sit down and well she could say "if you don't concentrate on your work
even if you do finish you can't go to the surprise 'cause you have to learn how to
concentrate."
Researcher: So would that be very fair?
Child: Yeah I think that would be fair cause so he would still finish his work.
Researcher: So that might help him to finish his work. Could she think or feel another
way about George?
Child: Mad about him
Researcher: She could be mad. And what would happen there?
Child: That he is too hyper that all he wants is to go to the surprise in Mr J's class.
Researcher- Unhuh. How is George feeling right now?
Child- Awfully disappointed.
Researcher- and how is his teacher feeling right now?
Child- the same probably.
PREDICTION 4-2
Researcher- Does George think he will get done before recess?
Child- probably not
Researcher-Does she think he will get done before recess?
Child- Yeah I think that she does cause she know that he can
Researcher- OK so she is staying pretty optimistic, pretty positive that he can get settle
down and get to work done.
MEMORY AID FOR MS. ANDREWS’ CLASS
Researcher- We are going to look into Ms. Andrews’ classroom next. Recall that she
has explained to the class both yesterday and today that they had a choice whether they
want to go to the surprise presentation but if they want to go they need to complete all
their language work first. If they choose to not go they could work in the library. Ms.
Andrews also told the class that she thought this was consistent with their class rule that
they could have free time activities after completing their work. Finally she offered the
children the chance to ask any questions.
Now I'm going to tell you about Paul. Paul usually has no trouble with language
assignments and concentrating on his work. Today, he is stuck in this class on a really
difficult question. He keeps reading the question over and over but can't figure out an
answer to write down. He wants to go to the surprise but he is really having trouble
getting the work done because it is so difficult.
COMPREHENSION PROBE
Now tell me what you know about Paul?
Child- Paul is really good in language and he doesn't have problems in language or
concentrating but he is stuck on this really hard question and he really wants to go to the
surprise in Mr J's class.
PREDICTION 5-1
Researcher- What do you think will happen next for Paul?
Child- He will probably figure out the answer that...
Researcher- Tell me what is going to happen between Ms. Andrews and Paul.
Child- She probably can go down beside him and help him understand the question.
Researcher- OK.
Child- And he could go up and ask her.
Researcher- So he would go and ask first
Child- Yeah.
Researcher- How is he feeling about that?
Child- Probably scared.
Researcher- How is his teacher feeling right now?
Child- She probably want somebody to help 'cause she's just been marking.
Researcher- So she would help because she has just been marking. Could she think or
feel another way about Paul having difficulty?
Child: Well she could feel angry because she knew, she knew he was really good in language and ... and she is just angry 'cause he won't even try.
Researcher: So how does that make him feel?
Child: Probably sad.
Researcher: OK
PREDICTION 5-2
Researcher: Does Paul think he will get done before recess?
Child: Probably not.
Researcher: Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?
Child: Yes
Researcher: She does. OK
Now I'm going to tell you about Fred. Fred usually
Child: isn't that Paul?
Researcher: How about this will be Fred? Fred usually has no trouble doing language assignments but he often has trouble concentrating on his work. He is really excited about the surprise and wants to go but today, Fred is really having trouble concentrating and getting his work done.
Now tell me what you know about Fred.
Child: Well he has no problem in language but he has a problem in concentrating.
Researcher: Unhuh.
Child: and he is really anxious to go into Mr. Jones' class for the surprise.
PREDICTION 6-1
Researcher: What do you think will happen next?
Child: He will probably finish it.
Researcher: How will that happen?
Child: by Mr.
Researcher: Ms. Andrews
Child: Ms. Andrews doing explaining.
Researcher: And what will help him with his difficulty concentrating? He is really excited and not settling?
Child: She'll say "Settle down now." or it doesn't matter if you finish or not cause you are not going to the surprise.
Researcher: OK
Child: I'll get that after.
Researcher: Yeah we don't need it right now. What is going to happen between him and Ms. Andrews?
Child: Ms. Andrews will probably go and sit down beside him and help him and help him settle down and not be so anxious.
Researcher: OK and how is she feeling about that?
Child: Really happy and stuff.
Researcher: OK and could she think and feel another way about Fred and the difficulty he is having?
Child: Talk to a parent –to parent. Tell them the difficulty he is having so they could help him.
Researcher: Ok.
Researcher: Does Fred think he will get done before recess?
Child: Probably not

Researcher: Does the teacher think he will get done before recess?
Child: Yup

MEMORY AID FOR MS. THOMAS' CLASS

Researcher: We are going to look into Ms. Thomas' classroom last. Recall that she told the students it was up to them to decide how they wanted to spend their time and when they wanted to get their work done because in real life they need to take responsibility for their own work. She shared her plan with the students and gave them direction to make their own planning decisions. Recall that Ms. Thomas had also asked if there were any questions and she offered to help students who requested it. The students were usually all good at language and today the assignment was difficult.

Researcher: Now I'm going to tell you about Joe. Which one should be Joe?
Child: Green guy in the back.

Researcher: Ok. Green guy in the back. Joe usually has no trouble with language assignments and concentrating on his work.
Child: Any girls in the class?
Researcher: No we aren't going to tell stories about girls today but sometimes I think I might make stories another time and see students another time about girls.

Now Joe is stuck on a really difficult question in this classroom. He keeps reading the question over and over but can't figure out an answer to write down. He wants to go to the surprise but he is really having trouble getting the work done because it is very difficult.

Researcher: Now tell me what you know about Joe.
Child: Well Joe is really good in language and he has no trouble concentrating except he is stuck on a difficult question that he can't do.

PREDICTION 7-1

Researcher: Tell me what you think will happen next?
Child: That he will probably notice that he can't concentrate hard enough and he is not thinking about the answer hard enough.
Researcher: Even though he doesn't have trouble concentrating, so maybe he needs to concentrate harder.
Child: I guess so.

Researcher: OK and how is he feeling about that, that he thinks he has to concentrate harder.
Child: He probably feels like he hears people saying that he is really going to concentrate on language and he probably feels guilty because other people are saying... and that is pressure.

Researcher: So he is having a hard time living up to that, is he?
Child: Yup.

Researcher: So he is putting pressure on saying you have to concentrate harder. What is going to happen between Joe and Ms. Thomas?
Child: Ms. Thomas will probably say "Joe you know all the things that kids say about you that you are so good at concentrating and language well it is true. All you have to do is concentrate as hard as you can and you can make it up."
Researcher: How is she feeling when she is saying that?
Child: Probably determined in herself.
Researcher: That she is going to be able to convince him that he really is a good concentrater.
Child: It is hard but everybody can do it if he really tries.
Researcher: Would she help him at all to re-plan his time?
Child: Yeah.
Researcher: To think about another way that he could get this work done.
Child: Well she could probably say well you Is this the class where they could take this home?
Researcher: Yes yes.
Child: So she will say if you are stuck on that question just skip it for now and maybe you need some blocks that we don't have at school and that you have at home and you can just do it at home.
Researcher: And how is she feeling when she helps him that way to change his plans?
Child: She will probably feel happy because he will still get it done.
Researcher: And how does Joe feel?
Child: Probably not so happy because he thought he could do it before recess and if he didn't I doubt that he could finish the whole test before recess cause he will probably get stuck on that till recess.
Researcher: But she thinks that he could get done before recess. I am going to tell you about one more boy Mark.
Child: Which one was Joe?
Researcher: The pen boy in the back.
Child: Right there the boy with long hair.
Researcher: OK
Child: Whoa! That is really cool the only girl in the class.
Researcher: Mark usually has no trouble doing language assignments but he often has trouble concentrating on his work. He is really excited about the surprise and wants to go today. Mark is really having trouble though getting his work done because he can't concentrate.
COMPREHENSION PROBE
 Now tell me what you know about Mark.
Child: That guy there
Researcher: OK we are going to change who Mark is.
Child: OK
Researcher: Tell me what you know about Mark.
Child: He is good in language as well as all the other boys that you talked about but he has difficulty in concentrating and he is really anxious to go to the surprise in Mr J's class.
PREDICTION 8-1
Researcher: What do you think will happen next for Mark?
Child: He will probably finish it as long as he concentrates.
Researcher: What will happen between Mark and Ms. Thomas?
Child: Ms. Thomas will probably get angry cause he is not concentrating.
Researcher: What would she say?
Child: Mark you can concentrate. I know I believe in you and if you concentrate on your test you can probably finish it so you can go to the surprise in Mr. Jones' class.
Researcher: OK. And how does that make Mark feel?
Child: Probably happy because now he knows that somebody believes in him.
Researcher: OK. How is she feeling when she is saying that to him?
Child: Ms. Thomas probably feels determined and knows that he can finish it.
Researcher: Is there a little bit of anger in there?
Child: Yes because she knows he can concentrate and he can finish it but he won't.
Researcher: So she is determined but she is angry with Mark too.
Child: Yeah
Researcher: Could she think or feel another way?
Child: Um she could feel sad in her student because he is not trying.

PREDICTION 8-2

Researcher: Does Ms. Thomas think he will get done before recess?
Child: Yup
Researcher: Does Mark think he will get done before recess?
Child: No
Researcher: Would he do anything about trying to change his plan so he could?
Child: Yeah
Researcher: What might happen then?
Child: He could take a skill in concentrating at home. Like he could have to look at this picture for a long time and concentrate on it.
Researcher: And practise focusing
Appendix K

Emotional Experiences of the Hypothetical Students and Teachers During Interactions in Each Class Generated by the Respondents (n=15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Student Emotions</th>
<th>Teacher Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy/glad</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad/unhappy</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous/anxious</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad/Angry</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad/Not good</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: sorry, confused, mixed</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional changes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/Fine/OK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Andrews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Student Emotions</th>
<th>Teacher Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy/glad</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad/unhappy</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad/Angry</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Student Emotions</th>
<th>Teacher Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad/Not Good</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:sorry,confused,mixed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Changes</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/Fine/OK</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no data</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Thomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Student Emotions</th>
<th>Teacher Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy/glad</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad/unhappy</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad/Angry</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad/Not Good</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:sorry,confused,mixed</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Changes</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/Fine/OK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>