DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 971 SP 039 209

AUTHOR Rickards, Tony; Fisher, Darrell
TITLE A Comparison of Teacher and Student Perceptions of Classroom Interactions: A Catalyst for Change.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; High School Students; High Schools; *Interpersonal Communication; Science Instruction; Secondary School Teachers; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Australia

ABSTRACT

This study compared science students' perceptions of their teacher-student interactions with those of their teachers. A sample of 3,515 students from 164 secondary school science classes in 35 Australian schools completed the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI), which gathered data on perceptions of teachers' and students' interpersonal communication patterns. The study found differences between the perceptions of teachers and their students. For example, the teachers thought they demonstrated more leadership and helping/friendly behavior than did their students. Differences in teacher actual and ideal perceptions were apparent and suggested that teachers perceived the ideal teacher as being more positive than they currently were. These differences served as a useful and practical catalyst for reflection on teaching practice and may assist in improving the enjoyment and achievement of students in science classes. (Contains 28 references.) (SM)

A Comparison of Teacher and Student Perceptions of Classroom Interactions: A Catalyst for Change.

Tony Rickards
University of Southern Queensland
rickards@usq.edu.au

Darrell Fisher
Curtin University of Technology
ifisherd@info.curtin.edu.au

Abstract

Much of the research in learning science learning environments reports on student perceptions of teacher-student interpersonal behaviour. The purpose of this study was to compare science students' perceptions of their teacher-student interactions with those of their teachers. A sample of 3515 students from 164 secondary school science classes in 35 schools completed a questionnaire, the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI), that gathered data on the perceptions of teachers' and students' interpersonal communication patterns. Statistical analyses previously have confirmed the reliability and validity of the QTI for secondary school science students. This study found differences between the perceptions of teachers and their students. For example, the teachers thought they demonstrated more leadership and helping/friendly behaviour than did their students. These differences served as a useful and practical catalyst for reflection on teaching practice and may assist in improving the enjoyment and achievement of students in science classes.

Introduction

Much of the research carried out in science learning environments reports on student perceptions of teacher-student interpersonal behaviour. Whilst this information provides a valuable contribution to the interpretation of communication patterns in a classroom, this paper reports teacher perceptions of the same learning environment on which their students are reporting on. This provides a richer description of the interaction behaviours in those classrooms.

Most science teachers believe that good relationships with their students are important. Is there a difference in science teachers' perceptions of their actual teacher-student interpersonal behaviour in the classroom and what they perceive to be ideal for that same class of students? Are the students' perceptions of teacher-student interpersonal behaviour the same as their teachers? The purposes of this paper are to outline a convenient questionnaire designed to assess teacher-student interpersonal behaviour and to report its use in answering these two questions.

The paper describes various forms of the *Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI)* and reports its use in past research. Finally, the paper describes how science teachers have used the questionnaire to assess perceptions of their own teacher-student interpersonal behaviour and used this as a basis for reflecting on their own teaching.

Teacher and Student Interaction in the Classroom.

International research efforts over the last 25 years have firmly established classroom environment as a thriving field of study (Fraser, 1994; Fraser & Walberg, 1991). Recent classroom environment research has focused on constructivist classroom environments (Taylor, Fraser, & Fisher, 1997), cross-national studies of science classroom environments (Fisher, Rickards, Goh, & Wong, 1997), science laboratory classroom environments (McRobbie & Fraser, 1993), and computer-assisted instruction classrooms (Fisher & Stolarchuk, 1997; Teh & Fraser, 1995).

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 2000

In The Netherlands, Wubbels, Creton, and Holvast (1988) investigated teacher behaviour in classrooms from a systems perspective, adapting a theory on communication processes developed by Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967). Within the systems perspective on communication, it is assumed that the behaviours of participants influence each other mutually. The behaviour of the teacher is influenced by the behaviour of the students and in turn influences student behaviour. Circular communication processes develop which not only consist of behaviour, but determine behaviour as well.

With the systems perspective in mind, Wubbels, Créton, and Hooymayers (1985) developed a model to map interpersonal teacher behaviour extrapolated from the work of Leary (1957). This model has been used in The Netherlands in the development of an instrument, the *Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction* (QTI), to gather students' and teachers' perceptions of interpersonal teacher behaviour (Wubbels, Brekelmans, & Hooymayers, 1991; Wubbels & Levy, 1993). This model maps interpersonal behaviour with the aid of an *influence* dimension (Dominance, D – Submission, S) and a *proximity* dimension (Cooperation, C – Opposition, O). These dimensions are represented in a coordinate system divided into eight equal sectors.

Every instance of interactional teacher behaviour can be placed within this system of axes. The closer the instances of behaviour are in the chart, the more closely they resemble each other. The sections are labelled DC, CD, CS, SC, SO, OS, OD and DO according to their position in the coordinate system. For example, the two sectors DC and CD are both characterised by Dominance and Cooperation. In the DC sector, however, the Dominance aspect prevails over the Cooperation aspect, whereas in the adjacent sector CD Cooperation prevails over the Dominance aspect (Wubbels, T., Créton, H., Levy, J., & Hooymayers, H., 1993). Table 1 shows the names of the behaviours (e.g., leadership behaviour, helping/friendly behaviour, understanding behaviour) given to each sector. These sector names are the names given to the eight scales of the QTI. Table 1 clarifies further the nature of the QTI by providing a scale description and a sample item for each of the eight scales.

One advantage of the QTI is that it can be used to obtain the perceptions of interpersonal behaviour of either students or teachers. When the QTI is administered to both teachers and their students, information is provided about the perceptions of teachers and the perceptions of their students of the interpersonal behaviour of that teacher.

The information obtained by means of the questionnaire includes perceptions of the behaviour of the teacher towards the students as a class, and reflects relatively stable patterns of behaviour over a considerable period. The wording of the questionnaire is varied slightly when used to obtain teachers' self-perceptions. For example the question "This teacher talks enthusiastically about his/her subject", becomes "I talk enthusiastically about my subject" in the teacher self-perception version, and "This teacher would talk enthusiastically about his/her subject" in the teacher ideal version.

Table 1

Description of Scales and Sample Items for each Scale of the QTI

Scale Name	Description of Scale (The extent to which the teacher...)	Sample Item
Leadership	...leads, organises, gives orders, determines procedure & structures the classroom situation.	This teacher talks enthusiastically about his/her subject.
Helping/Friendly	...shows interest, behaves in a friendly or considerate manner & inspires confidence and trust.	This teacher helps us with our work.
Understanding	...listens with interest, empathises, shows confidence and understanding & is open with students.	This teacher trusts us.
Student Responsibility/Freedom	...gives opportunity for independent work, gives freedom and responsibility to students.	We can decide some things in this teachers class.
Uncertain	...behaves in an uncertain manner & keeps a low profile.	This teacher seems uncertain.
Dissatisfied	...expresses dissatisfaction, looks unhappy, criticises & waits for silence.	This teacher thinks that we cheat.
Admonishing	...gets angry, express irritation and anger, forbids & punishes.	This teacher gets angry unexpectedly.
Strict	...checks, maintains silence & strictly enforces the rules.	This teacher is strict.

Previous Use of The QTI

The QTI has been shown to be a valid and reliable instrument when used in The Netherlands (Wubbels & Levy, 1993). When the 64-item USA version of the QTI was used with 1,606 students and 66 teachers in the USA, the cross-cultural validity and usefulness of the QTI were confirmed. Using the Cronbach alpha coefficient, Wubbels and Levy (1991) reported acceptable internal consistency reliabilities for the QTI scales ranging from .76 to .84 for student responses and from .74 to .84 for teacher responses.

Another use of the QTI in The Netherlands involved investigation of relationships between perceptions on the QTI scales and student learning outcomes (Wubbels, Brekelmans, & Hooymayers, 1991). Regarding students' cognitive outcomes, the more that teachers demonstrated strict, leadership and helpful/friendly behaviour, then the higher were cognitive outcomes scores. Conversely, student responsibility and freedom, uncertain and dissatisfied behaviours were related negatively to achievement.

When teachers described their perceptions of their own behaviours, they tended to see it a little more favourably than did their students. On average, the teachers' perceptions were between the students' perceptions of actual behaviour and the teachers' ideal behaviour. An interpretation of this is that teachers think that they behave closer to their ideal than their students think they do.

Variations in the students' attitudes toward the subject and the lessons have been characterised on the basis of the proximity dimension: the more cooperative the behaviour displayed, the higher the affective outcome scores (Wubbels, Brekelmans, &

Hooymayers, 1991). That is, student responsibility and freedom, understanding, helping/friendly and leadership behaviours were related positively to student attitudes. Uncertain, dissatisfied, admonishing and strict behaviours were related negatively to student attitudes. Overall, previous studies have indicated that interpersonal teacher behaviour is an important aspect of the learning environment and that it is related strongly to student outcomes.

Levy, Créton, and Wubbels (1993) analysed data from studies in The Netherlands, the USA and Australia involving students being asked to use the QTI to rate their best and worst teachers. Students rated their best teachers as being strong leaders and as friendly and understanding. The characteristics of the worst teachers were that they were more admonishing and dissatisfied.

Levy, Wubbels, Brekelmans, and Morganfield (1997) investigated a sample of 550 high school students in 38 classes comprised of three primary investigation groups, namely 117 Latinos, 111 Asians and 322 from the United States. The primary focus was the language and cultural factors in students' perceptions of teacher communication style. This study focused on identifying ways in which the students' culture relates to student perceptions of their teachers. The results from this study suggested that the students' cultural background is indeed significantly related to the perceptions that they had of their teachers' interaction behaviour. The study also concluded that teachers do not seem to be aware of cultural differences in their interactions with students in their classes in the same way as their students were, despite altering their behaviour in classes with different cultural compositions.

The Australian version of the QTI containing 48 items was used in a pilot study involving upper secondary science classes in Western Australia and Tasmania (Fisher, Fraser, & Wubbels, 1993; Fisher, Fraser, Wubbels, & Brekelmans, 1993; Fisher, Fraser, & Henderson, 1995). This pilot study strongly supported the validity and potential usefulness of the QTI within the Australian context, and suggested the desirability of conducting further and more comprehensive research involving the QTI.

Wubbels (1993) used the QTI with a sample of 792 students and 46 teachers in Western Australia and Tasmania. The results of this study were similar to previous Dutch and American research in that, generally, teachers did not reach their ideal and differed from the best teachers as perceived by students. It is noteworthy that the best teachers, according to students, are stronger leaders, more friendly and understanding, and less uncertain, dissatisfied and admonishing than teachers on average. When teachers described their perceptions of their own behaviours, they tended to see it a little more favourably than did their students. On average, the teachers' perceptions were between the students' perceptions of actual behaviour and the teachers' ideal behaviour. An interpretation of this is that teachers think that they behave closer to their ideal than their students think that they do.

The cultural aspects of teacher-student interpersonal behaviour have been investigated in several recent studies. For example, Fisher, Rickards, Goh, and Wong(1997) examined perceptions of interpersonal teacher behaviour in secondary science classrooms in Singapore and Australia. Another by Fisher, Fraser, and Rickards(1997) reported on gender and cultural differences in teacher-student interpersonal behaviour. These studies both reported that there were cultural differences in teacher-student interpersonal behaviour and that Asian students in particular perceived their learning

environments more positively than did other cultural groups for two indicator variables for cultural background, namely birthplace of parents and primary language spoken at home.

This paper will assist teachers to practically apply this research to their own classrooms by linking the results of previous research projects with a method to assess and reflect on teacher-student interpersonal behaviour in their classrooms.

Methodology

The aims of the proposed study were to provide further validation information for the student and teacher versions of the QTI, (in terms of reliability and ability to differentiate between different groups of students), when used with a large Australian sample. To investigate differences in the perceptions of science teachers and their students; and to investigate differences in teachers' actual and ideal perceptions of teacher interactions. The final practical application of the study was to examine the use of the QTI as an effective means by which to monitor and reflect on teacher-student interpersonal behaviour.

The following research questions were proposed.

1. Are the three forms of the QTI that examine student and teacher perceptions of the classroom learning environment valid and reliable in lower secondary science classes in Australia?
2. Are there differences in teachers' and students' perceptions of teacher-student interpersonal behaviour?
3. Are there differences in teacher actual and teacher ideal perceptions?
4. Can the QTI be efficiently used by teachers as a tool for self reflection?

The sample was composed of 173 science classes at the lower secondary levels in two Australian states, namely, Tasmania and Western Australia. The total sample involved 3,589 students in 173 science classes spread approximately equally between grades 8, 9 and 10 in 35 different schools. Each student in the sample responded to the student version of the QTI while their 164 teachers completed the teacher self and teacher ideal versions.

Results

Validation of the Questionnaire

The responses to the QTI from this study have resulted in a large database consisting of 3,589 students in 173 classes. These responses provide further validation data on the instrument. Table 2 provides information for the QTI when used specifically in the present sample of science classes. Statistics for the student version are reported for two units of analysis, namely, the individual student's score and the class mean score.

As expected, reliabilities for class means were higher than those where the individual student was used as the unit of analysis. Table 2 shows that the alpha reliability figures for different QTI scales ranged from .63 to .88 when the individual student was used as the unit of analysis, and from .78 to .96 when the class mean was used as the unit of analysis.

These values presented in Table 2 for the present sample provide further information supporting the internal consistency of the QTI, with either the individual student or the class mean as the unit of analysis.

Table 2 also indicates that the alpha reliability figures for different QTI scales using the teacher sample was somewhat lower and ranged from .72 to .92 for the teacher actual version of the QTI and .62 to .86 for the teacher ideal version of the QTI. These reliability figures are all above the 0.60 level proposed by Nunnally (1967; 1978), as a "suggested acceptable level for research purposes".

Table 2
Internal Consistency (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient) and Ability to Differentiate Between Classrooms for Student and Teacher versions of the QTI

Scale	Teacher		Student		
	Actual	Ideal	Unit of Analysis	Alpha Reliability	ANOVA Results(eta^2)
Leadership	.88	.81	Individual	.82	.33*
			Class Mean	.93	
Helping/ Friendly	.92	.86	Individual	.88	.35*
			Class Mean	.96	
Understanding	.88	.83	Individual	.85	.32*
			Class Mean	.95	
Student Resp/ Freedom	.79	.65	Individual	.66	.26*
			Class Mean	.82	
Uncertain	.78	.69	Individual	.72	.22*
			Class Mean	.87	
Dissatisfied	.84	.78	Individual	.80	.23*
			Class Mean	.93	
Admonishing	.79	.75	Individual	.76	.31*
			Class Mean	.87	
Strict	.72	.62	Individual	.63	.23*
			Class Mean	.78	

*$p<.001$ n = 3515 students and 164 teachers in 173 classes.

Another desirable characteristic of any instrument like the QTI is that it is capable of differentiating between the perceptions of students in different classrooms. That is, students within the same class should perceive it relatively similarly, while mean within-class perceptions should vary from class to class. This characteristic was explored for each scale of the QTI using a one-way ANOVA, with class membership as the main effect. It was found that each QTI scale differentiated significantly ($p<.001$) between classes and that the eta^2 statistic, representing the proportion of variance explained by class membership, ranged from .22 to .35 for different scales.

Differences Between Students and Their Teachers

In order to investigate if students perceived teacher-student interactions differently from their teachers, scale mean scores were calculated for each of the teacher and student samples and compared.

Table 3

Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers and Science Students' Scores on the Eight Scales of the QTI

Scale	Scale Mean		Difference	Standard Deviation		F Value	
	Teacher Actual	Student Actual	(Tchrs score -Studs score)	Teachers	Students		
Leadership	3.04	2.74	.30	.34	.73	26.26	**
Helping/ Friendly	3.31	2.83	.48	.41	.86	50.18	**
Understanding	3.19	2.83	.36	.37	.79	34.37	**
Student Resp/ Freedom	1.48	1.75	-.27	.45	.65	26.31	**
Uncertain	.81	1.01	-.20	.48	.69	14.17	**
Dissatisfied	.92	1.11	-.19	.44	.78	9.22	**
Admonishing	1.04	1.40	-.36	.45	.80	31.98	**
Strict	1.98	1.78	.20	.44	.65	14.09	**

* $p<.05$ teachers n = 164
** $p<.01$ students n = 3515

As indicated in Table 3, statistically significant differences were apparent in the responses to six of the eight scales of the QTI, with teachers considering they exhibited greater leadership, helping/friendly and understanding behaviours than did their students.

The students considered their teachers were more uncertain, dissatisfied and admonishing than did their teachers. The differences generally indicate that teachers believed they were more cooperative and less oppositional in the classrooms than their students perceived.

Student data generally indicate that students saw their classroom as less positive than did their teachers who believed they were more cooperative and less oppositional in the classrooms than did their students.

Differences Between Teachers' Self Perceptions and Their Ideals

Table 4 presents the differences that were recorded between the teacher ideal and teacher actual perceptions as collected using the QTI.

Scale mean scores ranged from 0.81 to 3.31 for the teacher actual version and from 0.46 to 3.75 for the Teacher ideal version. These scales were scored on a Likert type scale that ranged from 1 to 5.

If these scale mean scores are examined more closely is is possible to see that teacher ideal scale mean scores are higher for the scales of Leadership, Helping/Friendly and Understanding. This suggests that teachers' perceive their ideal teacher as exhibiting more positive behaviours than they currently do.

The teachers considered that they gave more student responsibility and freedom and exhibited more uncertain, dissatisfied and admonishing behaviours than did their ideal teachers. The differences in the teacher actual and teacher ideal scores suggest that teachers would generally like to see increased leadership, helping friendly and understanding behaviours exhibited in the classroom.

Table 4
Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers and Science Students' Scores on the Eight Scales of the QTI

Scale	Scale Mean		Difference	Standard Deviation		F Value	
	Teacher Actual	Teacher Ideal	(Ideal-Actual)	Actual	Ideal		
Leadership	3.04	3.75	0.71	.34	.25	461.05	**
Helping/ Friendly	3.31	3.69	0.38	.41	.33	90.00	**
Understanding	3.19	3.62	0.43	.37	.33	122.33	**
Student Resp/ Freedom	1.48	1.42	-0.06	.45	.42	1.88	
Uncertain	0.81	0.46	-0.35	.48	.49	42.3	**
Dissatisfied	0.92	0.69	-0.23	.44	.49	19.87	**
Admonishing	1.04	0.51	-0.53	.45	.46	109.80	**
Strict	1.98	1.98	0.00	.44	.47	0.09	

* $p<.05$ teachers n = 164 **$p<.01$ students n = 3351

Use of QTI by Teachers as a Tool for Self Reflection
After having completed the QTI and having had time to consider the results supplied to them, science teachers reported that they had been stimulated to reflect on their own teaching and verbal communication in the classroom. For example, one teacher concluded that she had become more aware of her students' need for clear communication and that this had become a focus for her in improving her classroom teaching.

One teacher, who had recently returned to teaching full-time after an absence from teaching of 14 years, found the information provided particularly useful in comparing the classroom environment perceptions of her students with her own perceptions. It was interesting for her to note that the perceptions of the classroom environment that the students held were very similar to her own. This proved to be a reassuring and

reinforcing finding because it suggested that she was meeting the individual needs of the students without compromising her own standards.

When teachers were asked if they agreed with the results for their classrooms, the findings were revealing. Though teachers agreed with the results, they acknowledged they raised further questions relating to their individual teaching practice. For example, the dimension of Helping/Friendly on the QTI produced a surprise for one teacher where students' perceived a lower level of teacher helping/ friendly behaviour than did the teacher. This suggested to the teacher that the students either needed more help than the teacher was able to give, or perhaps that the students really 'lapped up' the nurturing and wanted more.

Conclusions

This study found that the three forms of the QTI that examine student and teacher perceptions of the classroom learning environment are valid and reliable instruments for use by science teachers to assess teacher-student interpersonal behaviours in their lower secondary science classes..

It showed that there were differences in teachers and students perceptions of teacher-student interpersonal behaviour and that teachers tend to perceive their classes more positively than their students.

Differences in teacher actual and teacher ideal perceptions were apparent and tended to suggest that teachers perceived their ideal teacher as being more positive than they currently are.

The QTI is able to be eficiently used by teachers as a tool for self reflection. The three versions of the QTI allow science teachers to obtain their students' perceptions of their interpersonal behaviour, their own perceptions and the behaviour that they consider to be ideal. This valuable information then can be used as a basis for self-reflection by teachers on their teaching performance. Based on this information, teachers might decide to change the way they behave in an attempt to create a more desirable classroom environment.

References

Fisher, D., Fraser, B., & Wubbels, T. (1993). Interpersonal teacher behavior and school environment. In T. Wubbels & J. Levy (Eds.), *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education* (pp. 103-112). London, England: Falmer Press.

Fisher, D., Fraser, B., Wubbels, T., & Brekelmans, M. (1993, April). *Associations between school environment and teacher interpersonal behavior in the classroom.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Fisher, D., Henderson, D., & Fraser, B. (1995). Interpersonal behaviour in senior high school biology classes. *Research in Science Education, 25* (2), 125-133.

Fisher, D., Rickards, T., Goh, S., & Wong, A. (1997). Perceptions of interpersonal teacher behaviour in secondary science classrooms: Comparisons between Australia and Singapore. In D. Fisher & T. Rickards (Eds.), *Science, mathematics and technology education and national development.* Proceedings of the International Conference on Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, Hanoi, Vietnam, (pp. 136-143). Perth: Curtin University of Technology.

Fisher, D., & Stolarchuk, E. (1997, November). *The effects of using laptop computers on achievement, attitude to science and classroom environment in science.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Western Australian Science Education Association, Perth.

Fraser, B. (1994). Research on classroom and school climate. In D. Gabel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on science teaching and learning,* (pp. 493-541). New York: Macmillan.

Fraser, B., & Walberg, H. (Eds.). (1991*). Educational environments: Evaluation, antecedents and consequences*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Leary, T. (1957). *An interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York: Ronald Press.

Levy, J., Créton, H., & Wubbels, T. (1993). Perceptions of interpersonal teacher behaviour. In T. Wubbels, & J. Levy, (Eds.), *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education* (pp. 29-45). London: Falmer Press.

Levy, J., Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., & Morganfield, B. (1997). Language and cultural factors in students' perceptions of teacher communication style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21*, 29-56.

McRobbie, C., & Fraser, B. (1993). Associations between student outcomes and psychosocial science environment. *Journal of Educational Research,* 87, 75-85.

Moos, R. (1974). *The social climate scales: An overview*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Moos, R. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments: Procedures, measures, findings and policy implications*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. (2nd Edition ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Parker, L., Rennie, L., & Fraser, B. (Eds.). (1996). *Gender, science and mathematics: Shortening the shadow*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Fisher, D., Rickards, T., Goh, S., & Wong, A., (1997). Perceptions of interpersonal teacher behaviour in secondary science classrooms in Singapore and Australia, *Journal of Applied Research in Education, 1* (2), 2-11.

Fisher, D., Fraser, B., & Rickards, T. (1997). *Gender and cultural differences in teacher-student interpersonal behaviour*. Springfield, VA: Clearing House on Teaching and Teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 407 400)

Teh, G., & Fraser, B. (1995). Development and validation of an instrument for assessing the psychosocial environment of computer-assisted learning classrooms, *Journal of Educational Computing Research. 12,* 177--193.

Taylor, P., Fraser, B., & Fisher, D. (1997). Monitoring constructivist classroom learning environments, *International Journal of Educational Research. 27* (4), 293-302.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J., & Jackson, D. (1967*). The pragmatics of human communication*. New York: Norton.

Wubbels, T. (1993). *Teacher-student relationships in science and mathematics classes* (What research says to the science and mathematics teacher, No. 11). Perth: National Key Centre for School Science and Mathematics, Curtin University of Technology.

Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., & Hooymayers, H. (1991). Interpersonal teacher behavior in the classroom. In B. Fraser & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational environments: Evaluation, antecedents and consequences,* (pp. 141-160). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Wubbels, T., Créton, H., Levy, J., & Hooymayers, H. (1993). The model for interpersonal teacher behaviour. In T. Wubbels & J. Levy (Eds.), *Do You Know What You Look Like? Interpersonal Relationships in Education* (1st ed., pp. 13-28). London: The Falmer Press.

Wubbels, T., Créton, H., & Holvast, A. (1988*). Undesirable classroom situations. Interchange, 19*, 25-40.

Wubbels, T., Créton, H., & Hooymayers, H. (1985, April). *Discipline problems of beginning teachers*. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1991). A comparison of interpersonal behaviour of Dutch and American teachers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 1-18.

Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education*. London, England: Falmer Press.

AERA

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: A COMPARISON OF TEACHER AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS: A CATALYST FOR CHANGE	
Author(s): Dr TONY RICKARDS AND DR DARROL FISHER	
Corporate Source: —	Publication Date: APRIL 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: DIRECTOR OF ITEC TONY RICKARDS, PhD.	
Organization/Address: UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND TOOWOOMBA, AUSTRALIA, QLD 4350	Telephone: +61-7-46877630	FAX: +61-7-46877630
	E-Mail Address: rickards@usq.edu.au	Date: 28/4/00

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20772
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)