How do third-grade students and their teachers construe each other?

İsmail SANBERK *a   Semiha BAĞIŞ b

a *Çukurova University, Turkey*
b *Ministry of National Education, Turkey*

Abstract

This study aims to identify teachers' personal constructs about students and students' personal constructs about teachers and to reveal to what extent they see each other as ideal. The study is descriptive and multiple-case in nature. In this regard, it was conducted with 6 third-grade students with different mean scores and 6 teachers who instructed them in a private school. Teachers' and students' views towards each other were identified through a repertory grid technique, which is a semi-structured interviewing method. Teachers' and students' constructs towards each other are reciprocal. Students who were represented with successful and positive personal constructs, and thus who were placed closely to the ideal student profile, tended to see their teachers as ideal teachers. Similarly, students who were represented with unsuccessful and negative personal constructs by their teachers, and thus were placed as distant from the ideal student profile, tended to evaluate the teachers who had those representations negatively. Findings of the study were discussed in terms of the expectancy effect model and the transactional model.

Keywords: Teacher-student interaction, personal constructs, ideal student, ideal teacher, repertory grid technique.

Introduction

The relationship between teachers and students is not a relationship between two individuals having equal power; rather, the power relationship is non-symmetrical. Students behave in a way that confirms their teacher's expectations. The teacher's constructs about students regulate her behaviours towards students and cause her to develop expectations in relation to each student. The model known as the expectancy effect identifies the relationship between teacher expectations and student success (Brophy & Good, 1974; Brophy, 1983; Good, 1982; Good & Brophy, 2003). According to this model, for students, failure at school emerges as a result of typical interactions in learning situations. Many students are stereotyped from the beginning. In other words, the teacher's performance expectations in relation to her students can influence students'

* ✉ Corresponding author: Ismail Sanberk, Çukurova University, Faculty of Education, Department of Guidance and Counseling, 01330, Sarıcam, Adana, Turkey. E-mail: mailsanberk@gmail.com Phone: +90 (322) 3386733-31.

behaviours and success. In fact, every teacher has an idea about how 'a good student' should be, which causes her to develop a normative expectation.

Öztürk, Koç and Şahin (2003) have suggested that 92.8% of the teachers behave differently to students according to low or high expectation level that they have. Teachers develop expectations influenced by variables such as; students' gender, physical appearance, socioeconomic status, communication between teachers and families, students' success etc. and teachers' behaviours toward to their students are shaped by these expectations (Öztürk & Koç, 2001; Öztürk, Koç & Şahin, 2003). Even in the first interactions with students, these normative expectations guide the teacher's perception process (Schweer & Thies, 2000). In terms of the expectancy effect model, in time, students start to take form according to their teacher's image about them. This phenomenon is known as the 'Pygmalion effect' (Raufelder, 2006).

How teachers are perceived from the students' point of view has been subject to study since the 1930s (Holl, 2007). However, referring to students' perspectives in studies conducted in a school context accelerated after the 1980s (Nölle, 1995). In a study that investigated the features of 'a good teacher' from the student's point of view, Holl (2007) found that vocational high school students could not point to a teacher that would meet their criteria for goodness. Another finding that supports this result was presented by Klaghofer, Oser and Patry (1995); accordingly, a majority of high school students indicated that they were not happy about their teachers. In fact, students focused more on the environment that would meet requirements for success than on a good teacher. Therefore, teachers who have completed their professional training can have more positive effects on students (Holl, 2007). Another study that investigated the characteristics of a good teacher from students' points of view indicated that perceptions about teachers were shaped by components such as emotional warmth, being motivational, conducting interesting lessons, and being controlling, namely guiding (Petillon, 1987). According to Clausen (2002), perceptions about teacher behaviours are affected by many personal factors, such as student success, the nature of the teacher-student relationship, and students' social roles. With increasing student age, their perceptions about teachers are more likely shaped by field knowledge and proficiency. According to study of Afacan, Karakuş and Uşak (2013), students perceive their teachers less sufficient in field knowledge when students get older. Affective components, which were more predominant before, begin to have less importance. Teachers are seen as responsible for dissatisfying lessons and uninteresting content (Schmidt-Wellenberg, 1979; in: Fichten 1993).

From the students' perspectives, the teacher's personality and teaching style cannot be distinguished clearly; perceptions about the teacher are made in a holistic way (Fichten 1993). Cognitive constructs in relation to the ideal teacher are identified by two components that represent teacher qualities. The first component, 'love theme', is characterised by the emotional warmth and understanding that appear in teacher-student relationships. The second component is 'mastery theme', which is characterised by the teacher's proficiency and field knowledge (Ditton, 2002; König, 2007). Students' constructs in relation to the teacher change depend on their success; hence, students with low achievement levels develop constructs in terms of the 'love theme', and students with high achievement levels develop constructs in terms of the 'mastery theme'. It is not possible to fully differentiate students' expectations from teachers'; accordingly, a student who perceives his/her teacher in the framework of the 'love theme' also sees her in the 'mastery theme', and vice versa. Moreover, duration of interaction has positive effects on students' perceptions about the teacher.

Gültekin (2015) found that while fifth and eighth grade students describe ideal teacher, they emphasized ideal teacher as receptive/tolerant, patient, calm and respectful, open to

criticism, not over disciplined/oppressive; funny, humoristic sincere/hearty and happy with a smiling face; hardworking, ambitious and determined; disciplined; not using physical and verbal violence and behaving good to children and clean. According to study of Telli, Brok and Çakıroğlu (2010), both teachers and students describe ideal teacher who motivates, guides, helps students have self-confidence, have a good relationship with students and who are respected by their students. Also, Özabacı and Acat (2005) found that according to point of students what a teacher needs to have are being informative, good in a language, trustworthy, wise, communicative, democrat, honest and neutral and also the teacher needs to love his/her job. In addition to this, according to Wood (2012), more than half of the student participants of his study perceived differences between female and male elementary teachers, including beliefs that female teachers are more nurturing, that male teachers are more laid back, and that male teachers are more dominant and commanding with students.

One of the theoretical views that explain teacher-student relationships is the transactional model. This model, developed by Nickel (1976, 1985), as indicated in other models that explain the teacher-student interaction, derives from the assumption that the teacher's behaviours are largely determinant in the education process; in addition, however, there is some indication that feedback received from students affects the teacher's behaviours (Ittel & Raufelder, 2008). Behaviours on both sides have roles in the formation of perceptions. According to this model, students' social behaviours and academic achievement affect the teacher's views, but the way the teacher perceives students is not related only to students' behaviours and success. Variables such as the teacher's attitudes, role expectations, and habits form her perceptions in relation to students. In this way, determinants of teacher behaviours (on education and teaching style, success evaluation) can be identified. Just as students' behaviours have an effect on the teacher's perceptions, the teacher's behaviours have a role in students' perceptions. Students' perceptions about teachers are not only formed according to the teacher's behaviours; her attitudes, role expectations (including gender roles), habits and group norms also play roles in the way the teacher is perceived. Moreover, students' perceptions about the teacher also affect these variables (Ittel & Raufelder, 2008; Nickel, 1976, 1985).

According to Nickel (1976, 1985), it is not right to attribute teacher and student behaviours solely to this comparison. After all, all subjects have their own socio-cultural environment, which is transferred to school along with them. The teacher's social learning background (relationship experiences in her family of origin, teaching education, the training she received), current social relationships (with students, colleagues, school management, and her own family, friends and relatives) and objective effects (general and field knowledge, mass communication, curriculum, service instructions, rules, etc.) form her socio-cultural environment. Similarly, the student's social learning background (intra- and out-of-family education, school experience so far), current social relationships (with parents, other teachers, adults out of the family, and peers) and objective effects (childhood-youth and social reality literature, mass communication, etc.) form his/her socio-cultural environment. All of these behaviours that form the socio-cultural context of teacher and student behaviours are external behaviours that play roles in the teacher-student interaction (Ittel & Raufelder, 2008; Nickel, 1976, 1985).

Students behaving in accordance with their teacher's image can guide their school life. Students' experiences lead them to form representations, and thus attributions, about objects in relation to school (e.g., friends in class, lessons, teachers, etc.). Kelly asserts the notion that the individual tries to interpret the events in the environment through the patterns s/he has learned. In this process of interpreting and testing the existing structures, the similarity between objects in the environment makes the environment

predictable (Ewen, 2003; Feist & Fesit, 2006; Hjelle & Ziegler, 1992). Kelly states that individuals interpret each other's constructs in interpersonal relations and communicate with them in line with this interpretation (Ewen, 2003; Feist & Fesit, 2006). A review of the related literature indicates no clear findings regarding how student and teacher representations reciprocally portray each other. In fact, as is emphasised in the expectancy effect model (Brophy, 1983; Brophy & Good, 1974; Good, 1982; Good & Brophy, 2003) and the transactional model (Nickel, 1976, 1985), students' relationships with their teachers should be examined in terms of reciprocity.

Aim of Research

1. In terms of teachers, how far are the students with different success levels from the ideal student profile?
2. In terms of students with different success levels, how far are the teachers from the ideal teacher profile?
3. Are teachers' and students' evaluations in relation to each other reciprocal?

Method

Research Design

Although the present study is considered to be a quantitative case analysis model, it was designed as a descriptive and multiple-case study. "In the single case (phenomenon) studies, a specific characteristic or behaviour pattern of each individual is tested, but a test for one case is evaluated within itself" (Bortz & Döring, 2006; p. 580). Hence, as the data obtained cannot be generalised (i.e., it does not have nomothetic features), the present study has an idiographic nature, as it focuses on internal validity (Bortz & Döring, 2006). However, due to the lack of empirical research on how teachers and students represent each other reciprocally, this study is explorative in nature.

Data Collection Tool

Repertory Grid. The repertory grid technique aims to reveal how people interpret other important people (events or objects) in their lives (Feist & Fesit, 2006; Hall, Lindzey & Campell, 1997; Hjelle & Ziegler, 1992; Rychlak, 1981). This technique, which consists of a semi-structured interview, aims to obtain people's personal constructs on a specific topic. The technique has two fundamental concepts called 'construct' and 'element'. An element is actually a research object. These elements can be objects, events or people that are important to the person.

The elements were separately identified for the teacher and students in the present study. The Student Repertory Grid form included all of the teachers who attended the participants' classes (6 teachers in total) and two hypothetic elements (ideal and non-ideal teacher). The Teacher Repertory Grid form included 6 students with different academic success levels and two hypothetic elements (ideal and non-ideal student). The teachers participating in the study compared the elements in the repertory grid with the 'triadic comparison method' and the students with the 'dyadic comparison method'; thus, personal constructs they had in relation to the elements were identified (Fransella, Bell, & Bannister, 2003; Fromm, 2002; Kelly, 1955). Then, each element was ranked in terms of each construct elicited. As a result of these process steps, the way in which the teachers and students participating in the study construed each other was identified.

Participants

The target population of the study was third-grade students and their teachers in a private school located in Çukurova, Adana. The participants were identified using accessible, purposeful, and criterion sampling methods. The participants were chosen among

students taught by the second author of the present study in the 2014-2015 education year. When choosing the students, mean scores obtained from two standard tests which are conducted concurrently to test academic success level of students in some private schools in Turkey were taken as a reference. Three groups with different success levels were identified; the following table presents their names (pseudonyms were used to keep the students' identities confidential), genders, and success scores.

As success scores of students with different success level are dependent, this should be taken into consideration. Thus, the students in unsuccessful students' category should not be read as unsuccessful but less successful or relatively unsuccessful. No criteria were used in the selection of the teachers; all of the teachers attending classes in these students' group were included in the study as participants and all of the teachers are female (See Table 2).

Table 1. *Success Levels of the Students Participating in the Study*

Students' Names*	Gender	1st exam	2nd exam	Average Score
Nil	Female	98.46	100	99.23
Can	Male	100	96.92	98.46
Ekin	Female	96.92	87.69	92.31
Uğur	Male	89.23	95.38	92.31
Ali	Male	87.69	83.08	85.38
Behiç	Male	86.15	78.46	82.31

* Students' names were changed to keep their identities confidential.

Table 2. *Teachers' Genders, Ages, Branches and Years of Experience in their Profession*

Teachers' Names*	Gender	Age	Branch	Years of Experience
Ayça	F	35	Music	12
Azra	F	35	Gymnastics	9
Ezgi	F	31	English	6
Merve	F	29	Physical Education	6
Mine	F	32	Computer	8
Nazlı	F	42	Art	13

*Teachers' names were changed to keep their identities confidential.

Process

The data for the repertory grid technique were collected through semi-structured interviews. The average duration times for conducting the interviews were 50-55 minutes for the teachers and 40-45 minutes for the students. The elements in the repertory grid were identified by the researchers. Accordingly, a total number of 8 elements – 6 students with different success levels, and ideal and non-ideal student elements – were included and written on the cards prepared before the study. The eight cards were placed face down, and the teachers were asked to choose 3 of them randomly. Then, the personal constructs were elicited through such questions as: 'Do these two elements have anything in common that the third one does not have?' or 'Which two elements differ from the other? Please describe the feature that makes them different from the other (similarity)' (the triadic comparison method was used). This exercise continued until 10 personal constructs were elicited. After the identification of the personal constructs, the teachers were asked to rank each element in terms of each construct, between 1 and 5. The interviews with students followed a similar process, with 6 teachers attending their classes as elements, and ideal and non-ideal teachers. However, differently from teachers, the comparisons the students made about the elements were elicited utilising the 'dyadic comparison' method. Accordingly, the students were asked to choose two face-down cards

and were asked, 'What is the difference between them?' 'How do these two teachers differ from each other?' This method was preferred because the paired comparison method makes it easier (Vogel, 2012) to elicit personal constructs in relation to teachers when the participants are children. The exercise concluded when the elements were compared 10 times. The students were asked to rank each teacher in the repertory grid form and to rank the ideal/non-ideal teacher elements between 1 and 5 in terms of the personal constructs they used.

Data Analysis

The repertory grid technique was utilised to find answers to the research hypothesis. Teachers' and students' constructs about each other were elicited through semi-structured interviews. The Euclidean distance coefficient was taken as a reference to identify the distance of the elements to the ideal teacher element. Similarly, this distance coefficient was taken as a reference to find the distance to the ideal student element. According to Bortz and Döring (2006), Euclidean distance (metric) reveals the distance of objects in space (teachers and students in this study) geometrically. Finally, hierarchical cluster analysis was performed to determine which elements and constructs formed closed clusters. The data were analysed using the Idiogrid (Grice, 2008) statistical package programming.

Results

The Teachers' Perspectives about their Students

Table 3. *Euclidean Distance Coefficients between the Ideal Student Element and the Students**

	Ezgi	Nazlı	Ayça	Azra	Merve	Mine	Mean
Ideal Student	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ali	1.33	0.79	1.04	1.12	1.08	1.04	1.07
Behiç	1.16	0.98	1.09	1.11	0.70	1.08	1.02
Can	0.57	0.74	0.21	0.27	0.72	0.13	0.44
Ekin	0.55	0.52	0.72	0.76	0.92	0.23	0.62
Nil	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.12	0.16
Uğur	0.75	0.81	0.74	0.80	0.65	0.56	0.72
Non-ideal Student	1.88	1.79	1.71	1.70	1.76	1.68	1.75
Mean**	0.82	0.64	0.63	0.68	0.73	0.53	-

*   Teachers' personal constructs in relation to their students are presented in Appendix A.
**   While calculating the means, the distance coefficients between ideal and non-ideal student cells were not included in the calculation

Table 3 shows that the teachers found Nil and Can to be closest to the ideal student profile (with 0.16 and 0.44 Euclidean distance coefficients, respectively, to the ideal student profile), followed by Ekin and Uğur. Conversely, the students located most distant from the ideal student profile were Ali and Behiç (with 1.07 and 1.02 Euclidean distance coefficients, respectively, to the ideal student profile). The teacher with the most positive evaluations about her students was Mine. Accordingly, Mine found three of her students (Nil, Can and Ekin) to be very close to the ideal student profile; she found Uğur to be relatively close to this profile. The students that the teacher Mine found relatively negative, or located most distant from the ideal student profile, were Behiç and Ali, with 1.08 and 1.04 distant coefficients, respectively. The teacher Ayça evaluated the students second most positively. Ayça made a one-to-one matching of Nil and the ideal student profile (0.00) and ranked Can very close to this profile (0.21). Although she ranked Ekin and Uğur relatively close to the ideal student profile, she located these two students somewhere between the ideal and non-ideal student profiles (with 0.72 and 0.74 distance

coefficients, respectively). However, Ayça saw Behiç and Ali as relatively closer to the non-ideal student profiles (with 1.09 and 1.04 distance coefficients, respectively).

The teacher who generally saw students most distant from the ideal student profile was Ezgi, followed by Merve. The student who Ezgi saw as most distant from the ideal student profile was Ali (1.33), and the closest relative person was Ekin (0.55). Similarly, Merve found Ali most distant from the ideal student profile (1.08). In contrast, the closest person was Nil (0.30). Like Merve, teachers Nazlı and Azra also matched Nil with the ideal student profile (0.00). However, Nazlı placed Behiç at 0.98, and Azra placed Behiç (1.11) and Ali (1.12) relatively distant from the ideal student element.

An analysis of Table 3 shows that Nil was placed very close to the ideal student profile by all of the teachers. In fact, three teachers (Nazlı, Ayça and Azra) thought that Nil directly reflected the ideal student profile. Only Ezgi placed Can and Ekin, along with Nil, in the equal distance from the ideal student element. Can was generally placed closest to the ideal student profile after Nil. These students were followed by Ekin and Uğur. Conversely, students Ali and Behiç were placed relatively closest to the non-ideal student profile by their teachers.

Students' Perspectives about their Teachers

Table 4. *Euclidean Distance Coefficients between the Teachers and the Ideal Teacher Element**

	Ali	Behiç	Can	Ekin	Nil	Uğur	Mean
Ideal Teacher	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ezgi	0.56	0.33	0.29	0.57	0.00	0.15	0.32
Nazlı	0.52	0.44	0.54	0.83	0.57	0.63	0.59
Ayça	0.37	0.15	0.16	0.65	0.00	0.52	0.31
Azra	1.32	1.12	0.66	1.21	0.88	0.81	1.00
Merve	0.35	0.00	0.51	0.70	0.00	0.61	0.36
Mine	0.97	0.72	0.45	1.07	0.91	0.90	0.84
Non-Ideal Teacher	1.80	1.75	2.04	1.80	1.91	1.97	1.88
Mean**	0.68	0.46	0.43	0.84	0.39	0.60	-

*   Teachers' personal constructs in relation to their students are presented in Appendix B.

** While calculating the means, the distance coefficients between ideal and non-ideal teacher cells were not included in the calculation**s**

Table 4 shows that the teachers who were seen as closest to the ideal teacher profile were Ayça (0.31), Ezgi (0.32), Merve (0.36) and Nazlı (0.59). However, Azra (1.00) and Mine (0.84) were located most distant from the ideal teacher element.

The student with the most positive evaluations regarding her teachers seemed to be Nil. Three teachers (Ezgi, Ayça and Merve) were matched with the ideal teacher element by Nil. In other words, according to Nil, these three teachers had a one-to-one reflection of the ideal teacher profile. The teachers who were seen as relatively more negative, namely, more distant from the ideal teacher profile, were Mine and Azra, with 0.91 and 0.88 distance coefficients, respectively. The student with the second most positive comments about the teachers was Can. For Can, the teacher closest to the ideal teacher profile was Ayça (0.16), and the one he saw as most distant was Azra (0.66). Ali, who was seen as the most distant from the ideal student element, evaluated Merve most positively (0.35); similarly, Behiç also saw Merve as the ideal teacher (0.00). However, both Ali (1.32) and Behiç (1.12) saw Azra as distant from the ideal teacher element. Ekin had the most relatively negative evaluations about her teachers; the teacher whom she placed closest to the ideal element was Ezgi (0.57); the most distant teacher was Azra (1.21). Another student with the most positive evaluation about Ezgi was Uğur (the distance coefficient

between Ezgi and the ideal teacher element was 0.15). Mine was located the most distant from this element (0.90).

Among the teachers, Azra was located relatively more distant from the ideal teacher element by four students (Ali, Behiç, Can and Ekin), and Mine by two students (Nil and Uğur). The teachers who were located closest to the ideal teacher element were Merve, Ezgi, and Ayça. Accordingly, Ali and Behiç saw Merve closest to this element; for Ekin and Uğur, the teacher closest to this element was Ezgi, and for Can, it was Ayça. Nil located all three teachers (Ezgi, Ayça, Merve) closest to the ideal teacher element.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to identify how close teachers see their students to the ideal student profile and how close students see their teachers to the ideal teacher profile. Moreover, the study aimed to identify whether teachers' and students' evaluations in relation to each other were reciprocal.

Findings show that the student who was seen as closest to the ideal student element by their teachers was Nil. Hence, Nil was the most successful student in her classroom (mean score: 99.23). All of the teachers attending lessons in Nil's class represented her with positive personal constructs. The personal constructs her teachers used were 'follows the lesson well' (Ezgi), 'unprejudiced' (Nazlı), 'creative' (Ayça), 'careful' (Azra), 'questions-contestatory' (Merve), 'careful-does not find excuses' (Mine) and similar positive constructs. Just as Nil was placed closest to the ideal student profile by her teachers (0.16), she was the student who perceived her teachers most positively (0.39). The same situation was also valid for Can, who was the second most successful student in class (mean score: 98.46) and was also placed second in the ideal student profile. Can seemed to perceive his teachers positively. In other words, Can saw his teachers as close to the ideal teacher profile. Although the related literature includes no studies that investigated students' and teachers' constructs towards each other reciprocally, existing studies show that highly successful students (Good & Brophy, 1972), or students who have good marks (Petillon, 1982), are liked and loved more by their teachers. Students' perceptions about their relationships with their teachers are formed particularly according to their marks or success at school (Cornelius-White, 2007; Wu, Hughes & Kwok, 2010).

One of the expected findings was the representation of less successful students with negative constructs by their teachers. Hence, findings show that the two least successful students (Ali and Behiç) were represented by their teachers with negative personal constructs. The negative constructs the teachers used for these students included 'untidy', 'unambitious', 'does not like detail', 'does not study regularly', 'irresponsible', 'does not question', and 'finds excuses'. *In fact, according to the teachers, none of the students had non-ideal student profiles; therefore, more attention should be paid while interpreting the data.* Thus, teachers can be said to have given relative evaluations, and these students may partially reflect the non-ideal student profile. The same situation was not valid for the ideal student element because the teachers located Nil equal to the completely ideal student element or somewhere very close to it.

Students who were represented with positive constructs by their teachers were successful at school; students who were represented with negative personal constructs were not successful. It is reported that students who are successful tend to see their teacher as close to the ideal teacher profile. It was expected that unsuccessful students who were represented with negative constructs by their teachers (Ali and Behiç) would perceive their teachers negatively. It is interesting to note that those who were in the middle of the list in success rank (especially Ekin) generally had more negative constructs in relation to their teachers. This result might have stemmed from the fact that these students see the

more successful students as their competitors and might see the teachers as responsible for their relative failure. Hence, the finding that would support this idea is that Ekin located Ayça and Merve, who were located close to the ideal teacher element by other students, more distant than their friends did. A more detailed analysis reveals that both teachers had the most negative constructs about Ekin. Similarly, Ezgi, who saw Ekin as closer to the ideal student profile, was the teacher who was perceived most positively by Ekin. It is understandable that people tend to like people who like them, who accept them, and who are rewarding, which explains why this result was obtained.

In fact, the study also obtained some other findings that coincide with this result. For instance, can it be coincidence that Ali represents Merve with more positive personal constructs when compared to the other students and that Behiç makes a one-to-one matching of the ideal teacher with Merve? Likely not; while the other teachers located these two unsuccessful students as distant from the ideal student element, Nazlı's evaluations about Ali, and Merve's evaluations about Behiç, were relatively more positive. These findings coincide with the theoretical information proposed by the transactional model (Nickel, 1976; 1985), which investigates the teacher-student interaction from a broader framework. While students develop perceptions about their teachers, and while teachers develop perceptions about their students, they consider the perceptions and behaviours of the subjects with whom they interact.

As it is known, unsuccessful students feature 'loving theme' characteristics, such as emotional warmth and understanding, while developing perceptions about their teachers (Ditton, 2002; König, 2007). Hence, it is understandable that Ali and Behiç represented the teacher they saw as positive or close to the ideal teacher profile with these personal constructs (understanding, gives information about life, and loving). Furthermore, successful students give more importance to characteristics that reflect the teachers' professional expertise, field knowledge and teaching style (mastery theme) (Ditton, 2002; König, 2007). Therefore, Nil represented Azra, whom she saw as distant from the ideal teacher, with personal constructs such as 'does not teach new topics, is not interested in the lesson, does not give rewards', and Mine with 'does not give importance to students' ideas'. Similarly, another successful student, Can, used personal constructs such as 'does not give rewards' and 'disorganised' for the teachers he placed as distant from the ideal teacher element.

The teacher who was seen as most distant from the ideal profile by all of the students was their gymnastics teacher, Azra. The students used such constructs as 'is busy with out-of-lesson activities, does not give rewards, shouts at students, does not teach new topics, is not focused on the lesson, loveless, and is not fair-minded'. Another teacher who was evaluated with negative personal constructs was their computer teacher, Mine. The reasons for these teachers to be represented with negative constructs might be the fact that they could not establish strong bonds with students. Hence, the constructs used by the students indicate their negative relationships with these teachers; for instance 'does not consider students' and 'does not give importance to students' ideas' constructs were given for Mine; 'acts biased', 'is not fair-minded', and 'shouts at children' constructs were given for Azra. After all, students develop personal constructs about each teacher depending on their own experiences, and these constructs identify the direction and nature of their future life. The fact that both teachers were represented with similar personal constructs by students with different success levels (successful and unsuccessful) indicates that this case is not a personal, but rather a shared, experience. In other words, these constructs used by the students are not exceptions, but are shared by all students. Therefore, the teacher and her approach seem to be indicators in the formation of these constructs. Similarly, music teacher Ayça, English teacher Ezgi and physical education

teacher Merve were represented with positive constructs by all students, without exceptions. Naturally, these teachers were generally located close to the ideal teacher profile. Moreover, these teachers were represented with positive personal constructs by the students. However, as emphasised before, the causal explanations as to why these teachers were perceived as ideal by students differ for successful and unsuccessful students. 'Love theme' features of these teachers for students with low success levels and 'mastery theme' features for students with high success levels can explain why these teachers are perceived as ideal.

Conclusion and Recommendations

There is a reciprocal relationship between students' and teachers' constructs and their perceptions towards each other. Students who are represented with successful and positive personal constructs, and thus are seen as ideal students, tend to see their teachers as ideal teachers. In a similar vein, students who are represented with negative personal constructs tend to negatively evaluate the teachers who have these representations. According to students who are construed as unsuccessful and negative, an ideal teacher has a 'love theme' (understanding, affectionate, etc.); according to students who are construed as successful and positive, an ideal teacher has an 'mastery theme' (expertise, field knowledge, teaching style, etc.).

Studies on how students and teachers construe each other, and whether their constructs are reciprocal, are quite limited in number; it would be beneficial to conduct these kinds of studies. Due to the nature of this study (idiographic), the findings of the present research cannot be generalised. Therefore, conducting similar studies with more participants and using different research designs would contribute to the field. Moreover, whether the findings of this study are relevant for students in various education and grade levels and their teachers should be tested. Also, it would be beneficial to repeat this study on characteristic students in terms of success because participants of this study are compromise of only students of one class. Moreover, two success test scores were taken into account for selecting the students and how much the level of the students' unsuccessfulness categorized as unsuccessful is controversial. As evaluation about success is dependent and that is why, success is relative should be taken into account. In addition to this, another limitation is all of the teachers are female in this study. Future research may mediate more interesting findings if both students and teachers have different characteristics.

●　　●　　●

References

Afacan, M. Karakuş, M. & Uşak, M. (2013). "Öğretmenlerin Bilgi Düzeylerine İlişkin Öğrenci Algıları" Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması ve Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi (EBAD)* (Uluslararası E-Dergi), *3*(1): 185-200. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2013.3110a

Bortz, J. & Döring, N. (2006). *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation für Human- und Sozialwissenschaftler.* Heidelberg: Springer.

Brophy, J. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *75*, 631-661.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1974). *Teacher–student relationships: Causes and consequences*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Clausen, M. (2002): *Unterrichtsqualität: Eine Frage der Perspektive? Empirische Analysen zur Übereinstimmung, Konstrukt- und Kriteriumsvalidität.*- hrsg. in einer Reihe: Pädagogische Psychologie und Entwicklungspsychologie. Band 29.- Münster, New York, München, Berlin: Waxmann.

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-Centered Teacher-Student Relationships Are Effective: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 113–143.

Ditton, H. (2002). Lehrkräfte und Unterricht aus Schülersicht. Ergebnisseeiner Untersuchung im Fach Mathematik. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, *48*(2):262–285.

Ewen, R. B. (2003). *An introduction to theories of personality* (6th ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Feist, J. & Feist, G. J. (2006). *Theories of personality.* Singapore: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Fichten, W. (1993). *Unterricht aus Schülersicht. Die Schülerwahrnehmung von Unterricht als erziehungswissenschaftlicher Gegenstand und ihre Verarbeitung im Unterricht.* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 11, Pädagogik, 562). Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang.

Fransella, F., Bell, R., & Bannister, D. (2004). *A Manual for Repertory Grid Technique* (2. Auflage). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Fromm, M. (1995). *Repertory Grid Methodik - Ein Lehrbuch*. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1972). Behavioral expression of teacher attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *63*, 617-624.

Good, T. L. (1982). How teachers' expectations affect results. *Amexican Education*, *18*(10), 25-32.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. (2003). *Looking in Classrooms.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Gültekin, M. (2015). İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin İdeal Öğretmen Algısı. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, *10*(11).

Grice, J. W. (2008). *Idiogrid: Idiographic analysis with repertory grids, version 2.4.* Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Hjelle, L. A. & Ziegler, D. J. (1992). *Personality Theories.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Holl, H.-P. (2007). *"Gute" Lehrer an Berufsbildenden Schulen - Best Practice aus der Schülerperspektive.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Universität Erfurt. Retrieved on 17 Semptember 2015 from http://www.db-thueringen.de/servlets/DerivateServlet/Derivate-15280/holl.pdf

Ittel, A. & Raufelder, D. (2008). *Lehrer und Schüler als Bildungspartner. Theoretische Ansätze zwischen Tradition und Moderne.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kelly, G. A. (1955, 1991). *The psychology of personal constructs*. New York : Routledge.

Klaghofer, R., Oser, F. & Patry, J. L. (1995). What distinguishes good from bad teachers? The former students' image of their teachers. In R. Olechowski & G. Khan-Svik, *Experimental research on teaching and learning* (pp. 295-305). Frankfurt a.M.: Lang.

König, J. (2007). *Welche Merkmale sollte eine „gute" Lehrkraft haben? Gruppendiskussionen mit Schülerinnen und Schülern der 10. Jahrgangsstufe.* Berlin: Humboldt-Universität. Retrieved on 17 Semptember 2015 from http://edoc.hu-berlin.de/oa/reports/reRNbCttzVNJc/PDF/26W7Vi1P0HXNk.pdf

Nickel, H. (1976). Die Lehrer-Schüler-Beziehung aus Sicht neurer Forschungsergebnisse- ein transaktionales Modell. *Psychologie und Unterricht*, *23*,153-172.

Nickel, H. (1985). Die Lehrer-Schüler-Beziehung aus der Sicht neuerer Forschungsergebnisse – ein transaktionales Modell. In R. Biermann (Hrsg.), *Interaktion – Unterricht – Schule* (S. 254-280). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Nölle, V. (1995). *Schüler sehen Schule anders. Eine empirische Untersuchung über Schulauffassungen von Schülern und ihren Konsens.* Lang-Verlag. Frankfurt am Main.

Özabacı, N. & Acat, B. M. (2005). Öğretmen adaylarının kendi özellikleri ile ideal öğretmen özelliklerine dönük algılarının karşılaştırılması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, *11*(2), 211-236.

Öztürk, B. & Koç, G. (2001), "Öğretmen Beklentileri ve Öğrenci Üzerindeki Etkileri", *Eğitim Yönetimi*, *7*(27), 359-395.

Öztürk, B., Koç, G. & Şahin, F.T. (2003). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrencileri arasında ayrım yapma durumu ve bu ayrımın bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *1*(1), 109–118.

Petillon, H. (1987). *Der Schüler. Rekonstruktion der Schule aus der Perspektive von Kindern und Jugendlichen*. Darmstadt.

Raufelder, D. T. (2006). *Die Bedeutung des Lehrer-Schüler-Verhältnisses im Bildungsprozeß.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Fachbereich Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften der Freien Universität Berlin. Retrieved on 17 Semptember 2015 from http://www.diss.fu-berlin. de/diss/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/FUDISS_derivate_000000002233/0_DianaRaufelde r. Pdf

Schweer, M. & Thies, B. (2000). Situationswahrnehmung und interpersonales Verhalten im Klassenzimmer. In: M. Schweer (Hrsg.): *Lehrer-Schüler-Interaktion. Pädagogisch-psychologische Aspekte des Lehrens und Lernens.* Opladen: Leske & Budrich. pp. 59 – 78.

Telli, S., Den Brok, P., & Çakıroğlu, J. (2010). Öğretmen ve öğrencilerin ideal öğretmen hakkındaki görüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *33*(149), 118-129.

Vogel, M. (2012). Das Repertory-Grid-Interview für systemische Forschungsvorhaben. In Ochs, M. & Schweitzer, J. (Hg.), *Handbuch Forschung für Systemiker.* (pp. 381-394). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wood, T. D. (2012). Teacher Perceptions of Gender-Based Differences among Elementary School Teachers. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *4*(2), 317-345.

Wu, J.-Y., Hughes, J. N., und Kwok, O.-M. (2010). Teacher–student relationship quality type in elementary grades: Effects on trajectories for achievement and engagement. *Journal of School Psychology*, *48*(5), 357–387.

Appendix A

Personal Constructs which are most associated with Ideal and nonideal student profiles

		İdeal (+)	İdeal (-)			İdeal (+)	İdeal (-)
Ezgi	Careful	0.86	-0.88	Nazlı	Open to innovation	0.74	-0.94
	Tidy	0.85	-0.90		Comprehends fast	0.80	-0.73
	Highly motivated	0.89	-0.88		Productive	0.83	-0.93
	Follows the lesson well	0.82	-0.72		Conscientious	0.74	-0.84
	Witty	0.43	-0.58		Talkative	0.67	-0.76
	Responsible	0.87	-0.90		Elaborator	0.91	-0.78
	Studies Regularly	0.86	-0.86		Enterprising	0.62	-0.77
	Creative	0.99	-0.86		Ambitious	0.74	-0.61
	Smiling	0.61	-0.86		Speaks regardful	0.81	-0.70
	Pays attention to the lesson	0.91	-0.86		Unprejudiced	0.93	-0.83
Ayça	Responsible	0.84	-0.70	Azra	Follows the lesson well	0.88	-0.69
	Productive	0.92	-0.66		Does not interrupt the lesson	0.85	-0.65
	Ambitious	0.92	-0.61		Leader	0.82	-0.86
	Smiling	0.28	-0.82		Contestatory	0.77	-0.69
	Creative	0.95	-0.89		Responsible	0.84	-0.78
	Neat	0.86	-0.65		Careful	0.96	-0.90
	Witty	0.54	-0.82		Obeys the rules	0.89	-0.86
	Helpful	0.64	-0.95		Carefree	0.43	-0.71
	Alert	0.68	-0.87		Emotional	0.71	-0.87
	Questioner	0.77	-0.64		Creative	0.79	-0.82
Merve	Loving	0.74	-0.86	Mine	Enthusiastic, zealous	0.84	-0.80
	Fast	0.74	-0.67		Careful	0.97	-0.88
	Extrovert	0.74	-0.86		Calm	0.44	-0.54
	Comprehends fast	0.79	-0.69		Comprehends fast	0.94	-0.88
	Wise	0.86	-0.75		Highly motivated	0.94	-0.96
	Stays behind	0.46	-0.56		Respectful	0.69	-0.91
	Questioner	0.84	-0.84		Studies on time	0.89	-0.76
	Comfortable	0.84	-0.71		Does not find excuses	0.94	-0.81
	Contestatory	0.92	-0.92		Ambitious	0.94	-0.88
	Establishes dialogs well	0.64	-0.76		Questioner	0.79	-0.92

Appendix B

Personal Constructs which are most associated with Ideal and nonideal teacher profiles

		İdeal (+)	İdeal (-)			İdeal (+)	İdeal (-)
Ali	Gives information about life	0.83	-0.75	Behiç	Knowledgeable	0.94	-0.78
	Loving	0.88	-0.89		Understanding	0.89	-0.66
	Does not force	0.86	-0.86		Does not force	0.69	-0.96
	Uses various styles for instruction	0.87	-0.81		Skilful	0.78	-0.86
	Loves her job	0.97	-0.98		Focused on the lesson	0.91	-0.83
	Unprejudiced	0.81	-0.87		Kind	0.88	-0.90
	Interested in students	0.86	-0.92		Calm	0.62	-0.68
	Makes surprises	0.87	-0.89		Enthusiastic	0.90	-0.76
	Democratic	0.82	-0.91		Democratic	0.69	-0.96
	Organized in the lesson	0.88	-0.92		Is organized	0.81	-0.99
Can	Enthusiastic, lively	0.88	-0.97	Ekin	Gives rewards	0.87	-0.41
	Smiling	0.97	-0.85		Does not shout at children	0.71	-0.79
	Is organized	0.78	-0.90		Uses positive expressions	0.68	-0.80
	Creative	0.72	-0.90		Emotional	0.68	-0.64
	Gives rewards	0.88	-0.89		Respectful	0.57	-0.92
	Witty	0.98	-0.89		Considers students	0.70	-0.89
	Understanding	0.87	-0.96		Is organized	0.76	-0.90
	Gives importance to students	0.86	-0.98		Creative	0.64	-0.76
	Democratic	0.87	-0.98		Reviews previous topics	0.78	-0.71
	Gives importance to students' ideas	0.82	-0.98		Cares about students	0.56	-0.92
Nil	Democratic	0.99	-0.95	Uğur	Loving	0.87	-0.71
	Teaches new topics	0.95	-0.98		Gives rewards	0.87	-0.81
	Affectionate	1.00	-0.99		Creative	0.85	-0.94
	Interested in the lesson	0.95	-0.98		Lively	0.81	-0.86
	Gives importance to students' ideas	0.93	-0.97		Gives importance to children	0.94	-0.93
	Gives rewards	0.95	-0.98		Fair	0.75	-0.87
	Have full knowledge of the topic	0.85	-0.91		Zealous	0.95	-0.90
	Is organized	0.99	-0.95		Social	0.79	-0.92
	Entertaining	1.00	-0.99		Teaches in an entertaining way	0.87	-0.90
	Tidy	0.96	-0.92		Makes surprises	0.78	-0.89