



Mirsada S. Zukorlić¹, Iljaz A. Osmanlić
University of Belgrade, Teacher Education Faculty,
Department in Novi Pazar

Short scientific
paper

Levels of Interaction between Students and Teachers in the Classroom

Paper received: Jun 4 2017
Paper accepted: Aug 25 2017
Article Published: Sep 29 2017

Extended summary

The paper presents the results of a theoretical analysis of the correlation between the levels of teacher-student interaction in the classroom and the educational effects. An overview of the previous research of this interaction in the educational process has also been provided.

The teacher-student interaction has been studied from various aspects: the impact of the interaction on the social and emotional climate; the impact of the interaction on learning outcomes; the effects of this interaction on the quality of human relationships, etc. The concept of interaction is wider than the concept of communication, given that communication implies only interaction mediated by signs. A significant characteristic of communication is that it is a process in which one individual influences the behavior of another one. Important characteristics of pedagogical communication include: conditioning by educational goals; professional design and programming of its flow and outcome by preschool teachers; a high level of interaction and the possibility of mutual influence; openness; interpersonal relationship; active listening; understanding; emotions; empathy. The effects of pedagogical communication are more pronounced and directed towards the development of personality. For this reason, early education is defined as a specific interaction between preschool teachers and their pupils. The aim of the paper is to identify and present the levels of interaction between pupils and teachers. The implications of the specific aspects of this interaction on learning outcomes have also been analyzed (teaching, managing or supporting pupil autonomy, social and emotional relationships). When viewed from this perspective, the student-teacher interaction – in the form of teaching, managing, social and emotional relationships – characterized by strong support and high expectations (challenges) of teachers, active teaching strategy and mutual emphatic communication, is a type of communication which is reflected positively on educational effects. On the

1. mirsada.ljajic@uf.bg.ac.rs

Copyright © 2017 by the authors, licensee [Teacher Education Faculty](#) University of Belgrade, SERBIA.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original paper is accurately cited.

other hand, negative impact on educational effects is created by the interaction characterized by the low level of teacher support and expectations, authoritarian management style, and a negative attitude towards teaching coupled with high teacher expectations of their students.

In the concluding remarks the emphasis is on the conditions that must be provided for the realization of the highest level of interactive relationship. First of all, class sizes have to be smaller between the main actors in the classroom. (smaller number of students in the classroom; students and teachers know one another well) and subjective (adequate reactions of teachers, developed empathy, motivation for educational work) conditions that need to be provided for the accomplishment of the highest level of interaction between the main actors in the classroom - mutual empathic communication and dialogue. In addition, recommendations for enhancing teacher efficiency in the process of communication with students are also provided.

In the concluding remarks the emphasis is on the conditions that must be provided for the realization of the highest level of interactive relationship between the main actors in the classroom. First of all, class sizes have to be smaller because big classes make it impossible for teachers to get to know all their pupils well and communicate with them at a higher level of interaction. As far as subjective conditions are concerned, a developed empathy of teachers is crucial. Empathy enables teachers to be more sensitive to their pupils' behavior and to adjust their communication to pupils as individuals and to the entire class. To put their empathy to pedagogical use, teachers should not know only how their pupils feel, think and what kind of environment has engendered such thoughts and emotions, but they should also be positively determined to understand and accept their pupils and tolerate their negative characteristics. Apart from subjective conditions, such as developed empathy, teachers should be motivated to communicate successfully because such communication results in a successful educational practice.

The paper also offers recommendations for policy makers and persons dealing with planning in education. The recommendations are based on the assumption that a clear and effective communication is the underlying force of teacher efficiency. The following areas deserve special attention: communication skills should be the main criterion in the teacher selection; evaluation of communication skills should become a permanent segment of the regular teacher evaluation; the criterion for monitoring the quality of communication should conform to the principles of pedagogical communication (the principle of acknowledgement and acceptance of the pupil's personality and his/her feelings; the principle of equal and non-violent communication between teachers and pupils; the principle of usefulness of pedagogical communication; the principle of altruism and empathy in pedagogical communication; the principle of respecting cultural diversity in pedagogical communication).

Key words: teaching, interactive relationship, pedagogical communication, effects of the teaching process.

References

- Anderson, W. L. (2004). *Increasing teacher effectiveness*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

-
- Andrić, V., Čudina-Obradović, M. (1996). *Psihologija učenja i nastave* (III izdanje). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
 - Baucal, A., Arcidiacono, F. & Buđevac, N. (2011). Reflecting on different views of social interaction: Explanatory and analytic perspectives. In: Baucal, A., Arcidiacono, F. & Buđevac, N. (Eds.). *Studying interaction in different contexts: A qualitative view* (235–251). Belgrade: Institute of Psychology.
 - Bratanić, M. (1990). *Mikropedagogija – interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
 - Brekelmans, M., Levy, J. & Rodriguez, R. (1993). A typology of teacher communication style. In: Wubbels, T. & Levy, J. (Eds.). *Do you know what you look like?* (46–55). London: The Falmer Press.
 - Flanders, N. A. (1966). *Analyzing teaching behaviour*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
 - Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Reading, Massachusetts: AddisonWesley Publishing Company.
 - Gojkov, G., Stojanović, A. (2015). *Didaktičke kompetencije i evropski kvalifikacioni okvir*. Beograd: Srpska akademija obrazovanja.
 - Goleman, D. (2014). *Socijalna inteligencija*. Beograd: Geopoetika.
 - Grasha, A. F. & Yangarber-Hicks, N. (2000). Integrating teaching styles and learning styles with instructional technology. *College Teaching*, 48 (1), 2–10.
 - Grossen, M. (2009). Social interaction, discourse and learning. Methodological challenges of an emergent transdisciplinary field. In: Kumpulainen, K., Hmelo-Silver, C. E. & Cesar, M. (Eds.). *Investigating classroom interaction: Methodologies in action* (263–275). Rotterdam: Sense.
 - Huitt, W. (2003). A transactional model of the teaching/learning process. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved April 25, 2017. from: <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/materials/tchlrnmd.html>.
 - Knežević-Florić, O. (2006). *Interaktivna pedagogija*. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.
 - Kostović, S. (2005). *Vaspitni stil nastavnika*. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.
 - Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. A functional theory and methodology for personality evaluation*. Eugene OR: Resource Publications.
 - Mariani, L. (1997). Teacher support and teacher challenge in promoting learner autonomy. *Perspectives*, 23 (2). Posećeno 24. 7. 2017. godine na: <http://www.learningpaths.org/papers/papersupport.html>.
 - Milutinović, J. (2011). Socijalni konstruktivizam u oblasti obrazovanja i učenja. *Institut za pedagoška istraživanja*, 43 (2), 177–194.
-

-
- Natali, M. M. (2016). Možemo li da učimo kroz neslaganje? Sociokulturno viđenje argumen-
tovanih interakcija u pedagoškom okruženju u visokom obrazovanju. *Inovacije u nastavi*. 28
(3), 165–166.
 - *Pedagoška enciklopedija I i II* (1989). Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
 - Psaltis, G., Gillespie, A. & Perret-Clermont, A.-N. (2015). *Social Relations in Human and So-
cietal Development*. Basingstokes (Hampshire, UK): Palgrave Macmillan.
 - Richman, J. M. & Bowen, L. G. (1997). School failure: an ecological interactional – develop-
mental perspective. In: Fraser, M. (Ed.). *Risk and Resilience in childhood: an ecological perspec-
tive* (95–116). Washington DC: NASW Press.
 - Suzić, N. (1995). *Osobine nastavnika i odnos učenika prema nastavi*. Banja Luka: Narodna i
univerzitetska biblioteka.
 - Šimić-Šašić, S. (2011). Interakcija nastavnik–učenik: Teorije i mjerenje. *Psihologijske teme*. 20
(2), 233–260.
 - Williams, G. C., Freedman, Z. R. & Deci, E. L. (1998). Supporting autonomy to motivate pa-
tients with diabetes for glucose control. *Diabetes Care*. 21, 1644–1651.
 - Windschitl, M. (1999). The challenges of sustaining a constructivist classroom culture. *Phi
Delta Kappan*. 80 (10), 751–755.
 - Zukorlić, M. (2013). Vaspitanje – svojevrsna interakcija između vaspitača i vaspitanika. U:
Kačapor, S. (ur.). *Teme iz pedagogije* (306–307). Priština: Univerzitet u Prištini, Filozofski
fakultet.
 - Zukorlić, M. (2016). Pedagoška komunikacija u funkciji razvoja socijalne kompetencije
učenika. *Inovacije u nastavi*. 29 (1), 92–104.