Mirsada S. Zukorlić[*]

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Education, Novi Pazar

Slobodan Lj. Pavlović[*]

University of Kragujevac, Faculty of Education, Užice

STUDENT–TEACHER INTERACTION

Abstract: The paper presents the results of a theoretical analysis of pedagogical work in school as an interactive process. An important aspect of interaction is that it is a process in which one individual influences the behavior of another. In pedagogical communication, such influences are more pronounced and are directed towards the development of personality, with the ties between the subjects of the educational process being solid and strong. That is why education is defined as a kind of interaction between teachers and students. The paper discusses the implications of certain aspects of interaction – teaching, leadership or support for student autonomy and socio-emotional relationships – for the teaching outcomes. Accordingly, emphasis is placed on the conditions which need to be provided in order for the highest level of interaction to be achieved between the main actors in the teaching process – students and teachers.

Keywords: *interaction, aspects of interaction, pedagogical communication, teaching outcomes.*

Introduction

It is well known that teaching is based on forms of social interaction and that the effects of pedagogical work (the value system, attitudes, interests, etc.) depend on the social experience of students. This view of the teaching process, as well as of pedagogical work was initiated in the second half of the twentieth century, with the first transcendental-philosophical approach to treating pedagogical work as "communication" between teachers and students. From that period, new views on the participants in the educational process can be seen in scientific papers. Equality

---

[*] mirsada.ljajic@uf.bg.ac.rs

[*] slobodan.b.pavlovic@gmail.com

between students and teachers is emphasized more. Unlike earlier periods when the emphasis was either on the teacher activity (Herbart) or student activity (Dewey), interpersonal relationships, interactions between teachers and students come to the fore. The development of modern pedagogical science includes research, reflection, as well as creating models of effective pedagogical communication. This specifically means a change in the roles and relationships between students and teachers: the student becomes an active subject of the process, gains space for individual development and self-realization, begins to "learn for life", i.e. begins to develop the abilities of self-competence and social competence, while the teacher becomes profiled as an organizer, mediator, intermediary, advisor, and the like. In such an atmosphere, the possibilities increase for the main actors of the pedagogical process to adequately exchange messages and to put them appropriately in the function of living together.

Theoretical-methodological framework

The communicative pedagogy or, otherwise called, personalization pedagogy, interactive pedagogy, or communication pedagogy, appears as part of the "third wave" and states that pedagogical work is not only what the teacher does (Herbartian pedagogy) or only what the student does (Dewey's pedagogy), but what is "between" (interpersonal relationship, interaction, communication). Its appearance is related to the period after 1955 and is still being installed in practice (Трнавац, 2003). Thus, the traditional pedagogical tendencies become suppressed in the period from the second half of the XX century by the modern understandings of pedagogical work as "communication" between students and teachers. Numerous criticisms have been expressed from different points of view and within different orientations. The implications of this all are, or should be, what is known today as nonrepressive communication, with pedagogical work being known as a communicative process, which takes place between teachers and students, i.e. between trainers and trainees. Interpersonal relationship and the character of cooperative communication is the basic criterion taken into account by communication pedagogy, i.e. interactive pedagogy. At the core of communicative pedagogy is existentialist philosophy, the essence of which is that man is not considered a predetermined, full being, but has yet to be realized. Within this framework, the importance of communication is emphasized as a means by which a free man is realized. Also, communicative pedagogy implies pedagogical work as a transformation of an individual into a person (Кујунџић, 1986). This transformation lasts until the full realization of a free man, but not by the action of various heteronomous factors, but rather in the process of communication in which each participant is their own ultimate creator. One of the advocates of pedagogical work as "communicative action", Mollenhauer, continues to develop, after Mead and Habermas, the idea of symbolic interactionism, emphasizing the need for free

exchange of views and opinions of equal participants, as a way to overcome education as manipulation. Jurgen Habermas made a great contribution to the field of reflexive communication. He starts from the claim that the basic views on communication have become instrumentalist due to the deep social crisis, thanks to the dominance of science and post-industrialization in modern conditions. This means that communication is a means by which the recipient (listener) is persuaded to satisfy the interests of the actor (speaker), without taking into account the interests of the recipient. This view of communication was criticized as it reduces reason to instrumentality, diminishes a person's rational autonomy and undermines the respect that should be shown to other individuals. In order to overcome the shortcomings in the understanding of communication, Habermas offers the theory of "communicative action", which is also positively expressed in pedagogical relations. The starting point of this theory is a model or type of speech act that orients speakers and recipients to interactively achieve mutual understanding in relation to agreed value standards, thus nurturing rationality as a quality of inherent and superior value. This theory implies that pedagogical communication should consist of linguistic acts that aim at nothing more or less than understanding, which is rationally negotiated between teachers and students. Based on these acts, teaching will enrich reason, encourage rational autonomy of people, and strengthen equal respect they owe to each other as rational beings.

As part of his theory developed on the theory of discourse and/or communicative competence, Habermas also states the assumptions of an ideal speech situation. The first assumption concerns grammar and implies that the actor speaks intelligibly. The second assumption, which concerns the content, is that the actor sends to the recipient, implicitly and explicitly, some statement that he/she must understand. The third assumption, which concerns the actor themself, is that, by implying the first and second assumptions, the actor reveals himself/herself as sincere. The fourth assumption implies that the actor's statement is in accordance with the prevailing social or cultural norms. Habermas's description of the ideal speech situation is also the basis for the ideal pedagogical speech situation, and for that reason it is important for teaching.

Within his theory of "communicative action", he talks about three aspects of human communication (Флорић-Кнежевић, 2005): the functional aspect of mutual understanding (communication as transmission and development of knowledge information); the aspect of action coordination (communication as a factor of social integration and establishing solidarity); the aspect of socialization (communication as a basis for developing an individual's identity).

This innovated view of communication has nevertheless suffered some criticism, which has its justification, but it is hardly disputable that Habermas's theory of communication has significant implications for pedagogical communication and that, as such, it can be articulated as a framework of reference for understanding, researching and innovating communication in teaching.

Interaction and communication are the basis of education

Communication is a word, a lexeme that originates from the Latin word communicare, which, among other things, means: to inform, to interact. It is a process in which something is made common, which means connecting with each other in the community and communicating with each other (*Педагошки лексикон*, 1996). Communication between individual members of the group is not a specificity of human groups only, as we find some elements of communication in many lower and higher animal species as well. However, the human form of communication differs from the animal forms of communication in that human communication takes place on a symbolic and conceptual level. In the definition of communication, given in the pedagogical encyclopedia, it is said that "the very concept of communication means in its most general form, the exchange of messages between two or more persons" (*Pedagoška enciklopedija*, 1989: 404). Contemporary pedagogical science (communicative, emancipatory) considers communication, interaction and interpersonal relationship as essential features of pedagogical work.

Though forms of interpersonal relationships, interaction and communication can be defined separately, to understand their importance for pedagogical work (the interaction-communication aspect), it is especially important to consider what their relationship is and what their interconnectedness is. Interaction (in an interpersonal relationship) implies "an actual relationship between two or more individuals in which one individual influences the behaviour of others" (Rot, 1982: 15). This influence of one individual on others consists of one person noticing others and reacting to their activities/actions, gestures, ideas, etc., and also being perceived and reacted to by others (*Pedagoška enciklopedija*, 1989: 282). The interaction is reflected in the interaction of persons who mutually determine their behaviour based on the attitudes they take towards each other. It does not always imply face-to-face (interpersonal) relationships or the physical presence of others, nor spatial and temporal proximity. "Social interaction can also take place on a symbolic level, based on psychological interdependence – on knowledge of the expectations and myths of other individuals and groups and anticipation of their actions" (*Pedagoška enciklopedija*, 1989: 282). It is in this statement that we also find the essence of interaction between the subjects of pedagogical/educational work. Additionally, evaluation is of special importance for pedagogical work as one of the characteristics of social interaction; it includes the evaluation of others, their motives and actions, as well as the consequences that their reaction may have for the subject. It concerns an active mutual relationship that leads to changes in the behaviour of participants, that is, social influence. The concept of interaction is broader than the concept of communication, because communication is only that

kind of interaction which is mediated by signs. The process of transferring messages cannot take place without interaction and vice versa – with each interaction there is a kind of communication relationship between the participants. That is either a mutual or one-way influence.

Professional communication of pedagogues with children (where the term pedagogue means educator in the broadest sense of the word) is called pedagogical communication because it is aimed at solving educational tasks, development, education (Сергејев, 2000). In the pedagogical/educational process, communication assumes that both teachers and students understand communication signs and symbols, which is an important prerequisite for their equal and creative cooperation, and the overall success in teaching. "Communication becomes pedagogical when, conditioned by goals, it is previously specially designed and programmed by educators. Pedagogical communication is characterized by goal orientation, conscious goal setting, aspiration of the pedagogue to solve certain scientific, educational, developmental and pedagogical tasks in the process and outcome of communication" (Лихачев, 2000: 238). For the pedagogical/educational process, specifically for the teaching process, the effectiveness of the interaction on educational outcomes varies depending on the quality (level) of interaction between the subjects of this process.

A great many theorists have studied the interaction between students and teachers from the aspect of its impact on the socio-emotional climate: Levin, Lipit, White (1939), Andersson (1945), Withall (1949), Bratanić (1975), Ševkušić (1992), Rajević-Djurašinović (1984). There are theorists who have analyzed the interaction with respect to its impact on the learning outcomes: Flanders, N. A. (1965), Brophy (1989), Gage, N. L. (1968), Bennet (1976), B. Marentič-Požarnik (1978). The interaction between the main subjects of teaching has also been studied from the aspect of its reflection on the quality of interpersonal relations, (Babić, 1983). An extremely valuable contribution to this theoretical area and teaching practice was given by Suzić (1995), who researched the relationship between students' attitudes towards teaching and teachers and the characteristics of teachers. Teacher characteristics (authoritativeness, cooperation, normativity, problem-solving orientation, emotionally positive and emotionally negative reactions) are the independent variables, and students' attitudes towards teaching are the dependent variables. The most significant findings of this research indicate that:

1. There is a significant difference in the attitudes of students about the subject of those teachers who students evaluate positively and in the attitudes of students about the subject of those teachers who students evaluate negatively;

2. Students' academic achievement is related to their experience of teacher characteristics;

3. Students' attitudes about the subject, about learning and school depend on the experience of the teacher's characteristics;

4. The efficiency of a lesson and the level of teaching differentiation depend on the characteristics of the teacher;

5. The most important dominant factor that determines the attitude of students towards teaching, but also the behaviour of teachers is the IV-factor (interpersonal value factor). Research has shown the priority of the influence of these factors in both students and teachers.

The assumption from which Kostović started in her research is that students are exposed to pedagogical activity during the educational process, which is, in fact, a manifestation of the teacher's characteristics marked as educational styles (Костовић, 2005). The author considers interaction and communication in teaching through the dimensions of direct and indirect teacher influence. The direct influence refers to lecturing, explaining, directing students' behaviour and activities, criticizing and justifying authority, while the indirect influence is defined by praise, encouragement, positive emotional attitude towards students, i.e. teachers' interest in students' feelings, acceptance of students' ideas and suggestions. Analyzing the degrees of interaction in communication, Bratanić singles out four of them: the degree of physical presence; action-reaction question-answer communication; empathic communication and dialogue (Bratanić, 1990). The lowest level of interaction is physical connection, where the teacher establishes a communication relationship with students through non-verbal signs, i.e. based on their very presence. Non-verbal behaviour of teachers (physical presence) precedes verbal communication with students. If the teacher realizes it superficially, uninterestedly, if they do not care about the student's answer, the interaction remains at the lowest level. If there is a verbal communication in which the teacher asks questions and thus activates the students – and gets answers, it is the next (higher) level of interaction, the so-called action-reaction question-answer communication. A higher level of interaction in teaching than action-reaction communication is empathic communication. At this level, at least one person (usually a teacher) can communicate empathetically. The assumption is that the teacher knows their students well and adapts the way of communicating to them. At this level of interactional connection in teaching, there is a possibility of pedagogical action. This means that when a teacher communicates with a student on an empathic level, the communication goes deeper into the student's psyche, is reflected in their satisfaction, influences their attitudes and values, encourages them to engage in activities without which there is no learning or pedagogical process. The best pedagogical effects are achieved when empathic communication is mutual. This means that both the teacher and the student know how to listen to each other empathetically, put themselves in someone else's position and look at the problem from the other's point of view. This is the highest level in communication, the so-called dialogue – the ideal of human communication. Thus, "the higher level of interaction there is in the communication within pedagogical activity, the more

successful the pedagogical activity will be" (Bratanić, 1990: 77). The following sections discuss the implications of certain aspects of interaction for the teaching outcomes.

Implications of interaction aspects for the teaching outcomes

The development of an individual is conditioned by his/her interaction with the environment in which he/she is; thus, the development itself largely depends on the social and institutional frameworks (Зукорлић и Поповић, 2018). Given that teaching (enabling learning), leadership or support for student autonomy and socio-emotional relationships are important aspects of interaction in teaching (Šimić-Šašić, 2011), which can be established at different levels, it is in this context that we consider their implications for the outcomes of the teaching process. We have already emphasized that the impact of interactive connections on learning success is often considered in papers on the interaction between students and teachers. Exploring how teaching (aspect of interaction) reflects on the student's achievement in learning, their position in the teaching process, and the development of certain skills and abilities, Flanders states in his Protocol (the most commonly considered recording system) that verbal behaviour in the classroom is divided into teacher talk and student talk, and the teacher talk is further divided into direct and indirect influence (Flanders, 1966). Out of a total of ten formed categories, seven categories belong to the teacher talk, two to the student talk and the last one consists of silence or confusion. The indirect teacher influence contains four categories of behaviour: 1 Acceptance of student feelings; 2 Praising; 3 Accepting, explaining and using students' ideas; and 4 Asking questions. The direct teacher influence contains three categories of behaviour: 1) Lecturing, stating facts and opinions; 2) Giving directions; 3) Criticising. Student behaviour is observed through two categories: 1) Student talk response; 2) Student talk initiation. In his research, Flanders came up with the results which indicate a pronounced verbal dominance of teachers. Lecturing, asking questions, and other teacher comments take up two-thirds of the teaching event. The results showed that indirect teacher influence is more effective for student learning outcomes than direct influence. Direct teaching passivates students (Flanders, 1970). On the other hand, the so-called indirect interaction and active teaching result in: developed student attention and skills (communication, argumentative discussion, assertiveness, respect for others, cooperation, active listening, empathy), developed creative, critical and divergent thinking, intrinsic motivation, low presence of negative emotions (anxiety, fear, stress), evaluation of learning and knowledge, as well as positive attitudes (Robson, 1998; according to: Šimić-Šašić, 2011). Also, Huitt's research (Huitt, 2003) shows that the quality of interaction between students and teachers is one of the best indicators of students' achievement, i.e. the level of student engagement in teaching and learning, and that

learning outcomes affect student personality characteristics and motivation. The quality of student-teacher interaction depends on the teacher's teaching style (Grasha & Yangarber-Hicks, 2000). The expert style means that the teacher possesses extensive knowledge and expertise, and ensures competence development in students. The teacher emphasizes their status with formal authority, which is based on the knowledge they possess and the role of the teacher itself. A personality model acts by example, emphasizing direct perception and following the role of the model. The facilitator is a style of teaching which puts to the forefront the personal nature of the teacher-student interactions. This style prompts in students developing the ability to work independently, initiative and responsibility, and collaborative work with other students based on support and encouragement. A delegate encourages students to develop the ability to work independently or to work in teams, where the teacher appears in the role of the "auxiliary factor", i.e. a person to whom students can always turn for help. Each of the above styles is present in teachers to a different extent, but one style dominates. These styles can lead to combined styles that determine the socio-emotional climate in the classroom; for example, the expert-formal authority is accompanied by a neutral and cold climate, while the expert-facilitator delegate causes a warm emotional climate and encourages a certain learning style in students.

Leadership is another aspect of interaction between students and teachers in the teaching process. Through leadership as a social exchange, teachers can evoke pleasant or unpleasant feelings in students. In the first case, the student feels the teacher's empathy, support and positivity, and in the second they feel lonely. The teacher-student interaction model developed by Leary (Timothy Leary, 1957) is based on two dimensions of communication (the dimension of influence and the dimension of closeness). The dimension of influence is manifested through dominance and submissiveness and indicates who controls the situation and to what extent (level). The dimension of closeness is manifested through cooperation and opposition and refers to the level of cooperation or closeness between teachers and students. Given these dimensions, eight types of teacher behaviour can be distinguished: leadership, help/friendship, understanding, giving freedom to students, insecurity, dissatisfaction, reprimand, and strictness (Brekelmans et all., 1993). In teacher leadership, two broad dimensions of leadership can be distinguished: integrative teacher behaviour – encouraging group members to work towards common goals in a way that satisfies each member of the group, and direct teacher behaviour – task-oriented, involving specific resources to achieve the set learning goals and coordinate teaching activities (Watkins & Wagner, 2000). Teachers are often oriented towards the latter dimension, being focused on the subject itself and the academic achievement, while neglecting the establishment of social relations that imply integration, inclusion and cooperation among students. This will imply disciplinary problems or conflicts, while the fulfilment of school obligations will stay in the background. At the same time, this means poorer academic achievement of students, as well as the fact that they will not fully realize

their capacities in terms of intellectual, social and emotional development (Ђигић, 2017). A teacher with integrative behaviour or, in other words, a socially intelligent teacher, will raise the mood of students with their actions, which directly affects the strengthening of mental abilities such as creative thinking, cognitive flexibility and information processing. That is, instead of the role of a lecturer and the one who provides information, the teacher assumes the role of the one who facilitates group processes in the class (Ђорђевић, 2019). Moments of learning imbued with a solid mixture of deep attention, enthusiastic interest and strong positive emotions are actually moments in which learning is enjoyed (Goleman, 2014). Some authors prefer an authoritative leadership style because, seen from the perspective of task performance, the best results are achieved when the teacher applies this leadership style, but this type of interaction is not suitable for developing communication skills nor does it encourage motivation for academic achievement (Andrilović i Čudina-Obradović, 1996). It follows from the above that both dimensions are important for effective classroom management. Lenient and indifferent leadership styles do not achieve success by any criteria, because they are characterized by poor success in task performance, dissatisfaction with the achievement and poor interpersonal relationships.

Depending on the type of teacher authority and understanding of their own position and role and their independence and willingness to take responsibility, the student will be able to participate at different levels and with different degrees of autonomy. Some authors (Richman & Bowen, 1997) believe that the value of participation is not only reflected in making changes in the decision-making process, but also in the way in which independence and autonomy are developed. The higher the level of student participation in teaching, the sooner they will learn to act in accordance with their opinion and their will, that is, they will be autonomous in making decisions for which they are competent. The concept of support for student autonomy within the theory of self-determination (Williams & Deci, 1998) represents an interpersonal orientation in which a person in a position of authority (the teacher) takes into account the perspective of others (the students), provides relevant information and opportunities to choose and encourages taking responsibility for one's own behaviour. The autonomy and dependence of students in interaction is explained by Mariani through two parallel concepts – challenge and support (Mariani, 1997). The student's need for autonomy is satisfied by the teacher through challenge (setting open tasks, enabling choices between multiple alternatives, etc.), and the need for dependence by providing support (understanding the purpose of the task, understanding the relevant instructions, etc.).

Depending on the relationship between support and challenges, Mariani points to four levels of teacher-student interaction, and they are: 1) High support – high challenge means that the student performs the activity independently under teacher supervision, and implies student progress with satisfaction and self-esteem; 2) High support – low challenge is the interaction when the teacher provides clear and easy tasks, which results in a low level of knowledge and skills, but students

feel good and develop a warm and intimate relationship with the teacher; 3) Low support – high challenge is the interaction in which the teacher sets difficult tasks, mocks students, and the result is that students feel anxious and insecure, which is the reason for the development of conflicts between them; 4) Low support – low challenge is an interaction characterized by monotonous and boring teaching, which causes students stagnation, boredom, apathy, indifference and demotivation. Based on the abovesaid, we can conclude that leadership, which involves challenging students, implies meeting the basic human need for self-regulation and self-determination. Providing support in task design implies meeting the need for competence, while supporting in interaction provides the need for connectivity (Mariani, 1997). The teacher's pedagogical style (leadership style, communication style, style of organizing activities and affective style) are determinants of the quality of the socio-emotional climate in the classroom, which we discuss below.

Socio-emotional relations are the aspect of interaction that is a clear indicator of how students experience school, the degree of understanding of students' attitudes, the degree of satisfaction of the main participants in pedagogical/educational work, as well as the refinement of interpersonal relationships within school. And the emotional climate is an affective tone in the relationship between students and teachers, among students themselves, as well as among teachers, and is a consequence of established interactions. That is, "the quality of interpersonal relations between the participants of the educational process (class teachers, students, parents) affects the creation of a favorable socio-emotional climate in the class and outside it" (Милошевић, 2020: 43). The teacher's personality determines the socio-emotional climate of the pedagogical/educational process to a greater extent than their pedagogical and methodological measures. Rogers cites the characteristics of the teacher and the quality of their work that influence the creation of a climate conducive to student self-actualization (Rogers, 1985): facing the problem, teacher congruence, unconditional affection, empathic understanding and perception of the student (all the stated teacher characteristics are perceived by students as such).

Socio-emotional relations represent the subject of research (Гојков и Стојановић, 2015; Зукорлић, 2012) which emphasizes empathy as an important factor in successful cooperation and mutual satisfaction between students and teachers, as well as a key component of pedagogical communication (Зукорлић, 2016). Building and developing skills and abilities of empathic communication are an important condition for successful cooperation and mutual satisfaction of teachers and students. An important principle of pedagogical competence is respect for other people's opinion. That is – the opinions of students. The teacher is sometimes convinced that their opinion is unconditional and the only correct one, especially in assessing students and their qualities. Ignoring students' opinions and their perception is quite common. But practice shows a paradoxical thing: in most cases, teachers' expectations and predictions about children do not correspond to reality. The well-known Russian theorist Sergeyev explains this by believing that a

large number of pedagogues have not developed the most important professional trait very necessary in the process of pedagogical work – empathy, the ability to understand and comprehend another person. Working on developing empathy requires a high degree of attention and serious work of the soul and mind, and the most important thing, in this case, is to learn to listen to and hear the child. Pedagogical/educational work is characterized by interpersonal communication between students and teachers. In interpersonal communication (such as pedagogical communication), there are often situations when there is a lack of information on the basis of which one could draw conclusions about the feelings of others, so the application of empathy is valuable. The more communication takes place in the process of educational activities at the higher level of interaction, the more successful the educational activities will be" (Bratanić, 1990: 77). In that sense, empathy as an important component of the teacher's pedagogical competence is in the function of getting to know the personality of the student and their feelings better, so that the teacher can harmonize their behaviour and pedagogical work. This is a particularly important requirement for the teacher, because their attitude must reflect respect for the feelings of students, and provoke the desired behaviour of students through their own behaviour. Developing the empathic ability will help the teacher to discover the hidden motives behind the student's behaviour, and to act accordingly. When a teacher creates an image of a student based on what is seen from the outside, they may misinterpret the student's behaviour. However, if the teacher discovers the true motives behind the student's behaviour, we can say that they understood him/her (Bratanić, 1990). Therefore, understanding the student is crucial for the teacher to have an adequate pedagogical influence on them. Achieving cooperation and satisfaction in inter-student interaction (peer relationship), which is as important as teacher-student interaction, is possible if the classroom climate is democratized. A democratic climate leads to richer social exchanges in the teaching process. Favourable environment, presence of interpersonal communication, and empathetic communication in the classroom are suitable for achieving better effects in teaching.

Based on the analyzed literature, it is clear that all three analyzed aspects of interaction between students and teachers are interconnected and united by the construct of the teaching atmosphere (Šimić-Šašić, 2011). Creating a teaching atmosphere (socio-emotional climate) as well as the development of the school curriculum implies didactic and methodological readiness, as well as the attitude of teachers towards work that will create a climate of warmth, trust, and cooperation, and enrich the interaction between themself and the students. This would specifically mean that, when designing their syllabus as an integrative part of the school curriculum, the teacher is obliged to remove the possible obstacles to the development of students' social competencies. Namely, it is necessary to emphasize the cognitive goals, but those that do not obscure the social goals and social learning in general; that is, it is necessary to direct highly cognitive approaches towards the development of social competencies (Jurčić, 2010: 205). Viewed from

that perspective, the interaction between teachers and students – through teaching, leadership, and the socio-emotional relationship – characterized by high support and high expectations (challenges) by the teacher, and an active teaching strategy, as well as mutual empathic communication, is the one that is positively reflected in pedagogical/educational effects (Zukorlić i Osmanlić, 2017). On the other hand, interaction which is characterized by providing low support and low expectations by the teacher, an authoritarian leadership style as well as a negative attitude towards teaching and high expectations of students, has a negative impact on pedagogical/educational outcomes.

Conclusion

The quality of student-teacher interaction depends on the extent to which the teacher's pedagogical procedures are harmonized with the set goal, i.e. whether the established interactions and relationships confirm the presence of the educational goal. The success of the teaching and pedagogical process depends on those refined and subtle interactions (the hardly perceivable phenomena and processes) that are established between students and the teacher. According to the analyzed aspects of interaction between students and the teacher, providing optimal interaction and better teaching effects includes the following:

From the aspect of teaching, better effects in terms of learning outcomes will be achieved through the so-called indirect interaction and active teaching because they result in: developed students' attention and skills (communication, argumentative discussion, assertiveness, respect for others, cooperation, active listening, empathy); developed creative, critical and divergent thinking; intrinsic motivation; low presence of negative emotions (anxiety, fear, stress); valuing learning and knowledge as well as positive attitudes. In that sense, it is necessary to take into account the social aspect of the teaching process in the education of future teachers. This task, as a primary one, is included in the subject Interactive pedagogy in the process of training future teachers. This is a basic (insufficient) precondition for creating more optimal conditions for a purposeful interaction that would be in the function of successful teaching.

Based on the connection between the teacher leadership and teacher personality characteristics and by reviewing the success of different leadership styles in teaching as an aspect of interaction, the importance should be highlighted of integrative teacher behaviour (encouraging group members to work towards common goals, which provides satisfaction to each member of the group), as well as the direct teacher influence (task-oriented, which involves the use of specific means to achieve the set learning goals and the coordination of teaching activities). The teacher and the student share responsibility and control over the situation, whereby the teacher's task is to create a stimulating atmosphere in the classroom, in

which essential learning can take place, which includes the development of a flexible, adaptive, creative and free individual.

The standards of competencies for the teaching profession and their professional development should contain competencies that include knowledge, skills and attitudes about the possibilities, values and potentials of student participation that lead to autonomy. In order to fully support student autonomy, it is necessary to strengthen the form of student participation through the work of the student parliament and to connect it with those forms of student participation which can be purposefully developed in school through the teaching processes, as well as extracurricular activities and school life in general, that is, through school in its totality.

Socio-emotional relations are the aspect of interaction that is a clear indicator of how students experience school, of the degree of understanding of students' attitudes, the degree of satisfaction of the main participants in pedagogical/educational work, as well as the refinement of interpersonal relationships within school. This is a particularly important requirement for the teacher because their own attitude must reflect respect for the feelings of students, and provoke the desired behaviour of students through their own behaviour. Developing an empathic ability will help the teacher to discover the hidden motives of the student's behaviour, to act accordingly and adjust their own communication to the student as an individual and the class as a whole. This will contribute to the creation of favourable conditions in the school environment for the realization of students' aspirations towards complete development and self-realization.

References

Andrilović, V. i Čudina-Obradović, M. (1996). *Psihologija učenja i nastave* (III izdanje). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Brajša, P. (1994). *Pedagoška komunikologija*. Zagreb: Školske novine.

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 T. Wubbels & J. Levy (ed.): *Do you know what you look like*?. (46–55). London: The Folmer Press.

Đigić, G. (2017). *Upravljanje razredom:savremeni pristup psihologiji nastavnika*. Niš: Filozofski fakultet.

Ђорђевић, М. (2019). Улога наставника у подстицању просоцијалног понашања ученика. *Зборник радова Педагошког факултета,* Ужице, 22(21), 27–44.

Flanders, A. N. (1966). *Analyzing Teaching Behaviour*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Gojkov, G. i 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.

Jurčić, M. (2010). Nastavni kurikulum kao poticaj razvoju socijalnih kompetencija učenika. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 7(2), 205–217.

Knežević-Florić, O. (2005). *Pedagogija razvoja*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.

Knežević-Florić, O. (2006). *Interaktivna pedagogija*. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.

Kostović, S. (2005). *Vaspitni stil nastavnika.* Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.

Kujundžić, N. (1986). Komunikacija – bit edukativne prakse. *Filozofska istraživanja,* 19(4), Beograd: Nolit.

Lihačev, B. T. (2000). *Pedagogika*. Moskva: Kurslekcij.

Mariani, L. (1997). Teacher support and teacher challenge in promoting learner autonomy. *Perspectives*, 23(2). Retrieved July 24, 2017 from the World Wide Web http://www.learningpaths.org/papers/papersupport.htm.

Милошевић, А. (2020). Социјална дистанца одељенских старешина од ученика и родитеља. *Зборник радова Педагошког факултета,* Ужице, 23(22), 43–66.

Pedagoška enciklopedija I i II (1989). Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Педагошки лексикон (1996). Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства.

Richman, J. M. & Bowen, L. G. (1997). School failure: an ecological interactional – developmental perspective. In M. Fraser (ed.): *Risk and Resilience in childhood: an ecological perspective* (95–116). Washington DC: NASW Press.

Rogers, C. (1985). *Kako postati ličnost*. Beograd: Nolit.

Rot, N. (1982). *Znakovi i značenja*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike.

Sergejev, I. S. (2004). *Osnovy pedagogičeskoj dejatel'nostiy*. Minsk.

Timothy, L. (1957). Interpersonal diagnosis of personality: A functional theory and metodology for personality evaluation. Eugene OR: Resource Publications.

Trnavac, N. (2003). Tri epohe i tri teorijske koncepcije o komunkaciji u školskoj nastavi, *Komunikacija i mediji* (51–61). Jagodina: Učiteljski fakultet – Beograd: Institut za pedagoška istraživanja.

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.

Watkins, C. & Wagner, P. (2000). *Improving School Behavior*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Williams, G. C., Freedman, Z. R. & Deci, E. L. (1998). Supporting autonomy to motivate patients with diabetes for glucose control. *Diabetes Care*, 21, 1644–1651.

Зукорлић, М. и Османлић, И. (2017). Нивои инерактивне повезаности између ученика и наставника у настави. *Иновације у настави*, 30(2), 172–181.

Зукорлић, М. и Поповић Д. (2018). Повезаност школске климе и аутономије ученика. *Иновације у настави*, 30(4), 99–108.

Мирсада С. Зукорлић
Универзитет у Београду, Факултет за образовање учитеља и васпитача,
Нови Пазар
Слободан Љ. Павловић
Универзитет у Крагујевцу, Педагошки факултет, Ужице

ИНТЕРАКЦИЈА ИЗМЕЂУ НАСТАВНИКА И УЧЕНИКА

Резиме

У раду су приказани резултати теоријске анализе педагошког рада у школи као интерактивног процеса. Важан аспект интеракције је да је то процес у коме један појединац утиче на понашање другог. У педагошкој комуникацији овакви утицаји су израженији и усмерени су ка развоју личности, а везе између субјеката образовног процеса су чврсте и јаке. Због тога се образовање дефинише као вид интеракције између наставника и ученика. У раду се говори о импликацијама одређених аспеката интеракције – вођства или подршке аутономији ученика и социоемоционалних односа на исходе наставе. Сходно томе, акценат је стављен на услове које је потребно обезбедити да би између главних актера у наставном процесу – ученика и учитеља био остварен највиши ниво интеракције.

Кључне речи: *интеракција, аспекти интеракције, педагошка комуникација, исходи наставе.*