

Conflict in the Classroom: An Examination of Teacher
Management Strategies

by



Sandra Helen Birrell
B.Ed., University of Alberta, 1981


A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of



MASTER OF ARTS


in the Department of Psychological Foundations of Education


We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard



Dr. G. Hett, Supervisor (Department of Psychological
Foundations of Education)


Dr. H. France, Departmental Member (Department of
Psychological Foundations of Education)



Dr. V. Storey, Outside Member (Department of Communications
and Social Foundations of Education)


Dr. T. Riecken, Outside Member (Department of Social and
Natural Sciences of Education)


Dr. A. Preece, External Examiner (Department of
Communications and Social Foundations of Education)

© Sandra Helen Birrell, 1999
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in
whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the
permission of the author.

Abstract

The language, structure, and gestures used by teachers to reprimand children in grades 6 to 8 were examined. These reprimands were defined as teacher-student conflicts and Deutsch's (1994) theory of cooperative and competitive conflict management was applied as the theoretical framework. This study examined both the structure of teacher communication (literal/non-literal) and its social messages (cooperative/competitive). Videotapes of 4 teachers in a total of 9 middle school classes were scored for conflict episodes, teacher communication, and student variables such as gender, number, and frequency. Results showed teachers were 3 times more likely to use a non-literal reprimand than a literal one when dealing with an individual student (male or female), but only slightly more likely to use a non-literal reprimand when addressing student groups. Most significantly, teachers engaged in more conflicts with male students, and when they did, they elected to use competitive strategies almost 91% of the time.

Examiners:

[REDACTED]
Dr. G. Hett, Supervisor (Department of Psychological Foundations of Education)

[REDACTED]
Dr. H. France, Departmental Member (Department of Psychological Foundations of Education)

[REDACTED]
Dr. V. Storey, Outside Member (Department of Communications and Social Foundations of Education)

[REDACTED]

Dr. T. Riecken, Outside Member (Department of Social and Natural Sciences of Education)

[REDACTED]

Dr. A. Preece, External Examiner (Department of Communications and Social Foundations of Education)

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Literature Review	4
Conflict and Power in the Classroom	4
Communication in the Classroom	13
Discourse Analysis	16
Operational Definitions	19
Teacher-Student Conflict	19
Literal Speech Acts	21
Non-Literal Speech Acts	22
Cooperative Conflict Management	23
Competitive Conflict Management	24
Research Hypotheses	24
Methodology	26
Sample	26
Confidentiality	27
Procedure	28
Scoring System	29
Reliability Test	31
Results	33
Data Analysis	33

Discussion	43
Hypothesis 1	43
Hypothesis 2	45
Hypothesis 3	45
General Discussion	47
Limitations and Future Prospects	56
References	70
Scoring System	79
Transcripts of Teacher-Student Conflict Events	86

List of Tables

- Table 1 Classroom Demographics, page 27.
- Table 2 Teacher Non-Literal and Literal Communication in Teacher-Student Conflict Episodes as a Function of Student Gender and Number, page 35.
- Table 3 Teacher Conflict Management Strategy in Teacher-Student Conflict Episodes as a Function of Student Gender and Number, page 37.
- Table 4 A Comparison of Teacher Non-Literal and Literal Communication in Teacher-Student Male and Female Conflict Episodes Adjusted for Student Number, page 39.
- Table 5 A Comparison of Teacher Cooperative and Competitive Communication in Teacher-Student Male and Female Conflict Episodes Adjusted for Student Number, page 41.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the many University of Victoria faculty and staff who have guided and assisted me through this project. In particular, I would like to recognize the constructive input and helpful assistance of Dr. Dawn Howard Rose and Dr. Geoff Hett. Finally, this thesis would not have been completed without the tireless support and encouragement from my two sons, Jonathan and David, and my husband, Landon Schmidt.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Classroom management has traditionally dealt with the variables of control, power, and authority. Earlier researchers have focussed on teacher control of content, behaviour, and talk in classrooms (Cazden, 1986; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). The study of control also includes dimensions of power and authority, for example, teachers not only can make students behave because of the teachers' adult status, but, as teachers, they have a legitimate right to do so. This view of classroom management was concerned with teachers' needs to maintain control in order to pursue curricular objectives.

This study examines a new perspective on classroom management by defining teacher¹ reprimands as conflicts and analyzing them in light of Deutsch's (1994) conflict management theory.

In a pilot study (Schmidt, 1995), it was noted that teachers often used rhetorical questions or non-literal language to convey a corrective strategy to a student. Commonly used to smooth over situations where one person is trying either to decline a request or make a request of another, non-literal speech acts are conventionally thought to imply politeness and sensitivity. For example, if a

¹For the purposes of general discussion, a teacher will be arbitrarily referred to as female and single students as male. For specific instances extracted from the data, true gender identity will be used.

person remarks "I'm cold," he may be indirectly requesting that the heat be turned up or the windows closed. "Can you get that?" may be a request for someone else to answer the door. In both instances, more literal speech ("Turn up the heat" and "Answer the door") seems less polite and marginally acceptable in social situations.

This study supported the findings of the pilot study (Schmidt, 1995) with regard to the frequency of teachers' reliance on indirect, or non-literal, speech acts when responding to what Richmond and Roach termed "spontaneous classroom situations" (p. 62, in Richmond and McCroskey, 1992). The overall percentage of non-literal speech acts (69%), when compared to direct, or literal speech acts, was identical in both studies and indicates that these teachers relied on non-literal speech to manage the majority of teacher-student conflicts.

In teacher-student conflict episodes, the use of non-literal speech may not be accompanied by its conventional implication of politeness; indeed, it has the potential to convey sarcastic, coercive, and competitive messages to the student.

Deutsch (1994) believes power inequities in a relationship may lead to differing perceptions of the importance of any conflicts. Conflict is a relationship between two or more individuals. As such, each party contributes to and is influenced by its outcome.

Much of classroom interaction is top-down between teacher and students. As dispenser of information, traffic control, guidance, support, and discipline, the teacher is clearly the dominant figure in the classroom. When conflict emerges between the interests of the teacher and those of one or more children, this dominance becomes even more important. Thus, how teachers manage such commonplace conflicts—student movement around the room, attention to task, off-task interaction with others—may cumulate to form an individual experience and perspective on language, authority, and justice in the minds of the children.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the patterns of speech acts used by teachers when reprimanding students in middle school classrooms. By stipulating that such reprimands are conflicts, emerging patterns of communication can be scored using Deutsch's (1994) framework as having either a cooperative or competitive nature. In addition, the literal and non-literal content of teacher communication during reprimands will be scored. These variables will be jointly examined to determine patterns of teacher communication related to student gender, frequency, and general observations of student-teacher conflict.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Previous research has laid the foundation for the current study of teacher-student discourse. Of particular importance is the literature on the classroom dimensions of conflict, power, and communication. The study of communication also includes an overview of the literature on the chosen methodology, discourse analysis.

Conflict and Power in the Classroom

Conflict is traditionally viewed as destructive in either extreme and somewhat beneficial in moderation (Rahim, Garrett, & Buntzman, 1992). Social learning, including how to manage conflicts within relationships, may occur within what Deutsch (1994) termed cooperative and competitive frameworks. The ability to work in cooperative groups is increasingly seen as a desirable student skill (O'Donnell & O'Kelly, 1994; Snyder & Sullivan, 1995; Anderson, Reder, & Simon, 1996), avoiding the pitfalls of competitive environments that foster extrinsic motivation and social comparison. How teachers model both cooperative and competitive behaviours-in conflicts and elsewhere-may therefore influence student learning and social functioning both within and outside the classroom.

When a teacher employs competitive conflict management strategies, students are expected to conform to the teacher's requests because of the teacher's authority to

make them do so. A teacher who approaches student-teacher conflict from such a competitive framework may be more likely to employ communication that implies coercion, threats, and deception and to attempt to enhance the power differences between herself and her students.

Subconsciously, she may minimize her awareness of similarities in values and take a position of increased sensitivity to opposed interests, suspicion, and even hostility (adapted from Deutsch, 1994). Not surprisingly, Deutsch feels competitive strategies are destructive to relationships and a barrier to fostering the interdependence and shared goals necessary for cooperation.

On the other hand, Deutsch (1994) likens constructive conflict management to a cooperative process. In these instances, teacher communication may reflect an emphasis on shared interests or needs, minimization of power differences, and honest, non-threatening language and gestures. Deutsch proposes that the cooperative/competitive framework can be used to analyze conflict management orientations, influencing, and being influenced by, situational factors.

The exposed nature of the classroom environment lends unique characteristics to conflict between teachers and students. In a survey of teacher behaviour-alteration techniques (BATs), Plax and Kearney (cited in Richmond and McCroskey, 1992) discovered that teachers readily use this

public forum to put peer pressure on the non-conforming student to behave. Hodson (1991) identified a similar pressure in organizations, where management used co-workers to influence worker productivity before stepping into the conflict themselves. Victor, Trevino, and Shapiro (1993) also found that those in the superior position in a conflict often inform the errant individual's peers of the potential harm to their interests that may result from an unsatisfactory resolution to the conflict, thereby alienating the offending peer from the remainder of his group. Several common classroom examples of such group pressure readily come to mind—group detentions, clean-ups, extra work—where the instigating conflict may have involved a small percentage of students from the total group.

In addition, peers who are only witnesses to the conflict may serve to shape both the nature of the conflict and its eventual outcome. Nicholls (cited in Ames & Ames, 1984) suggests that the public nature of classrooms serves to promote competition, social comparison, and ability attributions. Not only is social comparison likely, as children perceive the distribution of justice by the teacher, but the formation of social alliances and emergence of within-group differences also are probable. Deutsch (1994) feels that group members who try to resolve conflicts constructively may be labelled traitors or weak by their associates. Deutsch's work suggests that teachers may have a

disincentive to manage conflicts cooperatively if it would appear to weaken their position within the classroom group.

Much of the research into conflict in classrooms and schools focusses on conflict resolution between disputing peers (Johnson & Johnson, 1994; Johnson, Johnson, Dudley, Mitchell, & Fredrickson, 1997; New York City Board of Education, 1990). The research on teacher effects (Heap, 1993; Richmond & McCroskey, 1992) in school conflicts corresponds with the move to examine the broader concept of conflict management instead of the more rigid conflict resolution, which assumes conflict needs to be eliminated to have a mutually beneficial outcome.

In education and other fields, the literature on conflict management most frequently examines the strategies used by the individuals who hold the balance of power in conflict situations², such as the employers or managers (Sitkin & Bies, 1993), males (in male-female conflict episodes) (Gwartney-Gibbs & Lach, 1994), professors (Bingham & Scherer, 1993), or teachers (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). Presumably, the behaviours of the more dominant partner in a conflict dyad are easier to observe in both laboratory and natural research settings (Bugental, 1993). These individuals have more control and can exert more influence on both the outcome and the individual with lesser power. As

²Although, see Bugental, 1993 for a study focussed on individuals who believe they are at a power disadvantage.

the more powerful individual in the conflict, the teacher's role in initiating, responding to, mediating, and closing any overt displays of classroom conflict is particularly compelling. While many conflicts may emerge between and among students that require teacher intervention, teacher-student conflicts warrant special consideration. As both participant and holder of authority and power, the teacher may be faced with striking a balance between often contradictory self, individual student, and group interests.

The balance of power in certain hierarchical relationships, such as teacher-student, employer-employee, and parent-child, is generally determined by role definition. In other relationships, power may be determined by factors such as gender, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or personality.

The classroom's multidimensional nature brings several power-laden variables into one environment. Johnson and Miller (1994) believe the teacher-student relationship can be distinguished from other hierarchical relationships by at least two factors: (a) the relationship is almost always involuntary and arbitrary, and (b) the teacher is formally granted power by both the school and society, in addition to the personal power already vested in an adult-child dyad.

Certainly, a teacher-student hierarchy exists, but there is also potential for bias on any number of other social factors. For example, research has shown teachers to

be more prone to single out male students for reprimand, but female students for academic talk (Ilatov, Shamai, Hertz-Lazarovitz & Mayer-Young, 1998; Hurrell, 1995). This discrimination may be based on teacher beliefs and expectations about male/female behaviour and abilities rather than on actual perceived differences (Hurrell, 1995).

Teachers also appear biased against older students (Lovejoy, 1996; Hurrell, 1995) and aggressive rather than other forms of misbehaving students (Lovejoy, 1996). Lovejoy reports that teachers may believe that as children age, they are better able to control their violent behaviour than other forms of misbehaviour such as stealing and cheating. Therefore, teachers may feel that older children, in particular, should be better able to conduct themselves within the rules of the classroom. The consequences of violent student behaviour may also make teachers less tolerant, especially as students grow older and more capable of inflicting serious physical harm. Each of these dimensions has the potential to become self-fulfilling when placed within the highly social, hierarchical, and influential context of a classroom.

When managing an adolescent population, teachers may face other challenges. For example, Aquilino (1997) notes that setting and enforcing behavioral expectations may be particularly difficult with adolescent children. For middle school teachers, who must cope with the emotional, physical,

and social changes of their students, standards must remain flexible and may even need to be adjusted for differing levels of maturity among their students and over the course of a year.

In addition, adolescents and teachers may perceive classroom conflict episodes quite differently. For the teacher, Deutsch's (1994) assertion that one party may have much more to lose in conflict situations, and therefore, more motivation to win, is particularly significant. The teacher may go to extraordinary lengths to retain control. She may believe that if she appears to back down in teacher-student conflicts, the effects may influence future classroom functioning, her authority, and student behaviours.

In contrast, a student's goal may simply be to engage the teacher in a conflict, not necessarily to overtly win in the final outcome. According to Adler and Adler (1995), it is particularly important for some children in early and pre-adolescence to ally themselves firmly in the group opposing authority in order to cement relationships within their community of peers. Juvonen and Weiner (1993) note that some students avoid conflict with teachers by essentially developing a split personality: the teacher sees the student who conforms to rules whereas the student's peers sees a person who openly flaunts them. For other students, repeatedly initiating conflicts with teachers may

be one means to gain social acceptance within a peer group. Teachers seem to make classroom management judgements based on social bonding among students, rating students in close-knit social groups as more likely to be disruptive and to be singled out for reprimand (Hurrell, 1995).

Tajfel (1982, in Deutsch, 1994) notes that groups with common interests form a type of ethnocentric response to conflict situations—identifying strongly with their group and thereby reducing the chances for constructive resolution of the conflict. It appears that classrooms may divide over teacher-student conflict issues, with some students siding with the teacher and others (perhaps only the offending student) forming the opposition. Adler and Adler (1995) propose that children's social groups may use violations of a competitor's interests (i.e., a teacher) to define group boundaries and enhance group cohesiveness.

Rubin (1994) identifies six means to settle conflict: domination, capitulation, inaction, withdrawal, negotiation, and third party intervention. Of these, he proposes that only negotiation and third party intervention can be classed as constructive, where both sides are taken into consideration prior to reaching settlement.

In a classroom, third party intervention in minor conflicts is unlikely to occur. In a study of school-based conflict, Storey (1991) reports that, even in major conflicts, third parties were often only brought into the

conflict well beyond the point where a satisfactory or constructive outcome was possible. Thus, according to Rubin (1994), negotiation remains as the sole means for constructive conflict management for everyday issues arising in classrooms.

The rapid-fire and unpredictable nature of commonplace classroom conflicts makes negotiation both a difficult and time-consuming option for teachers. Cabello and Terrell (1994) report, in a study of exemplary teachers and teaching practices, that negotiation does enter exceptional classrooms when a teacher intervenes in student-student conflict situations. They do not, however, report on how these master teachers manage teacher-student conflicts.

For negotiation to occur, Rubin proposes that there must be a pre-existing condition of interdependence. The typical classroom meets this criterion. Children are dependent on the teacher for direction, content, and structure of most of their activities. The teacher, in turn, is also dependent on the children, who, by sheer number, can make the teacher's job either bliss or anguish. However, this interdependence does not necessarily imply an equity of power. Thus, teachers enter teacher-student conflict with a forceful advantage: they may close the conflict almost at will if constructive measures fail or they may elect to use their power to quash conflicts competitively right from the start.

Communication in the Classroom

Understanding communication in a classroom requires knowledge of and experience with a particular set of verbal and nonverbal elements (e.g., gestures, intonation, expression, physical proximity). Lemke (1982) noted the classroom develops language protocols and idiom over the course of time with small, yet distinct differences from other classrooms, even within the same school (cited in Wittrock, 1986). The study of classroom language, therefore, uncovers common elements as well as specialized tools that have evolved to meet the communication needs of a particular environment.

According to Kess (1992) communication using language involves two principal functions: dissemination of information and representation of intent. In a teacher-student context, the teacher may direct the student to take his seat (the information component) and imply impatience through the use of sarcasm and tone (the intent component). It is up to the student to receive both parts of the message and interpret them accurately. With direct speech, where the syntax and meaning of the language are understood literally, the student may only need to determine the intent of the teacher. For example, the student may use other cues such as gestures, intonation, and context to judge the teacher's intentions to be humorous or threatening, and respond accordingly. However, when the teacher uses indirect speech,

where the meaning is implied and not literal, the student has the additional burden of interpreting both the information and the intent. With the pressure of the group environment, he may resort to what amounts to educated guessing.

According to Shapiro and Murphy (1993), the context is critical to understanding non-literal speech. Individuals construct schema for certain situations (e.g., classrooms) and use these to derive the most likely interpretation. These schema serve to speed up processing of the message so that individuals can respond appropriately.

There is support for both Deutsch's (1994) cooperative and competitive framework and for teachers' preference for non-literal communication in teacher-student conflicts. A pilot study preceding this proposed research (Schmidt, 1995), suggests that teachers often approach teacher-student conflict episodes from a confrontational stance, emphasizing the power differential between themselves and the students, singling out one student in comparison to his peers, and asserting the teacher's interests above those of the students. Far from being polite requests, these directives and reprimands are often sarcastic or verbally hostile in nature. In many cases, they are competitive as well, emphasizing the teacher's interests and authority over the situation: "Nobody told you to move [student name]" and "[student name], you're not in good shape as far as I'm

concerned."

Another significant observation from the pilot study is that teachers sometimes use cooperative strategies in response to teacher-student conflict, which emphasize mutual interests, de-emphasize any power differential, and are delivered in a non-threatening manner. This is illustrated in the following example, where the teacher gently corrects the behaviour of a small group of students who have wandered off-task: "OK, let's have everyone go back to their seats please." Rather than singling out the errant group, this teacher chose to broadcast a blanket request for all students to re-group at their desks. Cabello and Terrell (1994) particularly point out teachers' use of the third person (e.g., "Let's...", "Our...") and demonstration of respect for students as factors that promote unity and cooperation in classrooms.

Lastly, a significant portion (69%) of teacher reprimands in the pilot study (Schmidt, 1995) use non-literal communication. Teachers often use indirect directives, which are commonly understood in adult communication to represent polite requests (Holtgraves, 1986; Shapiro & Murphy, 1993) to correct or reprimand student behaviour. Only through discourse analysis, which examines tone and context, does the utterance "Will you please sit down?" become either a friendly invitation or a covert threat.

As reported by Richmond and Roach (cited in Richmond and McCroskey, 1992), teachers tend to react intuitively and emotionally to what these researchers termed "spontaneous classroom situations" rather than relying on planned and considered strategies (p. 62). Thus, when the teacher is also a party to the conflict, her emotional involvement may interrupt or preclude the choice of more reasoned, constructive strategies such as negotiation. Since the teachers' fleeting emotional responses may be quickly forgotten by both teachers and students, the methodology used to capture the nature of such classroom events becomes increasingly important.

Discourse Analysis

In the past, research into the nature of interpersonal conflict has relied on indirect means to collect data. Studies focussed primarily on issues of a global nature; for example, classification of individuals into one of any number of conflict management styles (Rahim, Garrett, & Buntzman, 1992; Sitkin & Bies, 1993). Even when subjects were asked to report specifically on conflicts in a particular relationship (e.g., employer-employee; teacher-student), they were asked retrospectively, and may have generalized to all such relationships or to their cumulative experiences in such a role. Rosenthal and Hautaluoma (1987) found test-retest reliability did not significantly improve when asking respondents to recall a specific conflict

compared to when they asked them to recall all conflicts in general. This could imply that individuals perceive all conflicts within certain types of relationships as generally the same. However, individuals may also have forgotten specific details of a single conflict and simply embellish using other conflicts from similar relationships to fill in where their memory fades.

Another potential problem with research based on self-report is the differing perceptions of each party in the conflict. When recalling conflicts, an individual may dwell disproportionately on conflicts he found to be significant. He may not recall, or may even be unaware of, conflicts in a relationship that were significant solely from the perspective of the other party.

Conflict may still be perceived as a negative experience by many individuals and recalling their experiences may be uncomfortable and disconcerting to their sense of self. Even with controls for social desirability bias, such as reverse-scored items, research may still restrict the range of behaviours admitted to by the subjects (Mudrack, 1993). In an attempt to correct the bias of earlier conflict management style instruments, Rosenthal and Hautaluoma (1987) had limited success when they redesigned self-report tools by specifically pairing and testing conflict management items having similar social desirability in a forced-choice questionnaire.

Self-report methodology, despite control for bias, has its problems when applied to a classroom environment. Babad (1990) notes students' propensity to portray their teachers positively, and turns to hypothetical vignettes as an impersonal alternative to self-report. Babad's findings underscore the difficulties capturing conflicts in hierarchical relationships and the special power characteristics of the teacher-student bond.

Thus, these studies have made several critical steps forward toward better understanding of superior-subordinate conflict. The literature supports the idea that individuals are able to recall conflict in their lives and not confound it with other interpersonal events. This suggests that the effects of conflict may have significant enduring qualities as well.

The differences in management of commonplace classroom conflict, and the relative frequencies of the chosen strategies, are the focus of this research. This involves looking at teacher discourse in response to commonplace teacher-student conflict episodes in the classroom, specifically, the verbal and non-verbal communication of the teacher, and using a scoring system (see Appendix A) to quantify the constructs under study.

Natural language use in research has emerged as a more multi-faceted approach to understanding language in context than speech act theory alone (Levinson, 1983). Given this

unpredictable and uncontrolled research environment, it is imperative to studies using discourse analysis in natural contexts to establish clear definitions to guide the scoring system. This removes some of the subjectivity that can make natural language studies difficult to replicate.

Operational Definitions

Operational definitions for each of the key components of this research are derived from the literature and serve as the foundation of the scoring system. The main categories are as follows:

1. Teacher-student conflicts involving overt teacher responses.
2. Non-literal speech acts.
3. Literal speech acts.
4. Cooperative conflict management.
5. Competitive conflict management.

Teacher-Student Conflict

This study uses Deutsch's (1969) definition of conflict, where conflict is defined as beginning when an incompatible activity takes place within a relationship (cited in Deutsch, 1994). This definition does not imply magnitude of neither the instigating behaviour nor the response; indeed, its focus is on the perception of an actual or impending incompatible activity. This definition also does not carry with it a negative connotation; incompatible does not necessarily mean antagonistic nor

hostile but includes a broader scope that may have constructive outcomes (Boardman & Horowitz, 1994).

Teacher-student conflict is also a relationship state; it cannot exist in one individual and not in the other. However, only one party may take action within or as a result of the conflict. This study examines teacher-student conflict episodes where there is a deliberate, overt response on behalf of the teacher.

The teacher has multiple concerns at any given time—noise level, on-task behaviour of students, curriculum, safety of self and students, time management, fair practice—each of which influences her perception of conflict. A student may engage in incompatible activities by as little as failing to pay due attention when the teacher requires it, or as much as overt actions violating the time, space, or safety of others.

The commonplace teacher-student conflicts under investigation in this study are operationally defined as instances where the teacher overtly responds, either verbally or non-verbally, to a situation where the activities of one or more students are in opposition to the interests of the teacher. Interests of teachers are construed from the situational context and the teacher's previous actions and communication. It is assumed that any student who acts in defiance of classroom rules or teacher directives is pursuing his own interests. For example,

students who continue to carry on conversations with other students after the teacher has called for quiet are acting in accordance with their interests (to socialize with their peers) and contrary to the teacher's (to listen or conduct individual study). In this research, it is not important to judge each party's interests exactly, as much as it is to judge, through observation, that their interests are in opposition to each other.

For the purposes of this study, identification of a commonplace conflict episode is made once the teacher responds to the conflict. Conflict episodes are scored as occurring when the teacher stops normal classroom routines, whether that is teaching, listening to a student speak, silent reading, or group work, to reprimand one student or a group of students.

Literal Speech Acts

Literal speech acts are defined as "utterances which have the same illocutionary force as the literal reading of the sentence" (Kess, 1992, p. 147). For the classroom environments under investigation, scorers judge whether the communication used by the teacher has taken on a literal, contextual meaning. For example, teachers often point with their hands, pencils, rulers, or chalk. If the teacher points to a student's chair when the student is standing, this is scored as a literal speech act requesting the student to sit down. However, if the teacher merely points

to the student, this is not scored as having a literal meaning. Presumably, this gesture has multiple interpretations, among which is a request to sit down.

Arriving at an operational definition for literal speech, then, involves identifying such words, phrases, and gestures that, through convention, have literal meaning when used within the group in question. Lastly, non-lexical utterances by teachers that convey a specific, literal meaning to the students are also scored as literal speech acts. A primary example of this is the use of "Shhh." This is normally an unambiguous communication, both within classrooms and elsewhere. Therefore, literal speech acts were operationally defined in this study as language and gestures whose literal meaning is commonly understood within the context of the group.

Non-Literal Speech Acts

In this study, non-literal speech acts are operationally defined as language and gestures whose literal meaning is different from their intended meaning. Included in this category are instances where the teacher uses non-literal language such as a student's name as a behavioral correction. In other environments, a single name called out loud may elicit a response of "Yes?" or even "What?" by the recipient. In the classroom context, however, the intent is either to quiet the student or have him cease current activity, and is normally delivered in a rhetorical fashion.

It is generally understood by classroom language conventions that responses to such reprimands are neither called for nor necessary. Teachers' use of student names in response to commonplace teacher-student conflicts are easily differentiated from other instances where the teacher calls upon a student by name when asking him to respond to a instructional question. Therefore, teachers' use of student names in response to teacher-student conflict are scored as examples of non-literal speech.

Cooperative Conflict Management

Cooperative teacher conflict management strategies are operationally defined in this study as teacher language and gestures used to reprimand students that emphasize mutual interests, show sensitivity to student needs and trust, and represent an enhancement of mutual power rather than power differences. An example of a cooperative orientation in a teacher reprimand is "Let's get to work now," emphasizing the collective effort needed by both parties (students and teacher) to complete the task. Similarly, a beckoning gesture used to invite an off-task student to rejoin the group is a cooperative management strategy. Thus, a teacher may appeal to students through language or gestures to consider the effects of continued disturbance on peers, the teacher herself, or time remaining. In all instances, the benefits to the group as a whole are represented by the teacher as more important than either the teacher's own

interests or those of the misbehaving student.

Competitive Conflict Management

Competitive teacher conflict management strategies are operationally defined in this study as teacher language and gestures that emphasize the power differences between the teacher and student(s), and that may invoke social comparisons, threats, or hostility. For example, situations where the teacher refers to her interests rather than group interests, such as telling a student "I'm waiting" as a reprimand to the student to stop talking or participating in off-task behaviour. Teacher power is also evident in gestures as reprimands: pointing or thrusting fingers in the direction on the student or removing objects from the student's possession without warning nor discussion. The scoring often requires intonation and context to make a final determination. Competitive management strategies, then, elevate the power and control of the teacher over the situation. Although the teacher's interests in maintaining a quiet or orderly classroom may ultimately serve those of the group as a whole, the language and gestures only emphasize the interests of the teacher above those of the misbehaving student.

Research Hypotheses

On the basis of the literature review and the pilot study (Schmidt, 1995), the following hypotheses were formulated to guide the current research:

1. Teachers will use non-literal speech acts more frequently than literal speech acts in response to teacher-student conflicts.

2. Teachers will use competitive management strategies more frequently than cooperative management strategies in response to teacher-student conflicts.

3. Teachers will engage in conflicts with male students more frequently than they will engage in conflicts with female students.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Sample

The data for this study were drawn from eight videotapes of classroom activity covering a total of nine separate classroom lessons in two middle schools over a period of three weeks in April-May 1995.

These lessons were taught by four teachers in total, two male and two female. Teacher 1 (T1 - male), taught four lessons, Teacher 2 (T2 - female), taught two lessons, Teacher 3 (T3 - female), taught two lessons, and Teacher 4 (T4 - male), taught one class lesson.

Each lesson lasted an average of 46 minutes, with a range of 25 minutes (Tape 06b) to 60 minutes (Tape 06a). All other lessons fell into a range of 42 to 49 minutes. The lessons on Tape 06a and 06b were part of a combined classroom period that totalled 85 minutes. This tape was scored as two lessons because the teacher (T1) divided the class into two subject areas and another student (male) joined the class for the second lesson.

Classroom demographics were as follows:

Table 1: Classroom Demographics

Class	Teacher	Grade	Subject	Students		Tape	Length (min.)
				M	F		
C1	T1	8	Math	14	12	01	52
C1	T1	8	Math	16	13	03	45
C1	T1	8	Math	11	13	06a	60
C1	T1	8	Science	12	13	06b	25
C2	T2	8	Foods	10	5	02	42
C3	T3	6	Core	14	11	04	45
C3	T3	6	Core	17	10	08	49
C4	T2	7	Foods	10	11	05	45
C5	T4	6	Tech Ed	9	16	07	47
Total (all classes)				113	104		410

Confidentiality

The focus of the current research is classroom communication; specifically, the means used by teachers in response to teacher-student conflict. Other than gender, no individual characteristics are used to analyze the data. Thus, this study did not single out any person, teacher, or student: the data were quantitatively scored without reference to any person by name. Students were designated as [SN] by each scorer whenever the teacher or another student refers to a student by name. Thus, in transcribing and scoring teacher-student discourse, this study omitted any details that could be used to identify any participant.

Procedure

This study examined videotaped teacher-student interactions during nine full class periods of regular classroom activity. The tapes were scored for teacher-student conflict events where the teacher responded, either verbally or non-verbally, to the conflict. These events were punctuated by changes in teacher behaviour, language, and/or physical movements. The unit of analysis began with the first action of the teacher to acknowledge the conflict and concluded with the teacher moving away from the conflict to resume teaching, reprimand another student or begin another activity. Thus, this analysis did not examine all classroom discourse nor all teacher-student conflicts, but only those events where a teacher responds to a teacher-student conflict. Other conflicts, for instance student-student, or teacher-student where only the student responds to the conflict or where there is no response, were not scored.

Discourse analysis was used to score each conflict according to the cooperative/competitive and literal/non-literal nature of teacher speech. This resulted in data representing the relative frequencies of teacher use of non-literal and literal speech acts and cooperative and competitive conflict strategies in response to commonplace classroom conflicts for each classroom. These relative frequencies served as dependent variables for the purposes of this study.

Scoring System

The purpose of the scoring system was threefold: first, to identify the beginning of each conflict episode that elicited a teacher response, and thereby to identify all such conflict episodes; second, to categorize language used by the teacher within these episodes as either literal and non-literal; and, third, to classify teacher conflict management strategies as either cooperative or competitive in nature.

This study used the scoring system developed for the pilot study (Schmidt, 1995) as described and outlined in Appendix A. The main scoring sheet contained examples meant to guide the scorers once they had thoroughly reviewed and become familiar with the more lengthy description of the scoring process. These samples were taken from a relatively short but representative session from the same videotape series. None of the conflict episodes used for example purposes were used in the final data calculations.

By referring to students as [SN] and not by name, it was not possible to track the incidence of conflicts between the teacher and specific students. Although specific student's conflicts with a teacher could be important to correlate with other student factors, such as academic ability, delinquency, or family economic or cultural environment, this information was judged to be of less value than maintaining subject anonymity for the present purposes.

In addition to student gender, only whether the conflict involved one or more students in addition to the teacher was scored.

Conflict episodes were counted as distinct events, whether or not the teacher repeatedly disciplined the same student or group of students. The resulting measurement of conflict frequency was, nevertheless, in line with the spirit of this study, which was concerned with the public nature of the classroom and the overall characteristics of teacher conflict management strategies.

The cooperative/competitive dimension is highly inferential and required the scorers to judge teacher intent and context of the communication. For example "Shhh" was generally scored as cooperative because it was meant to reduce the noise level to allow other students to talk, work, or listen to others. It was rarely used as a competitive reprimand, unless it was uttered loudly or sharply (see Tape 07, t7:20). Similarly, a teacher's use of "please" may have signalled sarcasm when used in teacher-student conflict episodes, in which case it was scored as competitive.

The scoring system directed scorers to watch for instances where students would have to make inferences to understand the teacher's communication. Therefore, in a context of reprimanding students for talking out of turn in class, "Be quiet!" was perceived as literal, whereas "Watch

it!" was not. Similarly, "eyes this way" (Tape 07, t7:18) was scored as "non-literal" because it was meant to reduce student movement around the room and talking—not to simply have them look towards the teacher. In contrast, on the same tape, the teacher says "work on your drafting assignment please" (t12:06) to a student who is off-task, which is exactly what he wants the student to do.

Several safeguards were put in place to reduce researcher bias. First, scoring for non-literal/literal language and cooperative/competitive strategies was done separately. Two independent researchers were used to establish reliability on representative portions of the data. The higher-inference data (cooperative and competitive) was scored independently of the lower-inference data (non-literal and literal speech acts). In this way, researcher effects were kept to a minimum.

Reliability Test

A reliability test was conducted on data from the pilot study (Schmidt, 1995) to establish reliability of the scoring system for indirect and direct teacher language. From the total data set, approximately 10 minutes, or 7%, was set aside to provide examples for the scoring system. Reliability results after two scoring sessions on the pilot data reported a final interjudge reliability of 97% on scorers' ability to identify conflict episodes and score them as either direct or indirect in nature. The ratio of

indirect strategies to direct strategies from the reliability test (62% indirect and 38% direct) compares favourably with the ratio from the entire data set (69% indirect and 31% direct). This confirms the representative nature of the videotape segment used for reliability testing. The current study used the operational definitions for indirect and direct language as a basis for literal and non-literal language. The scoring system did not change.

A second reliability test was conducted on the second part of the scoring system: cooperative and competitive teacher conflict management strategies. From the total data set, approximately 12.5 minutes, or 3%, was set aside to provide examples for the scoring system. Reliability results on the sample data reported a final interjudge reliability of 83.3% on scorers' ability to score teacher language used in teacher-student conflict episodes as either cooperative or competitive in nature. The proportion of competitive and cooperative conflict management strategies from the reliability test (88.8% competitive, 11.1% cooperative) compares favourably to the ratio found in the entire data set (77.7% competitive). This confirms the representative nature of the videotape segment used for reliability testing.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

A total of 229 conflict episodes representing teacher response to teacher-student conflict were scored. Total length of video observed was 410 minutes. This represented 9 full classroom lessons of approximately 45 minutes each involving a total of four teachers and five classes of students spanning three grade levels (six to eight). These nine classes were analyzed on a total of eight videotapes. Tape 06 contained two classes; the other videotapes recorded a single class period.

Data Analysis

Data were collected on each of four types of discourse: 1) literal communication, cooperative resolution; 2) literal communication, competitive resolution; 3) non-literal communication, cooperative resolution; and 4) non-literal communication, competitive resolution. Each type was scored according to whether it involved the teacher and a male student, a female student, or a group of students. When groups of students were involved in teacher-student conflicts, no student gender was recorded.

Table 2 summarizes the numbers of conflict episodes involving male, female or groups of students and scored for teacher use of literal/non-literal language. Statistics are reported for each of the four teachers, broken down for each of the nine lesson periods. Totals for each teacher are

shown as well as a total across all teachers.

Table 2: Teacher Non-Literal and Literal Communication in Teacher-Student Conflict Episodes as a Function of Student Gender and Number

Teacher	Class	Tape	Non-Literal			Literal		
			M	F	G	M	F	G
T1	C1	01	3	4	4	1	1	3
	C1	03	2	0	7	1	0	1
	C1	06a	4	1	8	2	0	2
	C1	06b	0	0	0	0	1	2
Total T1			9	5	19	4	2	8
T2	C2	02	11	6	5	0	2	2
	C4	05	7	4	0	1	1	4
Total T2			18	10	5	1	3	6
T3	C3	04	14	4	10	4	0	9
	C3	08	48	0	2	20	1	7
Total T3			62	4	12	24	1	16
T4	C5	07	4	4	7	1	0	4
Total T4			4	4	7	1	0	4
Total (all teachers)			93	23	43	30	6	34

Table 3 summarizes the numbers of conflict episodes involving male, female or groups of students and scored for teacher use of cooperative/competitive conflict management strategies. Statistics are reported for each of the four teachers, broken down for each of the nine lesson periods. Totals for each teacher are shown as well as a total across all teachers.

Table 3: Teacher Conflict Management Strategy in Teacher-Student Conflict Episodes as a Function of Student Gender and Number

Teacher	Class	Tape	Cooperative			Competitive		
			M	F	G	M	F	G
T1	C1	01	1	4	5	3	1	2
	C1	03	0	0	3	3	0	5
	C1	06a	1	0	4	5	1	6
	C1	06b	0	1	1	0	0	1
Total T1			2	5	13	11	2	14
T2	C2	02	0	1	1	11	7	6
	C4	05	2	2	4	6	3	0
Total T2			2	3	5	17	10	6
T3	C3	04	2	0	7	16	4	12
	C3	08	5	0	5	63	1	4
Total T3			7	0	12	79	5	16
T4	C5	07	0	0	2	5	4	9
Total T4			0	0	2	5	4	9
Total (all teachers)			11	8	32	112	21	45

Because the lessons varied in duration and student composition, the raw scores from Tables 2 and 3 were converted to relative scores based on student gender distribution and conflict frequency. The statistic for group conflicts was dropped at this point because there was no way to count the numbers of groups present in a natural classroom environment.

Table 4 represents the same information as Table 2, except for the omitted group data, transformed to control for gender distribution. Each score represents the relative frequency of conflict episodes using literal or non-literal teacher communication for male or female students in a given class. For example, in Class C1, Tape 06a, there were 11 male students in the class and 4 reprimands using non-literal language by the teacher directed at males. Thus, the frequency becomes $4/11$ or 0.36.

The relative frequencies report on how often the teacher used a particular strategy or type of speech to reprimand male or female students. These figures do not report on whether the conflicts were evenly distributed throughout the male or female students in each class.

Table 4: A Comparison of Teacher Non-Literal and Literal Communication in Teacher-Student Male and Female Conflict Episodes Adjusted for Student Number

Teacher	Class	Tape	Non-Literal		Literal	
			M	F	M	F
T1	C1	01	0.21	0.33	0.07	0.03
	C1	03	0.13	0.00	0.06	0.00
	C1	06a	0.36	0.08	0.18	0.00
	C1	06b	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
T1 Average			0.17	0.10	0.08	0.04
T2	C2	02	1.10	1.20	0.00	0.40
	C4	05	0.70	0.36	0.10	0.09
T2 Average			0.90	0.63	0.05	0.19
T3	C3	04	1.00	0.36	0.29	0.00
	C3	08	2.82	0.00	1.18	0.10
T3 Average			2.00	0.19	0.77	0.05
T4	C5	07	0.44	0.25	0.11	0.00
T4 Average			0.44	0.25	0.11	0.00
Average (all teachers)			0.82	0.22	0.27	0.06

Overall frequencies for teacher use of non-literal or literal speech acts during teacher-student conflict episodes, broken down by student gender, are reported on the bottom line of Table 4.

Table 5 represents the same information as Table 3, except for the omitted group data, transformed to control for gender distribution. Each score represents the relative frequency of conflict episodes using cooperative or competitive teacher strategies for male or female students in a given class.

Table 5: A Comparison of Teacher Cooperative and Competitive Communication in Teacher-Student Male and Female Conflict Episodes Adjusted for Student Number

Teacher	Class	Tape	Cooperative		Competitive	
			M	F	M	F
T1	C1	01	0.07	0.33	0.21	0.08
	C1	03	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.00
	C1	06a	0.09	0.00	0.45	0.08
	C1	06b	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00
Total T1			0.04	0.10	0.21	0.04
T2	C2	02	0.00	0.20	1.10	1.40
	C4	05	0.20	0.18	0.60	0.27
Total T2			0.10	0.19	0.85	0.63
T3	C3	04	0.14	0.00	1.14	0.36
	C3	08	0.29	0.00	3.70	0.10
Total T3			0.22	0.00	2.55	0.23
T4	C5	07	0.00	0.00	0.56	0.25
Total T4			0.00	0.00	0.56	0.25
Total (all teachers)			0.10	0.08	0.99	0.20

Overall frequencies for teacher use of cooperative or competitive conflict management strategies during teacher-student conflict episodes, broken down by student gender, are reported on the bottom line of Table 5.

These results show relative frequencies, not probabilities. For example, in Table 5, the overall frequency of teacher use of competitive conflict management strategies for male students is 0.99 and for female students it is 0.20. This does not mean males have almost a 100% probability of a competitive teacher reprimand. It does, however, indicate that all students witnessed almost five times as many competitive teacher conflict management strategies used in conflicts with male students when compared to the strategies used in conflicts with female students.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

Classrooms consist of as many as 30 or more students in almost continuous observation of teacher language-verbal and non-verbal. Patterns and protocols may emerge that are unique to these groups, or even unique to a single group on a particular day.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated that teachers will use non-literal speech acts more frequently than literal speech acts in response to teacher-student conflicts. This hypothesis was supported in both the pilot study (Schmidt, 1995) and by the current results. In this study, teachers were more than twice as likely to use reprimands containing non-literal language ($n = 159$) as they were to use literal reprimands ($n = 70$). This represented 69.4% of all reprimands and was identical to the pilot study (Schmidt, 1995) finding of 69% non-literal reprimands for a sample using a slightly younger student sample. These findings confirmed that teachers' use of literal/non-literal language was relatively stable across the six teachers (4 male; 2 female) and four grade levels (grades 4, 6, 7, 8) examined in both studies.

The teacher-student conflicts were also scored for whether the teacher responded to a conflict with a single student, male or female, or with a group of students. Across all conflicts, conflicts with student groups accounted for

34% of all scored conflicts.

Student groups accounted for almost half (49%) of all conflicts where teachers used literal language in response to teacher-student conflicts. In contrast, only 27% of all teacher use of non-literal language in response to teacher-student conflict involved conflicts with more than one student. Thus, it appears these teachers were more likely to use literal language when reprimanding student groups than they were when reprimanding individual students.

Teachers' preference for non-literal language in response to teacher-student conflicts involving individual students may be a recognition of the importance of subtle cues and situational factors present between each teacher-student dyad. It may be that teachers use fewer indirect reprimands with groups because of the greater potential for miscommunication when dealing with multiple perceptions.

Given that non-literal speech relies more heavily on the intent component, teachers may use this type of communication in situations with a lesser chance for misperceived or alternate interpretations by the student(s). As a result, the student may respond on the basis of his understanding and acceptance of teacher authority rather than because he has accurately interpreted what he did to cause the teacher-student conflict. It appears that when teachers used non-literal language in response to teacher-student conflict, students judged teacher intent by looking

to other environmental cues. One of these cues may have been how the teacher delivered the message itself.

Hypothesis 2

The second research hypothesis stated that teachers will use competitive management strategies more frequently than cooperative management strategies in response to teacher-student conflicts. This hypothesis was also supported by the finding of the current study, with teachers using competitive conflict management strategies ($n = 178$) more often than cooperative strategies ($n = 51$). This represents 77.7% of all conflicts being scored as ones where the teacher used coercive, threatening, or sarcastic language to manage teacher-student conflicts.

It was noted that teachers responded to conflicts with student groups in 34% of all observed teacher-student conflict episodes. Student groups accounted for a total of 63% of all conflicts where teachers employed cooperative conflict management strategies. In contrast, only 25% of all teacher competitive conflict management strategies involved conflicts with more than one student. Thus, it appears teachers are more likely to try cooperative strategies when addressing groups than they are when reprimanding individual students.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that teachers will engage in conflicts with male students more frequently than they will

engage in conflicts with female students. This hypothesis was supported by the overall data, with 123 out of 152 conflicts (81%) occurring between teachers and male students.

However, these raw scores must be transformed to take into consideration numbers of male and female students in each class. Otherwise, the disproportionate number of reprimands directed at male students may be a result of unequal gender distribution in the classes.

These classes had slightly more male students ($n = 113$) than female students ($n = 104$). When gender distribution is taken into account, support for Hypothesis 3 is nevertheless still confirmed, with 79.6% of teacher-student conflicts involving male students.

There was little difference in the type of language used by teachers when reprimanding male students. When controlled for gender distribution, teachers used non-literal language in response to teacher-student conflicts involving male students 78.8% of the time. For teacher-student conflicts where the teacher used literal language, 81.8% of the conflicts involved single male students.

In contrast, teachers' use of cooperative conflict management strategies in response to teacher-student conflicts involved males just 55.6% of the time. For competitive teacher conflict management strategies however, teachers directed their reprimands towards male students

83.2% of the time.

Thus, it appears that these teachers reprimanded male students more frequently than female students, and when they did, they elected to use competitive strategies almost 91% of the time. When they reprimanded female students, they still adopted a competitive strategy 71.4% of the time, however, the relative frequency for reprimands of female students is much lower, at 20.4%, compared to 79.4% for their male counterparts. Even with cooperative strategies, males received 25% more reprimands than their female peers. It appears then that males are the primary recipients of reprimands in the classroom, no matter how these events are scored.

General Discussion

The actions and language used by the parties within a conflict event combine to determine both the nature of the conflict and its outcome. In teacher-student conflict, the teacher holds the greater potential to regulate the behaviour of the student and bring the conflict to a speedy end. Thus, the nature of the teacher's communication is particularly important when examining teacher-student conflict episodes.

Even within the group, however, presumably a teacher's language in one situation can mean something quite different when delivered to another student in the same classroom. The speech and actions of both teachers and students may help

define multiple contexts within the classroom, with some common understandings within the group and a smaller number of constructed meanings particular to unique teacher-student dyads. Such socially constructed communication may develop among the members of a group and possess distinct meaning and function (Sell, Cohen, Graesser, Duncan, Ray, MacDonald & Crain, 1994).

Although not tested for specifically, there was some evidence of constructed meanings within the videotapes. Certain students answered the teacher's non-literal reprimands, often responding to the literal instead of the non-literal message. For example, it was possible to hear students occasionally responding "yes, yes, yes" following a reprimand delivered by the teacher in the form of a rhetorical question (such as "Will you please sit down?"). The teachers did not answer nor acknowledge these instances of students' come back; these student-teacher dyads clearly had a pattern of communication distinct from the remainder of the group. In each instance, the teacher was essentially letting the student win back some of the lost ground from being reprimanded. Both to himself and his peers, the student's unwillingness to back down verbally and unconditionally to the teacher's order may lessen the social impact of the reprimand even though he physically complies with her directive.

One class (C8) contained a lengthy series of conflicts

between the teacher and one particular male student. The student's actions suggested he deliberately tried to sustain the conflict and was well aware of his peers' responses to the escalating situation with the teacher. The teacher tried to close down the conflict (which actually persisted through the entire class period) by using progressive discipline: first level, reprimands; second level, stronger reprimands, threats; third level, punishment (moving student; issuing detentions); fourth level, expulsion from class, threats to call administration. The class ended with the conflict still ongoing and escalating.

According to Eden (1992), progressive discipline carries many undesired effects, including the potential to: (a) suppress behaviour rather than foster meaningful, lasting change; (b) cause the disciplined individual to withdraw emotionally from the group; (c) stimulate emotional rather than rational responses; (d) make it difficult for the disciplined student to respond favourably to the teacher's later attempts to reinforce positive behaviour; (e) cause undue stress for the teacher as she switches between enforcer and reinforcer roles; and (f) create discipline rituals, where individuals play out predetermined outcomes. Eden believes progressive discipline is more successful when reminders of group norms and expectations are used, not threats of action against an individual. Reminders are a form of agreement on group standards that

can nevertheless still underscore the seriousness of the incident while emphasizing collaboration and mutual interests.

In some instances, teachers reprimanded students using reasonable, if not even polite, non-literal language delivered in hostile or covertly threatening ways. One example is the exchange in Tape 04 (t1:20). The teacher used a request for some exercise sheets to disguise a reprimand for a student behaving out of line.

Another instance of a polite, yet competitive reprimand occurred on Tape 06 (t8:53). The teacher stated: "I love your enthusiasm this morning [SN]." The student was wildly waving his hands in the air in defiance of an earlier reprimand (t7:56) for speaking without first raising his hand. With both hands now waving, this student went overboard with the teacher's request. The teacher's second reprimand was sarcastic and rhetorical. He clearly intended it as a message to the student to stop fooling around. The student stopped his public display of over-compliance, but what did the teacher learn from this experience? With only the student's behaviour as a yardstick to gauge whether the message was accurately received and understood, the teacher may believe the student has learned not to wave his hands in class. The student's understanding of the conflict, however, may be that he stood up to the teacher in front of his peers. Two important observations can be noted about this

incident: 1) that the student's role in initiating and closing the conflict is not well understood; and 2) without considering the context of the delivery, this discourse may not have been classified as a conflict.

Although non-literal speech was used extensively by these teachers and often in a competitive manner, it was not the only form of competitive reprimand. The teacher in Tape 08 tried two non-literal reprimands (t27:55) before resorting to a direct "Get off of it!" to stop a student from sitting on a desk. This may suggest that teachers try non-literal communication, which may carry compliance-gaining messages to the intended student but is nevertheless still open to multiple interpretations by the remainder of the class, before they disclose their intent to a more widespread audience. According to Dews, Kaplan, and Winner (1995), non-literal criticisms are often seen as less insulting and less threatening, especially if humour is used. Trying non-literal reprimands first may allow teachers to show positive emotions (e.g., humour) while disciplining instead of purely negative ones (e.g., anger, frustration). However, Dews, Kaplan and Winner's research was conducted using all adult subjects. It is unclear whether adolescents would find non-literal reprimands less insulting within a classroom environment.

As hypothesized, teacher communication was scored as competitive more frequently than it was scored as

cooperative in nature. It is likely that teachers routinely must exercise their power and control over the students to manage group and individual behaviours. Without structure, little progress would be made on curricular or classroom tasks. Thus, competitive scoring is not necessarily indicative of an overall hostile atmosphere, but may represent the degree to which the teachers are able to manage daily teacher-student conflicts without resorting to authoritarian practices.

Classroom structure during conflict episodes seems to split one party away from the rest of the group. In commonplace classroom conflicts, often the first indication of a teacher-student conflict is the interruption or withdrawal of the teacher from main-group activity. Such action serves to invite social consequences as students wait for their non-conforming peer to be brought in line. Where students interrupt routines and peers with disruptive behaviour, the remaining students may take sides with the teacher and exert pressure on their non-conforming peer to behave.

In the current study, sometimes the teacher recruited classroom peers for the purpose of managing a conflict, as seen on Tape 04 (t13:58). The teacher sent a covert message to two inattentive students by asking one of their peers to wait until he had everyone's full attention before answering a question. Another example was found on Tape 08 (t3:07).

Here the teacher exerted social pressure and possibly ridicule on one student by telling the rest of the class "[SN] is going to spend some time with me," referring to a detention after class. She then turned her attention to the student and said "You now owe me two minutes."

In other situations, the misbehaving peer seems to recruit his cohorts into passive or active endorsement of his actions, thereby squeezing the teacher out of the group. Even with a solution imposed by the teacher, both parties may emerge from a conflict with their goals achieved—classroom harmony is restored and the student claims his one minute in the spotlight. To the extent that teachers are aware of or invoke this influence, how they deal with conflict may have spin-off effects on the engaged students, non-participating peers, and the teachers themselves.

The teacher's responses to student off-task behaviour within the classroom contains several elements that have the potential to influence the teacher-student relationship and the classroom environment. These events send messages to the students through the teacher's use of language, gestures, social comparison, and power. Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman, and Ryan (1981) noted the teacher's need to maintain order in a classroom and set norm-referenced standards may undermine a student's development of intrinsic motivation. These researchers cited teacher communication and reward systems

as the determinants of whether the teacher is oriented toward control or autonomy in the classroom.

Thus, rather than contributing to students' learning, ego-focus, and intrinsic motivation, teacher reprimands may only serve to "encourage minimum performance necessary to avoid [their] application" (Eden, 1994, p. 514).

Furthermore, repeated conflict threatens to distort the teacher-student bond, making the dual nature of the teacher's task to dispense both positive reinforcement and classroom discipline a difficult balance for teachers to achieve.

When teachers use rhetorical questions instead of literal commands to manage student behaviour, they deviate from the normal Initiation-Reply-Evaluation (IRE) structure commonly found in other classroom questioning (Cazden, 1986). In this study, the teachers showed no interest in nor allowed time for student response (the "reply" component) and normally gave no acknowledgement that the student had complied successfully ("evaluation"). This break from a routine designed for achieving academic outcomes may have signalled the group that the question was in response to a teacher-student conflict and not one to be answered literally.

The teacher may thus remain unaware of the student's confusion over the message if it was delivered either non-literally or rhetorically. Without feedback, she may make

unsubstantiated assumptions regarding the communication with the student. For example, student compliance may not necessarily mean understanding nor acceptance of the directive. In conflict episodes, such miscommunication may be particularly significant.

These teacher-student conflict exchanges constitute a micro environment within the larger classroom group, with distinct rules for discourse. The IRE pattern may not appear as clearly as it does with academic instruction, but may persist in another form. At the beginning of a teacher-student conflict, the student's actions or failure to act may be interpreted as initiating communication with the teacher. The teacher's response is a directive to conform. Evaluation proceeds as the student decides whether or not to comply. Thus, the 3-part IRE structure may be a common attribute of classroom communication that originates with teachers during instructional times and with students during teacher-student conflict exchanges.

Norms for managing conflict episodes may reflect deliberately flexible classroom protocols. The range of strategies used by teachers to manage teacher-student conflict may reflect teachers' beliefs that individual students would respond best to particular techniques. The discipline may not need to be the same for it to be accepted by the group, but it may need to be consistent. Absolute standards for academic performance (Blumenfeld, 1992) may be

conceptually similar to absolute standards for behaviour, where defined limits to student talking and movement around the room concurrently restrict all students. The challenge is for teachers to stress individual rather than group objectives, while enforcing sufficient behavioral standards to maintain classroom functioning. Students, too, must remain flexible, especially beginning at the middle school level with the change to multiple teachers over the course of a school day. This could lead students to adopting an understanding of and response to teacher-student conflict in one classroom and a markedly different understanding in another.

Limitations and Future Prospects

This research measured the relative frequencies of teacher conflict management strategies in middle school classroom environments in response to commonplace teacher-student conflicts. It serves to foster the understanding of teacher-student conflict within the classroom context. First, the reliability test confirmed the ability of trained scorers to independently identify classroom conflict episodes. This required monitoring classroom activity, teacher behaviour, and teacher-student interaction. Thus, the identification of conflict episodes from videotape alone allowed this research to proceed without relying on self-report.

With more conventional survey research, when subjects

were asked to recall, whether it be through hypothetical scenarios or survey instruments, the choices they would have made in a similar situation, they had the benefit of time and reflection and the potential to answer in socially desirable ways. Termed the Hawthorne Effect (Borg & Gall, 1989), subjects tended to portray themselves in the best possible light. In this study, it was likely that any such effects would have decreased the frequencies of the more coercive or authoritarian behavioral corrections by teachers. As such, this study's results may be conservative in their report of the frequencies of the more negatively-perceived teacher behaviours.

Videotape analysis afforded the opportunity to include non-verbal behaviours, but has also introduced additional influence into the classrooms under study. Tapes were made with not only camera equipment but also a graduate student researcher present. In several instances, students made eye contact or directed comments at the camera operator. Despite researcher assurances of anonymity, individuals may have been uncomfortable with the camera's presence, especially when it captured their questionable behaviours. Cazden (1986) concludes the selection of method to record classroom interaction should consider the nature of the research question and use the least possible invasive method. Videotaping was determined to be necessary in this study because of the inclusion of teacher and student non-verbal

behaviours in the discourse analysis.

Nicholls (cited in Ames & Ames, 1984) reports individuals in an evaluative or public situation, such as videotaping, tend to become more ego-involved and self-aware. For this study, teachers were instructed that the tapes were for research purposes only to capture teacher-student interaction and classroom environment conditions and were not to be used for evaluation. As such, the effects reported by Nicholls were not seen as a significant threat to the integrity of the current research. Thus, at the minimum, this study examined the most positive range of teacher responses to commonplace classroom conflicts with students.

However, there are several drawbacks to the methodology used in this study. First, this research did not incorporate conflict episodes where either party remained visibly passive. Presumably a student may withdraw from active participation in classroom activities or a teacher may feel anger or frustration as a result of a student's behaviour, but, because of the unique qualities of the individuals and situation, do nothing to resolve the conflict.

Second, this study can be criticized for making assumptions regarding intent of teacher language. Each scorer was instructed to look for episodes where the teacher was trying to correct students' behaviour. Although this required a subjective decision to be made as to intent, it

was felt that intent itself cannot be observed nor scored literally from observation alone. According to Bavelas, Black, Chovil, and Mullett (1990), the study of human communication requires examination of both the message as a whole and the interrelated parts. In this study, this suggested that intent was a vital component of the language surrounding the conflict to include in the data. Thus, the scorers were instructed to look for a reasonable perception of intent to correct behaviour instead. This meant that the scorers received the teachers' language and gestures as if they were the intended recipients, and judged whether to score the message as a behavioral correction accordingly. It was important to note that adults scored the data, therefore, the resulting conflict episodes were interpreted from an adult's perspective. The perceptions of children or a longitudinal perspective cannot be concluded from the data in this study.

Third, without further study, it was unclear whether perceived differences in interactions between teachers and individual students or groups of students (including male/female groups, low ability/high ability groups) was a result of teachers' well-intentioned responses to individual needs or teacher prejudices and preferences.

Teacher communication may not only respond to perceived differences and expectations but may also help shape them as well. Future research may link teacher-student conflicts

with lost instructional time and student achievement. On Tape 08, the male student involved in the conflict beginning at t1:13 (and persisting on and off until t41:12), spent 14 minutes in the hallway, was reprimanded after class (i.e., was late for his next class too), and was issued an after-school detention. His time-on-task during this class period would surely fall well below class average and may not allow him to progress at the same pace as his non-reprimanded peers.

Researchers (Hurrell, 1995; Lovejoy, 1996) have shown teachers to have higher expectations for behaviour with older students within the group. Another prospective study would be to examine whether teachers discriminate against older students by entering into more teacher-student conflicts with them. This has special implications for older students who may have been kept back one or more years early in their schooling because of a learning disability. At the middle school level, where age differences among students may result in widely different rates of physical maturation, these age differences become acutely evident and may affect teacher expectations for behaviour.

In addition, this study represented the observed teacher-student interactions as examples of natural language. The question then becomes: how can a natural environment be defined? This important concern was reconciled by limiting research interference. First, the

videotaping was done in such a way to minimize effects on both teachers and students. A single camera was used from a fixed location, with the researcher rotating the camera angle to focus on teacher movement around the room.

Videotape analysis preserves discourse so the researcher can revisit the communication many times over to confirm or discard scoring decisions. Nevertheless, classroom nuances are difficult to observe when using videotape alone, such as whispering, eye contact, and speaker identification. In addition, it was apparent in several instances that students and teachers played to the camera. In one situation, the teacher removed the misbehaving student from camera range to administer a reprimand; however, the microphone still managed to capture the essence of the communication. Most evidence for camera influence involved students making faces or glancing towards the lens.

Videotaping a classroom may introduce researcher effects that limit the extent to which results can be generalized to natural environments. Students may exaggerate their misbehaviour because they know they can get away with it; alternatively, they may try harder to behave because they want to please their teacher. There was evidence to suggest both of these effects on the tapes under study. A few students brought on teacher censure by failing to pay attention in class and fooling around with the camera; others quieted down instantly when the video camera panned

the class and focussed on their location.

Whatever the researcher effects, discourse analysis allows the researcher to acknowledge such influences as part of the context under study. Thus, having a researcher in the classroom may not create an unnatural environment but rather an environment wherein the individuals respond using their previous experiences with one another as the basis for the current behaviour. It may be little different from having a teacher aide, parent, or school administrator in the room—all common occurrences in classroom life.

Using discourse analysis methodologies in research was challenged by the well-documented effects of observer and researcher bias from videotaped classroom interaction (Babad, 1990). The choice of discourse categories observed, how the scoring system was structured, and knowledge of classroom teaching and interaction processes undoubtedly affected the results. The study's conclusions became discourse about discourse, and remain similarly subject to interpretation.

Despite its limitations, discourse analysis of teacher-student communication expanded our understanding of classroom interaction. Other forms of research, including Babad's (1990) study using vignettes and Plax and Kearney's (1992) survey and vignette studies, failed to capture the emotional component of teacher-student conflict. In this study, observation of the classroom environment using

videotape storage for retrieval and review of teacher-student interactions, allowed for the emotions of both teachers and students involved in the conflict episode to be preserved.

Lastly, by examining conflict episodes from multiple teachers and classroom environments, this research may be criticized for pooling results and drawing comparisons among widely diverging classroom environments. However, Dixon, de la Cruz, Green, Lin, and Brandts (1993) found recurrent themes in all classrooms that made the study of life in classrooms possible and worthwhile. Behavioral standards common to these classrooms have emerged, as well as inconsistent behaviours across multiple subject areas and teachers.

These limitations do not negate the value of this research, they simply add further dimensions to continued study of classroom conflict. Future studies may examine how teacher responses to conflict vary across time. In a classroom, this may involve various defined points within the school year or even smaller divisions such as the school day or week. Thus, not only will the age of students become an important variable, but also the amount of time spent in any particular classroom environment. For example, Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman, and Ryan (1981) found student perceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were relatively fixed by the fifth week of a school year. If

parallel findings of the importance of initial perceptions were to occur in behavioral research, this may show students' perceptions shaped by a disproportionately rigid and externally focussed period during the first few weeks as the teacher tries to establish classroom behaviour protocols and regulations.

Teacher discourse during a teacher-student conflict was also scored for its cooperative or competitive nature. Every teacher must enforce what is commonly called classroom management or discipline practices in order to maintain a functioning learning environment. When defined as conflicts and scored according to Deutsch's (1994) categories of conflict management, the results supported the research hypothesis quite convincingly. A large majority of conflicts (78%) were scored as competitive.

Identifying the factors that contribute to positive, mutually respectful conflict management in teacher-student conflict may contribute to informing pre-service and professional development teams so they can incorporate these components into their training structures. Research into conflict management training reports qualified long-term success in changing how individuals approach and manage conflict situations, especially when given long-term support (Schaffer, Stringfield & Devlin-Scherer, 1990). For teachers, such changes could be readily introduced into their regular professional development activities.

As an environment where children are meant to learn and develop both socially and academically, the classroom should be a safe place. It is here where their frailties and risk-taking are vulnerable to observation and comment from those around them. Not only is the student surrounded by peers, but he is in the company of an adult who controls the environment, decides on his eventual success or failure, and administers both reward and punishment.

Conflict is jointly constructed and may be mutually beneficial and/or destructive. Students take a risk when instigating conflict that interrupts the regular flow of classroom learning. What compensatory social or other benefit exists that makes such a risk worth taking? What is the nature of the cost when the risk fails?

Teachers may dominate the classroom, but students take the lead, even momentarily, when initiating teacher-student conflicts. These small reversals in power may sustain the behaviour and serve to shift the equilibrium of classroom power slightly.

Cooper and Good (cited in Witty & DeBaryshe, 1994) found that teachers exercised greater control and were differentially negative toward low achievers. Witty and DeBaryshe further comment on a number of studies indicating that teachers expect less of boys, ethnic minorities, and children from low socio-economic backgrounds (1994). It would be presumptuous to assume that teachers are the only

purveyors of negative criticisms and corrections in a child's life. However, to overlook the powerful influence this environment has on students would be equally negligent. The student characteristics found by Witty and DeBaryshe to be most likely the focus of negative teacher response—males, low SES, ethnic minorities, low achievers—are also found in literature looking into links to juvenile delinquency. Thus, the commonplace nature of certain classroom conflicts may belie their importance.

An increasing amount of a child's time is spent in care of non-related adults, caregivers and teachers. For children of working parents, these caregivers may take over primary care as early as two months of age. For many children, though, the most significant adults in their lives other than family members may be school teachers. Children spend up to six hours over the most productive portions of their day with teachers, who will witness and contribute to many, if not most, academic, social, behavioral, and developmental milestones past infancy.

To understand the unique nature of the teacher-student relationship, consider the child's perspective. Children need to do well in school, academically and socially, to succeed in the eyes of others and to make them feel good about themselves; teachers facilitate a significant portion of this process. However, teachers may hold the balance of power in every regard—coercive, reward, legitimate,

referent, expert-and in almost every classroom situation. This inequity may be necessary to organize and effect student learning, but it also makes the study of teacher-student conflict that much more compelling.

The study of teacher-student interaction has most often focussed on learning. Learning, however, does not solely relate to academic knowledge acquisition and understanding, but presumably refers to becoming aware of and conforming to a social and behavioral indoctrination within the classroom environment. The literature (e.g., Pintrich, Marx, & Boyle, 1993) has shown classroom learning to be a group rather than an individual experience, influenced by, and influencing, teacher-student interaction. How students receive the behavioral corrections directed at their peers and relate it to their own experiences with teacher-student conflict is still unknown. If multiple corrections are levied against a specific student, do his peers take this as a measure of his ability to behave or of his social stature?

The results of this study also have implications for teacher attention to male versus female behaviour. Are teachers reprimanding males more because they are watching male students more closely than their female counterparts? Or do male middle school students instigate more teacher-student conflicts? Can female students get away with more classroom misbehaviour than males? And last, how does teachers' disproportionate attention to conflicts with their

male students affect instructional objectives and the learning environment?

This study of teacher-student interaction contributes to our understanding of the significant socializing and developmental processes all students experience in daily school life. There is a need to address the significant number of children who thwart authority and enter into delinquent lifestyles later in adolescence, where many more teenagers engage in delinquent activities than predicted by conventional early warning systems such as childhood histories of conduct disorder (Patterson, DeBaryshe & Ramsey, 1989) or temper tantrums (Caspi, Elder & Bem, 1987). Given the paucity, then, of pre- and early adolescent predictors of later delinquent behaviour, more study is needed on significant influences on children's social development.

This study examined two important themes in classroom conflict: first, that commonplace conflicts are numerous and readily apparent in middle school classrooms. The descriptive component of this research also allowed further examination of teacher-student conflict, including critical questions related to student gender and conflict frequency. Second, the data analyzed the relationship between teacher non-literal speech acts and competitive conflict management strategies in response to teacher-student conflict. This may have important implications for youth as they interact with

adult authority figures such as parents, police, and other community stakeholders. Aquilino (1997), in a longitudinal study focussed on parent-child relationships, found significant implications for the enduring effects of the nature of adult-child conflict relationships:

The movement of the [adult-child] relationship toward mutuality is greater when patterns of earlier interaction suggest a more individuated [adult]-adolescent relationship, a relationship marked by [adult] support, a democratic style of discipline, and less reliance on coercive means of control (p. 678).

The research into mutuality in the teacher-student relationship awaits further research. The progressive ability of students to continue to be active participants in their education and to understand and respond to messages from their teachers represents one possible next step suggested by the findings of the current study. Only with further research will the short and long term nature of the influence of teacher communication on student learning, social development, and behaviour unfold.

References

- Adler, P. A. & Adler, P. (1995). Dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in preadolescent cliques. Social Psychology Quarterly, 58, 145-162.
- Ames, R. E. & Ames, C. (Eds.). (1984). Research on motivation in education. (Vol. 1). Toronto: Academic Press, Inc.
- Anderson, J. R., Reder, L. M., & Simon, H. A. (1996). Situated learning and education. Educational Researcher, 25, 5-11.
- Aquilino, W. S. (1997). From adolescent to young adult: A prospective study of parent-child relations during the transition to adulthood. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59, 670-686.
- Babad, E. (1990). Calling on students: How a teacher's behavior can acquire disparate meanings in students' minds. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 25, 1-4.
- Bavelas, J. B., Black, A., Chovil, N. & Mullett, J. (1990). Equivocal communication. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Bingham, S. G. & Scherer, L. L. (1993). Factors associated with responses to sexual harassment and satisfaction with outcome. Sex Roles, 29, 239-269.
- Blumenfeld, P. C. (1992). Classroom learning and motivation: Clarifying and expanding goal theory. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84, 272-281.
- Boardman, S. K. & Horowitz, S. V. (1994). Constructive conflict management and social problems: An introduction. Journal of Social Issues, 50, 1-12.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. (5th Ed.). New York: Longman.
- Bugental, D. B. (1993). Communication in abusive relationships: Cognitive constructions of interpersonal power. American Behavioral Scientist, 36, 288-308.
- Cabello, B. & Terrell, R. (1994). Making students feel like family: How teachers create warm and caring classroom climates. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 29, 17-23.
- Caspi, A., Elder, G. H. & Bem, D. J. (1987). Moving against the world: Life-course patterns of explosive children. Developmental Psychology, 23, 308-313.

- Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.) (pp. 432-463). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Deci, E. L., Schwartz, A. J., Sheinman, L. & Ryan, R. M. (1981). An instrument to assess adults' orientations toward control versus autonomy with children: Reflections on intrinsic motivation and perceived competence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 642-650.
- Deutsch, M. (1994). Constructive conflict resolution: Principles, training, and research. Journal of Social Issues, 50, 13-32.
- Dixon, C., de la Cruz, E., Green, J., Lin, L. & Brandts, L. (1993). Do you see what we see? The referential and intertextual nature of classroom life. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27, 29-36.
- Eden, G. (1994). Progressive discipline: an oxymoron? Industrial Relations, 47, 511-530.
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P. & Lach, D. H. (1994). Gender differences in clerical workers' disputes over tasks, interpersonal treatment, and emotion. Human Relations, 47, 611-639.

- Heap, J. L. (1993). Seeing snubs: an introduction to sequential analysis of classroom interaction. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27, 23-28.
- Hodson, R. (1991). The active worker: Compliance and autonomy at the workplace. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 20, 47-78.
- Holtgraves, T. (1986). Language structure in social interaction: Perceptions of direct and indirect speech acts and interactants who use them. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 305-314.
- Hurrell, P. (1995). Do teachers discriminate? Reactions to pupil behaviour in four comprehensive schools. Sociology, 29, 59-72.
- Ilatov, Z., Shamai, S., Hertz-Lazarovitz, R. & Mayer-Young, S. (1998). Teacher-student classroom interactions: The influence of gender, academic dominance, and teacher communication style. Adolescence, 33, 269-277.
- Kess, J. F. (1992). Psycholinguistics: Psychology, Linguistics and the Study of Natural Language. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1994). Constructive conflict in the schools. Journal of Social Issues, 50, 117-137.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., Dudley, B., Mitchell, J. & Fredrickson, J. (1997). The impact of conflict resolution training on middle school students. The Journal of Social Psychology, 137, 11-21.

Johnson, G. M. & Miller, P. J. (1994). Field theory applied to classrooms: Toward a bidirectional paradigm of teacher-student relationships. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 28, 15-21.

Juvonen, J. & Weiner, B. (1993). An attributional analysis of students' interactions: The social consequences of perceived responsibility. Educational Psychology Review, 5, 325-345.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lovejoy, M. C. (1996). Social inferences regarding inattentive-overactive and aggressive child behavior and their effects on teacher reports of discipline. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 25, 33-42.

- Mudrack, P. E. (1993). An investigation into the acceptability of workplace behaviours of a dubious ethical nature. Journal of Business Ethics, 12, 517-524.
- New York City Board of Education. (1990). The resolving conflict creatively program: 1988-1989. Summary of significant findings. ERIC #ED348422.
- O'Donnell, A. M. & O'Kelly, J. (1994). Learning from peers: Beyond the rhetoric of positive results. Educational Psychology Review, 6, 321-349.
- Patterson, G.R., DeBaryshe, B. D. & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. American Psychologist, 44, 329-335.
- Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W. & Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom context factors in the process of conceptual change. Review of Educational Research, 63, 167-199.
- Plax, T. G. & Kearney, P. (1992). Teacher power in the classroom: defining and advancing a program of research. In V. P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.),

Power in the classroom: communication, control, and concern (PP. 67-84). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Rahim, M. A., Garrett, J. E. & Buntzman, G. F. (1992). Ethics of managing interpersonal conflict in organizations. Journal of Business Ethics, 11, 423-432.
- Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (Eds.). (1992). Power in the classroom: communication, control, and concern. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Rosenthal, D. B. & Hautaluoma, J. (1987). Effects of importance of issues, gender, and power of contenders on conflict management style. The Journal of Social Psychology, 128, 699-701.
- Rubin, J. Z. (1994). Models of conflict management. Journal of Social Issues, 50, 33-45.
- Schaffer, E. C., Stringfield, S. C. & Devlin-Scherer, R. (1990). A two-year follow-up of a staff development program design to change teacher behavior. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 25, 15-21.
- Schmidt, S. (1995). Establishing a methodology to measure

teacher use of non-literal and literal speech acts to manage commonplace classroom conflicts. Unpublished manuscript, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia.

Sell, M. A., Cohen, R., Graesser, A. C., Duncan, M. K., Ray, G. E., MacDonald, C. D. & Crain, M. (1994). The form and function of speech act exchanges in children's dyadic interactions. Discourse Processes, 18, 119-139.

Shapiro, A. M. & Murphy, G. L. (1993). Can you answer a question for me? Processing indirect speech acts. Journal of Memory and Language, 32, 211-229.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

Sitkin, S. B. & Bies, R. J. (1993). Social accounts in conflict situations: using explanations to manage conflict. Human Relations, 46, 349-369.

Snyder, T. & Sullivan, H. (1995). Cooperative and individual learning and student misconceptions in science. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 20, 230-235.

Storey, V. (1991). Parent-school conflict. Victoria, BC: Institute for Dispute Resolution, University of Victoria.

Victor, B., Trevino, L. K. & Shapiro, D. L. (1993). Peer reporting of unethical behaviour: The influence of justice evaluations and social context factors. Journal of Business Ethics, 12, 253-263.

Wittrock, M.C. (Ed.). (1986). Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Witty, J. P. & DeBaryshe, B. D. (1994). Student and teacher perceptions of teachers' communication of performance expectations in the classroom. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 29, 1-8.

APPENDIX A
Scoring System

In this study, you will be looking at teacher strategies used to manage instances of teacher-student conflict. The data will be collected from videotapes of grades six to eight classrooms made in 1995. They feature four separate teachers—two female and two male.

Scoring will require three distinct stages: identification of the beginning of conflict episodes, and classification of the teacher's strategy as cooperative or competitive, and as non-literal or literal. To ease this process, the following procedure is recommended:

1. View the entire tape without pausing or recording any event.
2. Play back the tape, this time concentrating on identifying conflict episodes and scoring the beginning of each episode. Replay the tape as many times as necessary to record the first few key words and the counter number of the beginning of the episode. Replay the tape again to ensure you have recorded all conflict episodes.
3. View the tape again, this time watching for specific episodes and scoring individual strategies within each episode. Replay the tape as many times as necessary until you are satisfied you have scored all strategies. Do not worry if the counter numbers change slightly

each time the tape is replayed. Unless changed significantly, do not adjust your previously scored counter numbers.

Step 1: Determination of Teacher Response to Conflict

Conflict is defined as beginning when the teacher overtly responds, either verbally or non-verbally, to a situation where the activities of one or more students are in opposition to the interests of the teacher. Normally the teacher will indicate, either verbally or non-verbally, the beginning of the conflict. She may do this in several ways:

- a. by abruptly interrupting her teaching (even if it is silent reading or group work) of the whole class to focus on one student or a small group of students;
- b. by making a gesture while teaching to single out one student or a small group of students;
- c. by interrupting a student who "has the floor" to single out another student or a small group of students.

Examine the teacher's language and gestures to determine whether she intended to change one or more students' behaviour. If you feel the teacher's message would reasonably be perceived by a student as a reprimand, score the episode as a conflict. Whether or not the student complies is not important to the data.

You should enter the counter reading on the video machine at the beginning of each conflict episode on the

scoring sheet. You should also put several key words on the scoring sheet that can be used to identify this conflict episode, normally the teacher's first few words or a description of the her gesture.

Each conflict episode may include one or more students, and one or more conflict management strategies by the teacher. A conflict episode will be determined to have ceased when the teacher: resumes normal classroom activity that was previously interrupted (e.g., starts teaching again, indicates to the interrupted student to continue his or her answer) or when she reprimands another student.

Note that you will not consider the student's behaviour as a factor in determining whether the conflict has concluded. Only the teacher's behaviour is considered for scoring purposes.

Step 2: Determination of Strategy Type

Once conflict has been confirmed, look at each conflict episode to determine which strategies were attempted by the teacher. The teacher may attempt several conflict management strategies with either the same or different students during each conflict episode. You will score a strategy as distinct from other strategies in the conflict episode when:

- a. the teacher moves to interact with another student or students;
- b. the teacher comes back to correct the same student after an intervening pause or other distraction;
- c. the teacher changes from using a direct strategy to using an indirect strategy, or vice versa.

In cases where the teacher is using the student's name in a conventional manner (i.e., to get the student's attention) prior to delivering a behavioral correction, without interruption, pausing, or other intervening strategies, score both name and the correction as single strategy. A single strategy would be "Bill, sit down," whereas "Bill-[pause]-sit down" would be scored as two separate strategies. Note that evaluating a pause requires you to look at whether the teacher is simply identifying the student being reprimanded or is trying one strategy (student name) before trying another.

In cases where the teacher repeats the same strategy without interruption, pausing, or other intervening

strategies, score the entire episode as a single strategy. A common example of this is "Shhh, shhh, shhh."

You will then score the cooperative or competitive nature and the non-literal and literal classification of each teacher strategy. Record whether the conflict involved one or more (no need to track how many more) students and whether the single students were male or female.

Cooperative conflict management strategies are defined as teacher language and gestures used to reprimand students that emphasize mutual interests, show sensitivity to student needs and trust, and represent an enhancement of mutual power rather than power differences. An example of a cooperative orientation in a teacher reprimand is "Let's get to work now," emphasizing the collective effort needed by both parties (students and teacher) to complete the task. A teacher's use of "Shhh..." can be cooperative if delivered in a non-hostile manner and if the teacher is emphasizing the group's interests by reducing the noise level in the room. Similarly, a beckoning gesture used to invite an off-task student to rejoin the group is a cooperative management strategy.

Competitive conflict management strategies are operationally defined in this study as teacher language and gestures that emphasize the power differences between the teacher and student(s), and that may invoke social comparisons, threats, or hostility. For example, situations

where the teacher refers to her interests rather than group interests, such as telling a student "I'm waiting" as a reprimand to the student to stop talking or participating in off-task behaviour. If the teacher issues a rhetorical reprimand, i.e., one that does not allow the student to respond or negotiate, it is competitive. Teacher power is also evident in gestures as reprimands: pointing or thrusting fingers in the direction on the student or removing objects from the student's possession without warning or discussion. The scoring often requires intonation and context to make a final determination.

Literal speech acts are defined as language and gestures whose literal meaning is reasonable or understood within the context of the group. For instance, if the teacher directs a student to "Sit down" or "Be quiet." Also scored as literal speech acts are utterances and gestures used by teachers that convey a specific, direct meaning to the students. The primary example of this is the teachers' use of "Shhh." This is commonly understood, both within this group and elsewhere, to be a direct request to stop talking or to lower voices.

Non-literal speech acts are defined as language and gestures whose literal meaning is different from their intended meaning. Included in this group are instances where the teacher uses a student's name as a behavioral correction, usually spoken as a question (e.g., "Becky?").

No additional, direct request is immediately made to the student. Ordinarily, such a question would elicit a response of "Yes?" or even "What?" by the recipient. In these cases, the intent is clearly to quiet the student or have him or her cease activity and is spoken in a rhetorical fashion. In addition, teachers may use gestures such as pointing or tapping on desks as corrective measures when dealing with student conflict. These messages are subject to interpretation and are, therefore, non-literal.

For strategies where a determination cannot be made because of tape quality or some other reason, score the gender and number of student(s), if possible and record it in the "Not Classified" column.

Where necessary, identify the teacher as "T" and students as "S." If the teacher uses the student's name as part of the strategy, record it as [SN] for "student name." If necessary, for multiple student names, designate them as [SN1], [SN2], [SN3], ... and so on.

APPENDIX B

Transcripts of Teacher-Student Conflict Events

KEY:

First character:	M (Male Teacher) or F (Female Teacher)
Second character:	G (Group reprimand), M (Male reprimand), or F (female reprimand)
Third character:	I (Non-literal or non-literal) or D (literal)
Fourth-Sixth characters:	COO (Cooperative strategy) or COM (Competitive strategy)
[SN]:	Student Name
n/c:	Not Classified (out of range)
Underline:	Emphasis (loud or stressed)

Tape: 01

Teacher: T1

Class: C1

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
3:10	I think we're done in about 3 seconds now-2-1-0. Thank you.	MGICOO
3:27	I need you to be real quiet and attentive.	MGICOM
3:36	Shhh...	MFDCOO
4:28	Are you with me with this material?	MMICOO
13:10	Are you with me [SN]?	MFICOO
13:12	This is where it's at here-OK?	MFICOO
13:14	[gesture: points to student, then points to board repeatedly]	MFICOM
13:16	Try not to do three things at once-OK?	MFICOO
19:59	Just a minute folks.	MGICOO
20:02	Everybody quiet please.	MGDCOO
24:14	Rest of you quiet.	MGDCOM
27:17	Would everyone listen very carefully to [SN]?	MGICOO
27:22	Shhh...Shhh...Shhh...Shhh...Listen very carefully to [SN].	MGDCOO
35:25	[Teacher takes calculator from student]	MMICOM
35:50	[SN] [long pause and stare] Stop.	MMICOM
		MMDCOM

Tape: 02

Teacher: T2

Class: C2

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
2:12	I need you to be quiet please-OK?	FMICOM
3:45	Shhh...	FGDCOO
3:48	When you're quiet-I'll start.	FGICOM
3:54	Student (loudly): Shhh...	FFICOM
	Teacher: [gesture: long stare]	
4:42	[SN]	FMICOM
6:04	[gesture: 3-4 stares]	FGICOM
6:09	I'd like you two to move in here please.	FGICOM
6:09	[gesture: hand points]	FGICOM
6:11	Move on in.	FGDCOM
6:47	[teacher whispers to students she just moved]	FM n/c
7:28	Shhh...	FFDCOO
7:55	Excuse me...	FMICOM

7:56	I have this strange expectation that you're capable of being quiet while I'm doing this. And if you aren't then we can just stop the demonstration and you can do [unclear] instead, OK?	FMICOM
8:08	[SN] Would you put your pen up please?	FMICOM
8:17	I don't understand what the problem is [SN]	FMICOM
8:40	[gesture: stares, then thumps desk with hand at point nearest student who is talking]	FMICOM
9:33	[gesture: points at student then points to side of classroom]	FMICOM
12:28	[SN] What's the problem?	FFICOM
12:31	I don't want you speaking out.	FMICOM
12:33	Student: I was just... Teacher: [gesture: shakes head] I don't want you speaking out.	FMICOM
12:52	Are you falling apart there [SN]?	FFICOM
15:35	I don't care for what you're doing right now [SN]. I don't think it relates to the subject at hand-OK?	FFICOM
25:06-	[Teacher takes student moved at t9:33 into hall]	FM n/c
25:39		
25:58	You're not managing today?	FFICOM
26:55	Hey-hey-hey-[SN]. That's not appropriate. [gesture: long stare]	FFDCOM FFICOM

29:04-	[Teacher speaks out of range to	FM n/c
29:12	student involved at t26:55]	
32:20-	[Teacher gestures to student involved	FM n/c
33:20	at t8:40 and speaks to him out of range]	
33:29	[SN], do you have something to do?	FMICOM
41:59	Excuse me...	FGICOM

Tape: 03

Teacher: T1

Class: C1

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
0:45	I'm sure you have it in front of you-[louder] right now!	MGICOM
2:39	Hey-I have you for science so I can give you a detention.	MGICOM
4:03	I can't talk...	MGICOM
4:06	Do you want to stay?	MGICOM
4:08	You don't, you don't? Then calm down.	MGDCOM
15:18	Shhh...Shhh...Shhh...	MGICOO
16:28	Just a minute... someone not everybody...	MGICOO
19:49	Are you working [SN]?	MMICOM
36:56	[gesture: long stare at student out of seat]	MMICOM
37:08	[SN] keep working.	MMDCOM
39:18	Even if you're not listening could you please be quiet? Thank you.	MGICOO

Tape: 04

Teacher: T3

Class: C3

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
0:33	You still have something in your mouth? Then get rid of it.	FMDCOM
0:44	[SN] [gesture: pointing]	FMICOM
0:47	Sit down-sit down.	FMDCOM
0:49	[gesture: points at student]	FMICOM
1:18	Completely ignore that please [SN].	FMDCOM
1:20	I need-I need [gesture: points with pencil at student]...	FFICOM
1:20	... the moon sheets and the starry night observation sheets please.	FFICOM
1:23	Student: [whines] Teacher: No, I don't want to hear any excuses I just want to see the sheets.	FFICOM
3:10	[gesture: long pause and stare]	FGICOM
3:14	[SN], could you sit down please?	FFICOM
3:43	[gesture: long pause-unclear comment-long pause]	FGICOM
4:01	Excuse me [SN] and [SN].	FGICOM
4:05	We're waiting for you.	FMICOO
4:41	Shhh...	FGDCOO
6:12	[SN], we're in one big group now.	FMICOO
7:43	Is there something wrong?	FMICOM
9:43	Excuse me.	FGICOM

9:49	Excuse me.	FGICOM
10:11	Shhh...	FGDCOO
10:28	Shhh...quickly.	FGDCOM
10:50	Shhh...quiet please.	FGDCOO
11:10	Shhh...	FGDCOO
11:18	Shhh...	FGDCOO
11:36	Shhh...	FGDCOO
11:38	[gesture: finger to lips]	FGDCOO
11:48	[gesture: pause and stare]	FGICOM
11:51	[gesture: pause and stare]	FGICOM
12:26	[gesture: very long pause and stare]	FMICOM
13:17	[SN]	FMICOM
13:19	[gesture: long pause and stare]	FMICOM
13:46	Excuse me.	FGICOM
13:58	[directed at student answering question] Be sure [SN] and [SN] listen.	FMICOM
14:00	[SN], listen.	FMDCOM
14:05	[SN], [SN]	FMICOM
15:42	Try to keep the shoes off the table	FMICOM
17:33	[gesture: teacher places hands on student and leads him back to desk]	FMICOM
22:32	[gesture: rapid up and down motion with hand]	FGICOM
23:39	[gesture: finger to lips like a zipper]	FGDCOM
25:45	[gesture: stares at student for very long time]	FMICOM

25:58

[SN]?

FMICOM

26:31

[gesture: pause]

FGICOM

Tape: 05

Teacher: T2

Class: C4

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
2:54	Shhh...	FGDCOO
5:01	[SN], can you keep your bodily parts to yourself please?	FFICOM
5:03	[gesture: pointing at student]	FFICOM
5:14	Shhh...Shhh...	FGDCOO
5:55	Pardon me?	FMICOM
11:01	Excuse me [SN]? Excuse me.	FMICOM
11:03	[gesture: finger to lips]	FMDCOO
11:34	[gesture: finger to lips]	FGDCOO
11:57	Student: I put my hand up. Teacher: I didn't notice that [SN].	FMICOM
13:25	Shhh...Shhh...	FGDCOO
23:52	[SN], do you want to move your table forward so there's room for both you and [SN]? Thank you.	FMICOO
24:05	[SN], could you tell the story after you finish writing out the recipe? Thank you.	FMICOM
24:08	[gesture: nods and stares]	FMICOM
24:13	I want you to do your recipe now. Thank you.	FMICOM
31:15	[SN], you can visit after you have your recipe done, OK?	FFICOO

36:43	[SN], no visiting unless they're finished too ... [out of range]	FFDCOO
40:15	[SN]	FFICOM

Tape: 06a

Teacher: T1

Class: C1

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
3:39	All right. Let me give you a count of 3-2-1-zero. You don't want me to get into the negatives.	MGICOM
6:19	Your eyes need to be focussed on two things right now-one eye on each.	MGICOO
7:25	You don't have the option of doing your own thing right now.	MGICOM
7:56	With a hand raised please.	MMICOM
8:12	[gesture: points to student]	MMICOM
8:14	Your hand up [SN]?	MMICOM
8:25	I'm hearing too many voices.	MGICOM
8:27	[SN], did your hand go up?	MFICOM
8:53	I love your enthusiasm this morning [SN]	MMICOM
10:00	Your eyes all on that same place?	MGICOO
12:00	Time out-time out.	MGICOO
29:50	[gesture: makes circles repeatedly with hand]	MGICOM
31:28	[gesture: motions student to move]	MMDCOM
33:34	Be quick.	MGDCOM

48:50	Being finished is not a signal to start talking. It is a signal to start working on the assignment that's on the board.	MGICOM
59:39	Please remain quiet; quietly working on what's up front here.	MGDCOO
59:45	[gesture: finger to lips]	MMDCOO

Tape: 06b

Teacher: T1

Class: C1

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
100:16	You all put your eyes on me please right now. Right now.	MGDCOM
101:58	I said quietly work on what has been assigned. Quietly means no talking as a courtesy to those who are still writing. Thank You.	MGDCOO
102:05	[gesture: finger to lips]	MFDCOO
106:20	All right folks. Eyes on me again. Tune up.	

Tape: 07

Teacher: T4

Class: C5

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
2:40	Your book [SN]?	MMICOM
5:14	OK-here we go.	MGICOO
7:18	Eyes this way.	MGICOM
7:20	Shhh...	MGDCOM
7:24	Eyes this way.	MGICOM
7:26	[SN], [SN]	MFICOM
7:28	Eyes this way. Let me see the colour of your eyes.	MGICOM
7:38	Shhh...	MGDCOO
7:42	[gesture: whistles at one student; nods head once firmly in student's direction]	MMICOM
9:05	OK-listen.	MGDCOM
12:06	OK [SN], work on your drafting assignment please.	MMDCOM
35:32	OK-stop! OK-stop!	MGDCOM
36:00	[SN], [SN], [SN], [SN]	MFICOM
36:48	Are you cleaning up?	MFICOM
38:58	[SN]	MFICOM
40:30	OK guys, the table.	MGICOM
40:32	Guys.	MGICOM
40:33	[SN]	MMICOM

40:36	[gesture: thrusts finger towards small group of students]	MGICOM
40:40	[out of range]	MG n/c
42:09	[SN]	MMICOM

Tape: 08

Teacher: T3

Class: C3

Time Index	Communication (assume Teacher unless otherwise specified)	Coding
00:02	Quietly. No talking.	FGDCOM
00:14	NO talking.	FGDCOM
1:13	Shhh...	FMDCOO
1:17	[gesture: finger to lips]	FMDCOO
1:19	[gesture: stare]	FMICOM
1:27	[SN], [SN].	FMICOM
1:30	[gesture: points to student then points to chair near the front of room] ³	FMICOM
1:33	[SN], are we going to waste time on this right now? Because you could make those up by yourself later on.	FMICOM
1:47	[SN], we are now wasting one minute already-you could make that up after-any more time?	FMICOM
1:54	[gesture: goes to board and records a one minute detention for student]	FMICOM
2:02	Let's not waste time on that.	FMICOO
3:03	[gesture: stares and moves closer to student]	FMICOM

³Non-literal; presumed intended as a warning.

3:07	OK-[SN] is going to spend some time with me.	FMICOM
3:10	You now owe me two minutes.	FMICOM
3:11	[gesture: writes two minute detention on board]	FMICOM
3:14	I don't like to be interrupted	FMICOM
3:16	Shhh...	FGDCOO
3:25	Cut!	FGICOM
3:25	[gesture: moves hand horizontally from side to side]	FGICOM
3:52	[gesture: long stare]	FMICOM
5:03	[SN], turn around please.	FFDCOM
5:10	Shhh...	FGDCOO
5:18	Move forward.	FMDCOM
5:19	[gesture: motions student to come closer]	FMDCOM
5:37	[gesture: points at student then points to location on board where detentions are recorded]	FMICOM
6:23	Shhh...	FGDCOO
12:32 ⁴	Hey-if you're here you'd better be working or back to your class.	FMICOM
13:40	[gesture: points to student]	FMICOM
15:00	[gesture: stares; snaps fingers]	FMICOM
15:46	Uhhh...	FMICOM
15:46	[gesture: makes rotating motion with finger]	FMICOM

⁴Class has now moved to computer lab

19:28	[SN]?	FMICOM
19:32	[gesture: finger to lips]	FMDCOO
19:55	Shhh...	FGDCOO
20:05	[SN]	FMICOM
20:05	[gesture: points to student then to door] ⁵	FMICOM
20:15	You can [unclear] or you can go out in the hallway. Make up your mind. I'll give you three minutes.	FMDCOM
21:22	[SN]-out in the hallway.	FMDCOM
21:22	[gesture: moves quickly to student and points for a long time towards the door]	FMDCOM
21:26	No why. You can either go out in the hallway or to the administration office. Make up your mind.	FMDCOM
21:36	If you don't go to the office, I'll get the administrator to come and get you. Now! I'm going to give you five seconds to be out in the hallway, or an administrator will come and get you.	FMDCOM
21:39	[gesture: points towards door and in direction of school office]	FMDCOM
21:58	Four seconds-one to go.	FMICOM

⁵Non-literal; presumed intended as a warning.

21:59	[gesture: stares and holds up four fingers]	FMICOM
22:05	[gesture: thrusts hand towards door]	FMDCOM
22:20	[gesture: quickly moves across classroom; points to student]	FMICOM
22:22	I'll have to call administration to come get you.	FMICOM
22:23	[gesture: Goes into office beside classroom where phone is]	FMICOM
22:30	Go out in the hallway.	FMDCOM
22:31	[gesture: points to door]	FMDCOM
22:47	[out of range: talks to student in hallway for 20 seconds]	FM n/c
23:34	[SN]?	FMICOM
23:36	[gesture: points to student]	FMICOM
23:36	[SN], why don't you leave? I don't want you in here.	FMICOM
23:45	I don't want you in here. It's a privilege to be in here-OK?	FMICOM
23:49	[gesture: points to door]	FMDCOM
25:59	[gesture: uses pencil to point to student]	FMICOM
27:40	[gesture: points to student]	FMICOM
27:55	[SN]	FMICOM
27:55	[gesture: points to student; waves finger]	FMICOM
28:00	Get off of it.	FMDCOM

28:50	[out of range: talking to student in hallway for 35 seconds]	FM n/c
29:30	Get a note from your teacher and leave-now! Or go to the office.	FMDCOM
29:37	Move over.	FMDCOM
29:38	[gesture: points to where she wants student in hallway to stand]	FMDCOM
32:06	[gesture: stares; uses pencil to point to door to hallway]	FMICOM
32:08	[SN]?	FMICOM
32:47	[gesture: holds two fingers up to student in hallway (who is watching through window in door)]	FMICOM
35:55	You don't have to be right here. You could be out in the hallway.	FMICOM
36:10	[gesture: points to hallway] ⁶	FMICOM
36:14	Make up your mind [SN].	FMICOM
36:24	Now you don't want me to call administration. You don't have to be here.	FMICOM
40:53	[gesture: stares; moves toward student]	FMICOM
41:02	[SN], keep it down please.	FMDCOO
41:12	[out of range]	FM n/c
44:32	[gesture: uses pencil to point at student]	FMICOM

⁶Non-literal; presumed intended as a warning.

44:42	[SN]	FMICOM
44:46	And make sure you pick up everything that's on the floor. ⁷	FMICOM
45:12	[gesture: points repeatedly to floor by student's feet]	FMICOM
47:10	Shhh...	FGDCOO
47:13	[SN], [SN]	FMICOM

⁷"And" refers to the unspoken half of the reprimand, i.e., "Stop doing that and make sure you pick up everything that's on the floor."

VITA

Surname: Birrell

Given Names: Sandra Helen

Place of Birth: Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Educational Institutions Attended:

University of Victoria 1993 to 1999

University of Alberta 1976 to 1981

Degrees Awarded:

B.Ed. University of Alberta 1981

Honours and Awards:

Publications:

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis:

Conflict in the Classroom: An Examination of Teacher
Management Strategies

Author



Sandra Helen Birrell

28 June, 1999