



Pedagogical Contexts 2020, No. 1(14)
www.kontekstypedagogiczne.pl
ISSN 2300-6471
pp. 27–46
<https://doi.org/10.19265/kp.2020.1.14.241>



ORIGINAL PAPER

Received: 12.11.2019
Accepted: 20.12.2019



Eugenia Rostańska

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3118-7766>
WSB University in Dąbrowa Górnicza
erostanska@wsb.edu.pl

LINGUISTIC REPRESENTATIONS OF RELATIONSHIP EXPERIENCE IN CHILD-TEACHER COMMUNICATION

JĘZYKOWE REPREZENTACJE DOŚWIADCZANIA RELACJI W KOMUNIKACJI DZIECKA I NAUCZYCIELA

Keywords:

communication,
child, teacher, rela-
tionship, relationship
asymmetry, relation-
ship statements

Słowa kluczowe:

komunikacja, dziecko,
nauczyciel, relacja,
asymetria relacji, wy-
powiedzi relacyjne

Summary: Child-teacher communication in educational situations is a special form of communication based on the dyadic structure and the relationships of the participants. Its specificity is expressed in various types of statements demonstrating the dyadism of the educational situation and the asymmetry of the relationship. These statements include ones accepting the child's independence, expressing readiness to help, confirming the child's dependence, confirming the teacher's independence and ones of the children expressing themselves. Their occurrence determines the quality of education. Recognition and creation of an appropriate relationship with the student by building a proper relationship with them is a necessary skill of the teacher.

Streszczenie: Porozumiewanie się dziecka i nauczyciela w sytuacjach edukacyjnych stanowi szczególną formę komunikacji, opartą na diadycznej strukturze i relacjach osób w nim uczestniczących. Jej specyfika wyrażana jest w różnych typach wypowiedzi, demonstrujących diadyczność sytuacji edukacyjnej i asymetrię relacji. Należą do nich wypowiedzi akceptujące



samodzielność dziecka, stanowiące o gotowości do pomocy, wypowiedzi potwierdzające zależność dziecka, wypowiedzi potwierdzające niezależność nauczyciela i wypowiedzi dziecka eksponujące siebie. Ich występowanie stanowi o jakości edukacji, a rozpoznawanie i tworzenie przez właściwe zastosowanie odpowiedniej relacji z uczniem jest niezbędną umiejętnością nauczyciela.

Introduction

The relationship between education and communication manifest in student-teacher interaction is the subject of various pedagogical analyses and its importance is confirmed by multiple studies conducted by linguists, psychologists and educators. They expressly emphasize the specificity of the situation of communication between an adult and a child, as well as the teacher-student relations built in this way (Zalewska-Bujak, 2017, p. 60). The structure and special roles of interlocutors are indicated as significant components of communication. The purpose and result of communication are also important because the quality of the child-teacher connection is one of the basic conditions for effective education (Adamek, 2014, p. 21).

The relationship between communication and learning/teaching is the subject of much research into the education process. It is distinguished by the purpose of the analyses defining the importance of the research and the diversity of perspectives: psycholinguistics, text linguistics, dialogue structures, language forms and behavior, educational discourse, aspects of interpersonal relations and activity in various environments (see Bochno, 2004; Van Dijk, 2001; Harwas-Napierała, 2006; Kojs, 2014; Oelszlaeger-Kosturek, 2018; Ostrowska, 2000; Retter, 2005; Rostańska, 2010; and others). Regardless of the diversity, however, it shares the research space which is the communication situation between a child and a teacher.

Communication with children in elementary school is a specific area of research. This specificity is determined by the subject, which is the child and their development, as well as the fact that what is important in the relationship between education and communication in early school education is contained in the child's and teacher's speech. Using a variety of spoken language, the

elementary schoolteacher builds relationships, explains, directs, assesses and stimulates the child's cognitive activity. In speaking – often using colloquial speech with its characteristic features, like the occurrence of anacoluthons, retardation phrases, inclusions, as well as with non-verbal features of the semantics of speech – the child also communicates their experiences, doubts, emotions or information. Both the teacher and the child build and demonstrate the image of their world using this form of language (Retter, 2005), which occurs interpersonally, in direct communication (Frydrychowicz, 2005). Features characteristic of this type of communication include the spontaneity and situationality of speaking, asymmetry of the relationship resulting from the child-teacher role system, ambiguity of the language tool, as well as children's experience of using language. This experience consists of both sensations and attempts to use language in communication. Hence the fields of analysis of the communication between a child and a teacher in the context of interpersonal relations focus on the **dyadic structure** and **role asymmetry** (Eggin & Martin, 2001, pp. 153, 180).

Dyadic structure and accounts of participants in educational communication

The dyadic structure is made up of persons in the communication dyad: a child and a teacher as the senders and recipients of messages and relational statements. Elements that model communication in the dyad are the child's situation in contact with an adult, the characteristics of this contact and previous experience. For the adult, the basic elements building communication situations are his or her role as a teacher and the features of contact with the student built through verbal interactions, a common field of attention, behaviors and statements that open, build, maintain and close communication (Frydrychowicz, 2005, pp. 97–98).

In the child-teacher dyad, participants' statements demonstrate their mutual relations and communication status. This happens in a situation of understanding (acceptance of an idea, explanation of view, consideration of thoughts, paraphrasing thoughts, developing thoughts, agreement), judgment (positive assessment, negative assessment, opposition, other suggestions, suggesting assessment), showing oneself (limited communication, dialogue with an "arbitrator"), formal and indirect assessment, as well as assessment as an "act of care" as a factor disrupting communication between a child and a teacher (Ostrowska, 2000).

In the situation of child-teacher communication, the features of role asymmetry expressed in their statements are also important. For the teacher, it is self-focus, creating unjustified assumptions about the child's ability to understand their signals and statements, and ignoring the attitudes and experiences of the child. For both the child and the teacher, role asymmetry can be expressed when the message reaches the recipient but the intentions are not seen or their meaning is misunderstood. It may also happen that the message noticed by the interlocutor is irrelevant to them and a wrong interpretation or answer is not in line with the sender's intention. The recipient then recognizes in the message intentions that were not expressed by the sender. The asymmetry of the child and teacher roles significantly affects their experience of relationships, which is manifest in their statements in educational situations. The significance of dyadism in the situation of teacher-child communication is grounded in Martin Buber's understanding of a genuine meeting. It can be defined as a specific contact in which entities, i.e., I-Thou, shape the course of the meeting through their own individuality (see Rostańska, 2010, p. 160).

Outline of the concept of research on visible relations between a child and a teacher in educational communication

Indications of the importance and complex nature of educational communication in the context of the child-teacher dyad imply the need to determine specific features of the relationship created by the educational asymmetry of the roles of the adult/teacher and child. Hence, an important question for early school pedagogy concerns the relationship between a teacher and a child as built in direct communication, as well as its visible signs. The answer to this question requires an analysis of the child's experience of relationships in interactions and acts of communication in school situations. Their visible sign is the statements of the communication participants expressed by language representations of relational behavior. An analysis of statements in communication dialogue is focused on the search for significant language features and their description, which is the basis for creating a picture of the child-teacher relationship. In studies on education, this corresponds to a qualitative research approach that seeks to capture experiences in their natural context, occurring naturally, as a clearly identified phenomenon embedded in this context (Flick, 2012, p. 14; Gibbs, 2015, p. 27). Therefore, an analysis of collected data requires reduction and representation in order to draw conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 2000, p. 11).

The research and analyses carried out for the sake of the following study were intended to determine how language relations between the child and the teacher are expressed. Therefore, the examined statements met the specific requirement for this relationship, namely, the principle of dyadism (i.e., they were uttered between two participants only – a child and a teacher – communicating in a conversation situation). What is more, the situation of these relations could not be declarative or organized, but natural and spontaneous. Only then do the statements become visible linguistic signs of the relationship. This constituted the organizational difficulty of the study.

The research material, collected since 2010, contains over one and a half thousand transcribed recordings of school situations. Their goal had been the methodological documentation of the classes conducted rather than reporting their course. This enabled the registration of the participants' natural behaviors in typical, random situations without a pre-determined role system and set ways of expressing themselves (such as determining who asks questions and who answers them). These recordings were made in schools during student internships in random school situations. Direct communication of primary school teachers with children – girls or boys ages 7–9 – has been registered. From the collected material, situations have been selected that corresponded to the research assumptions, namely, the dyadism of the teacher-child contact and direct communication. For the analysis of language phenomena in communication, the frequency of their occurrence has not been significant but – due to the potential of the language – their appearance in the context of the quality of teacher-child communication in early school education has been considered highly significant.

In order to exemplify the research, and to conform to the publication recommendations, examples of relational statements recorded at school were compiled during lessons, during breaks, before lessons and in spontaneous situations, during conversations of children from classes 1–3 with their teacher, without first specifying their topic or course. The collected linguistic material was subjected to transcription, which is the basis for selecting verbal representations of relational statements in teacher-child contact, as experienced individually. The collected and transcribed material on the basis of data aggregation was then reduced (Rubacha, 2008, p. 260), and the relational statements were differentiated, the demonstration of which is presented in exemplifying situations in which the statement of a child or teacher is a visible sign of their relationship.

Experiencing a child-teacher relationship. Representations of statements in exemplifying situations

Relations between a child and a teacher have their linguistic representation in communication of relational statements (Nęcki, 2000, pp. 59–60). Relational statements are a visible sign of relationships. Their language representations are specific types of utterances which are

- connected with planning the course of communication;
- connected with creating the course of communication;
- related to the regulation of adult-child relationships;
- developing relationships;
- developing communication;
- facilitating contact;
- accepting the independence of the child;
- not accepting the child's independence;
- highlighting dependence;
- demanding involvement;
- emphasizing mutual commitment.

Language representations have their dimension both in the communication itself and in the ways its participants treat each other. An illustration of this are the statements regarding the child's independence, involvement in communication situations and those determining the child's communication dependence on the teacher.

Language representations are also a set of indicators confirming and describing the functioning of the category of child-teacher relations in the space of experiencing communication.¹ The communication relationship is made up of the people who are participants of the communication. Their perception of each other is expressed in language statements and is confirmed by commitment and acceptance. Therefore, thematic narratives and children's emotions are accompanied by statements planning and expanding communication, as well as emphasizing mutual commitment (Rostańska, 2019, p. 351).

Mutual involvement is strengthened by a signal of optimism that the teacher sends to the child:

¹ A detailed description of the category of relational statements is included in the publication of E. Rostańska (2010).

Teacher: Have you finally patched things up?

Child: Only at the end of the break.

Teacher: So, everything's all right now, right? That's great, sit down ...

[situation 1]

There are also statements whose content is to emphasize the mutual involvement of the child and the teacher in the subject.

T: In my opinion, it will be very interesting because we have thought it over together.

C: Yes. But you will help me.

T: With great pleasure ... [sit. 2]

The teacher is particularly active in statements **demanding involvement**. This is expressed by a sequence of several questions asked one after another:

T: And who had such a monkey? Which girl?

C: I don't know.

T: You don't know which girl like you had such a monkey? She walked with her. Who was it?

C: [after a moment of silence] Pipi? [sit. 3]

or sayings such as "and say ...," "tell me about it," "and what else ...," "and look," "and what will you do when ...";

T: And tell me what you enjoyed in class today the most?

C: I liked ... art, shop.

T: Why?

C: Because we made nice butterflies, I could help the teacher a lot. [sit. 4]

In the case of statements demanding involvement, the teacher's statement constitutes the whole relationship, creating its course:

T: Then listen to me, is there anything else you want to say to the headmistress?

C: I have nothing more to say.

T: And you don't want to say hello to her?

C: I want to, hello headmistress. [sit. 5]

Relational statements are also those that demonstrate the teacher's attitude towards the independence of the child. Its acceptance is not very expressive and usually comes down to agreeing to the child's proposed line of action or accepting the child's attitude, pending approval of the teacher's behavior:

T: Who won?

C: My colleague.

T: And you took which place?

C: Third.

T: Third? It is also very good. Bravo! Were there any rewards? [sit. 6]

Other statements signaling the acceptance of the child's independence include:

T: You can do it ...

C: But ... I don't know.

T: You will do it when you have to ... [sit. 7]

The teacher's lack of acceptance of the child's independence is also represented in specific statements with a clearly controlling character

T: Show me how you did it ... [sit. 8]

T: You haven't done too well lately. [sit. 9]

or managing the child's activities:

T: If we do what we have to do, you will get some paper and crayons.

T: Leave it, you will do it later ... leave it, I will take it out later ... leave it, because you will get dirty ... [sit. 10]

A special situation in the absence of acceptance of the child's independence is created by those of the teacher's statements that emphasize the child's dependence.

T: Leave it [...], I will get it out later, leave it because you will get dirty, come to me, Adam!

C: [lingering] You can't draw with this chalk.

T: You can, but you don't know how to do it yet. [sit. 11]

The child's dependence on the teacher can also be demonstrated less politely:

T: Well, just listen ... [sit. 12]

Dramatized by the emphasis put on specific words, the teacher's statements create the impression of clear relationship control, with an indication of dependence in actions and in understanding of their purpose. Among the statements made by the child and teacher in educational situations, there are also ones that **facilitate contact** and ones **related to the course of contact**.

Statements that facilitate contact are encouragement for the children to establish interaction and develop it. These include praise:

T: That's wonderful, you did great. [sit. 13]

Encouragement can also have the form of repetitions or unfinished forms, waiting for the child to join the conversation:

T: Wojtek from grade ...

C: One.

T: Do you remember the last meeting? We have determined that Wojtek will improve his ...

C: Behavior. [sit. 14]

It also happens that the attempts to develop the relationship with the child by the teacher do not produce the expected result:

T: What time do you start your lesson?

C: ...

T: Do you go to class with Mateusz?

C: [confirms, nodding]

T: Do you sit together?

C: [shakes his head]

T: Would you like to come here regularly?

C: [shrugs]. [sit. 15]

Statements related to planning the course of communication are the domain of the teacher. They appear along with the tasks related to the child's learning:

T: Tell me what function ... technical devices in your home ... no ... enumerate them first. [sit. 16]

These statements often begin with the command "tell me" or "let's talk:"

T: Tell me – I heard you recently had your birthday? Which one already ...?

C: Yyy ... seventh ... [sit. 17]

T: Well, so let's talk about seasons [sit. 18]

The form "let's talk" indicates that the conversation planned by the teacher is to be only an exchange of statements, with a clear indication of who decides about its course.

“Tell me” and “say” are also forms of initiating communication that give a specific course to children’s statements. Sometimes the child does not agree to such a form and opposes it:

T: Look at me and tell me if you did something wrong that you should apologize for. Adrian, do you want to talk about it?

C: No.

T: Will you talk to your tutor about this?

C: [silent]. [sit. 19]

After the child expresses the willingness to talk, the teacher demands a specification of the subject of the conversation. Here, the child encounters a difficulty, presents the topic, but the conversation is in fact about something else.

C: I wanted to talk to you.

T: What would you like to talk to me about?

C: Under the table is our secret hideout.

T: And what do you do in this hideout?

C: Well, we hide, we leave, we hide, we leave. [sit. 20]

Communication-building sentences that the teacher directs towards the child contain the word “else” or “something” as an indication of the adult’s waiting for the child’s statement to develop:

T: And what else did you do? [sit. 21]

T: Kajtuś, tell me something about this girl. [sit. 22]

T: And what else did you do in Tunisia during the holidays? [sit. 23]

However, “else” is not effective in developing the relationship:

T: What else did you find out that you could tell me about your colleagues?

C: [silent]. [sit. 24]

The child’s silence can have different meanings: lack of involvement in the relationship, embarrassment or lack of acceptance of the adult. It may also be an indication of relationship asymmetry. Although the child’s semantics of silence is not the subject of research in educational communication, its occurrence may have a specific meaning in communicating with adults.

Experience of asymmetry of child-teacher relations in language representations. Representations of statements in exemplifying situations

The asymmetry of the relationship experienced by the child and the teacher results from the sheer difference in their age, their different roles, their different circumstances and experiences, their perceptions of each other and their specific intentions, goals and motivations to engage in conversation. The basic feature of asymmetry is a different view of self, childhood and adulthood, as well as the different roles of the learner and teacher (Rostańska, 2016, pp. 38–39). Among the statements that are visible signs of the relationship asymmetry, the following were selected:

- expressing readiness to help communication;
- confirming the orderliness of the course of communication;
- confirming the child's dependence;
- confirming the teacher's independence;
- the child's statements through which they express themselves;
- the child's statements expressing their position in the world.

A special case of demonstrating the asymmetry of the child-teacher relationship in an educational situation is seen in statements expressing **readiness to help**. The teacher understands their help as something natural, stemming from their professional role. Meanwhile, the statements emphasize the child's immaturity and dependence on the teacher.

T: I will give you some advice – maybe you shouldn't worry so much, don't cry, just have a lot of patience. [sit. 25]

or suggesting assessment and the suitability of the topic for the child:

T: When the questions are unclear ... I will help you. [sit. 26]

T: Actually ... listen, it would be easier together ... I will tell you riddles, and you try to guess ... [the teacher encourages the child, offers help, then asks non-riddle questions]

T: How do we know it is spring? [sit. 27]

Statements signaling the teacher's readiness to help are very characteristic:

T: What else can you say? [sit. 28]

or:

T: And I'm curious what you will say. [sit. 29]

There are also indications of the teacher's participation in an activity:

T: Maybe it will be easier to count the apples when you take them out of the basket and arrange them? We'll do it together ... okay? [Sit. 30]

T: Please, Kinga, since you have already joined me, sit down and tell me what's new with you this week or this day, because we haven't talked for long enough. [sit. 31]

The teacher's help also imposes the topic of communication. This is not usually what the child wants:

C: Well, I like the story. This most beautiful story ...

T: A story? ... What do you mean by a story?

C: [silent]. [sit. 32]

In situations presented by children, the teacher, by means of offering help, in fact suggests a ready solution, not taking into account the child's opinion:

T: Well, I will help you – how to become a friend of someone, for example, Paweł is in trouble with learning – what then? ... [sit. 33]

T: Can you count?

C: No.

T: So, we will do it together and then you will color ... okay?

C: Okay. [sit. 34]

The teacher's statements about their readiness to help in conversation, confirming the asymmetry of the relationship, can be defined in terms of the **situation of child assessment**, defense, and a trap set by the adult to achieve a specific goal:

T: Was it difficult, Grześ, or easy?

C: I know how to do it now.

T: You have learned it, it was easy for you ... yes?

C: [silent]. [sit. 35]

A question that could signal readiness to help was, in fact, used to assess the child: the adult suggested that Grześ would not be able to do more difficult

tasks. The child's line of defense comes down to a lack of acceptance expressed in silence, feeling trapped:

T: David, tell me, in your opinion, what should the ideal teacher you would like to have be like? What features should they have?

C: They should be good.

T: Good and what else?

C: [silent].

T: Only good? What does it mean that they should be good?

C: [silent]

T: "Good," does it mean that they should tell everyone that everything is great, even if they did it wrong?

C: Yes. [sit. 36]

Sometimes the child's statements express a clear **opposition**:

T: Do you talk to your friends about what you will take to the school trip, what you will be doing there?

C: Not yet.

T: And can you you imagine the train ride?

C: Terrible.

T: Why terrible? I thought you like train rides.

C: But lying down, not sitting.

T: And how many of you will be there in the compartment?

C: I don't know.

T: Who would you like to be in the compartment with, the girls?

C: No way!

T: Why not, the girls are calmer, they will sleep!

C: I prefer not!

T: Why not? And how will the food be on the trip?

C: Terrible for sure.

T: Why terrible? [...]. sit. 37]

A teacher's help will not bring the expected result in the face of the child's reluctant and categorical attitude. A separate group includes those statements that relate to the child's dependence and the adult's independence. They are associated with various other statements occurring in situations of readiness to help or interact. A confirmation of their occurrence is seen in such forms as "And do you know ...", "Today we will talk ...", "Well, what are you doing now ...", "Can a child ...".

They also include **judgment about a child**:

T: Oh, so he was walking with his friends. And what happened ...? Which one of you started it?

C: Well, they bothered me for no reason ...

T: But you must have somehow got into Patryk's black books. [sit. 38]

or statements controlling their activities:

T: Ania, when you come home, ask your mother to help you wash and give you clean clothes, and now wash your hands and mouth ...

C: What for ...? [sit. 39]

Demonstrating **teacher independence** during communication with the child is also a component of other situations, such as willingness to help or interact. It is revealed in statements such as:

T: I asked you here... [sit. 40]

T: Tell me ... [sit. 41]

T: Can you tell me ... [sit. 42]

T: How will you answer this question ... [sit. 43]

T: There are questions that you need to answer. [sit. 44]

The pronoun confirmation of one's independence is specific to the adult. It also takes the form of full expression:

T: Oh, and if you wanted to come closer and touch them ... could you touch them ...?

C: [silent].

T: You don't know?! I will tell you ... [sit. 45]

Demonstrating the teacher's independence in conversation with a child sometimes takes the form of a straightforward declaration:

T: You don't have to know everything about teachers. Only as much as necessary or as much as you can notice ... [sit. 46]

Representation of the category "**children expressing themselves**" varies widely: from stating who one is to defining their own beliefs and immediate environment. Expressing yourself as a person is expressing yourself as a child:

C: But it's good that she has already assigned me to the sopranos, not to the altos, because I have a friend in the sopranos, but on the other hand, it would be better to be with the altos, because I am scared of Anka from the sopranos.

T: And what does she do to you that you are so afraid of her?

C: No, she doesn't do anything, it's just that she is 19 years old. [sit. 47]

These are often statements thrown into the conversation:

C: I can draw notes. [sit. 48]

C: See how talented I am? [sit. 49]

C: Am I very, very cheerful? [sit. 50]

Children express themselves through the skills they brag about, not only when they show them, but also by saying that they like them:

T: Have you read all of them yet?

C: No, but I like to look at illustrations and photos. Then I read what interests me the most. [sit. 51]

T: And what do your parents say about all this?

C: They are happy about my successes ... especially at school ... Because now school is the most important for me, and everything else is my hobby ... it does not affect school grades. [sit. 52]

The children demonstrate not only their successes but also themselves as firm and aware of their own tasks. Sometimes, however, it is different:

C: I like slow jogging and pushups ...

T: These are rather hard exercises.

C: Yes, but others do not suit me.

T: Why is that?

C: I don't know, I just don't know. [sit. 53]

The child also demonstrates his or her resourcefulness, shows him or herself as an organized person:

T: If you are hungry, what do you do?

C: When I'm hungry, I make French fries or sandwiches. [sit. 54]

T: Can you swim, or do you just play in the water?

C: I can't swim? I can swim.

T: Well, so you will definitely get an A from PE, right?

C: Well, I recently got an A for a roll, because I did it in the air, not on my head ... [sit. 55]

The child's reaction changes the planned topic of the conversation. The child demonstrates him or herself in the content through which the teacher

tries to confirm the child's image. Sometimes it is a very specific response: the child does not shy away from opposing the teacher's attempts to impose their own perspective:

T: And she used bad words, right? And you think you're okay? Well, how is it, Andrzej?

C: Yes and no.

T: Yes and no? So why no?

C: But what's the point? [sit. 56]

T: Wojtek, please come to me.

C: Why should I? [sit. 57]

The child also objects when the teacher, through their inquisitiveness, creates a relationship in which the child feels unfavorable towards themselves:

T: Which one would you like?

C: This one.

T: Okay, read the instructions.

C: I'm reading. [reads]. Choose vowels. What is this?

T: "From".

C: [...] from words and select ...

T: No...

C: List them ...

T: Thank you.

C: I will not read this anymore! [sit. 58]

Teachers also express themselves during their conversations with children. Their statements representing this category can be divided into two groups:

- pointing to the child as a more efficient person due to their age;
- demonstrating the role and skills of an adult assigned to them.

This is how a certain image is created – an adult is the one who, if they only wanted, could do everything a child can do.

T: You know I can't. I have never tried roller skating. [sit. 59]

T: I walk to work quickly, but I can't run as fast as you do. [sit. 60]

Expressions in which teachers reveal they can do something better than a child are common:

T: Leave it! I'll take it out later ... [sit. 61]

T: Look into the text quickly, because I know it and I know what kind of animal is expecting a baby, like you put it nicely. [sit. 62]

They also present themselves as role models:

T: Well, you know when I was your age, and even younger, I already knew it... [sit. 63]

There are also assessment statements based on the teacher's evaluation of the child:

T: Anyway, I got very angry when I found out what you were doing during the teacher's absence. [sit. 64]

T: Is cheating nice? I always told you not to cheat. [sit. 65]

The phrase "I told you" used by the teacher is important. It refers the truth to the course of speaking, not to the subject of the conversation, and thus reduces its meaning.

Conclusion

Relations in child-teacher communication are particularly visible in the statements of its participants. Their exemplifications from 64 selected school situations in classes 1–3 confirm that the teacher is particularly active in statements demanding the child's involvement, in ones expressing themselves as an adult and ones emphasizing the child's dependence. This is characteristic of an educational communication situation in which statements relate to the visibility of oneself, especially the teacher, and form a relationship with a particular indication of the superiority and subordination of its participants, thus constituting the basis for authoritarianism in communication.

Childhood experience of relationship asymmetry occurs even when the teacher declares help in cooperation, pointing to themselves as a guarantor of the child's proper, effective or correct action. This is confirmed by representations of statements about the desire to help the child, characteristic of contacts with a child relying on the colloquial language of communication, and in positive situational perception. In the educational aspect, it can imperceptibly be the basis for the authoritarian situation of the teacher in communicating with the child, expressed by passing knowledge, opinions and instructions, showing dissatisfaction, criticizing, emphasizing their own opinion or emphasizing power, as well as justifying the child's passivity by the zeal of an adult.

In a different relationship, one of cooperation in communication, one can see the acceptance of views and opinions, rewarding, encouraging, developing ideas, asking questions for the sake of independent decision-making and enabling the child to ask questions (cf. Oelszlaeger-Kosturek, 2018, pp. 48–51). Teachers' statements with a clearly controlling character stand out as significant. In turn, the statements of teachers who directly allow the child's independence are insignificant.

The analysis of the representation of statements can be an encouragement to understand the meaning of the child-adult/teacher relationship in early-school educational communication. This relationship arises not from the didactic situation in which the participants perform specific functions assigned to them, depending on the tasks they perform, but from the daily contact between the child and the adult, the student and the teacher, whose experience in the school situation determines the quality of communication of its participants.

The importance of relationality in teachers' statements requires special training in communication skills in educational situations in which the child is a participant. They can be created through the use of spoken language, direct contact and the asymmetry of communication roles played by the child and the teacher, or avoiding statements that create difficulty for the child and unwanted relationships with the teacher. This is confirmed by the statement that education is organized and durable communication aimed at learning (Kojis, 2014). The quality of communication can, therefore, determine the quality of education. The ability to recognize linguistic signs of relativity in communication with a child and their use to improve the quality of education seems to be necessary in the teaching process.

References

- Adamek, I. (2014). Jakość edukacji dziecka/ucznia – nauczyciele jako przewodnicy w uczeniu się [Quality of Child/Student Education – Teachers as Learning Guides]. In: I. Adamek & B. Olszewska (eds.), *Pomiędzy dwoma edukacjami. Nauczyciel wczesnej edukacji dziecka wobec zmian* [Between Two Educations. Early School Education Teacher in the Face of Change] (pp. 15–26). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Łodzi.
- Bochno, E. (2004). *Rozmowa jako metoda oddziaływania wychowawczego* [Conversation as a Method of Educational Influence]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

- Eggs, S. & Martin, J.R. (2001). Gatunki i rejestry dyskursu [Genres and Registers of Discourse]. In: T.A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Dyskurs jako struktura i proces* [*Discourse as Structure and Process*], transl. T. Dobrzyńska & G. Grochowski (pp. 153–182). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Flick, U. (2012). *Projektowanie badania jakościowego* [*Designing Qualitative Research*], transl. P. Tomanek. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Frydrychowicz, S. (2005). Sposoby i wymiary komunikowania interpersonalnego a rozwój człowieka [Ways and Dimensions of Interpersonal Communication and Human Development]. *Psychologia Rozwojowa*, 10(3), 93–100.
- Gibbs, G. (2015). *Analizowanie danych jakościowych* [*Analyzing Qualitative Data*]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Harwas-Napierała, B. (2006). *Komunikacja interpersonalna w rodzinie* [*Interpersonal Family Communication*]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Kojs, W. (2014). O strukturze i funkcjach rozmowy w procesach kształcenia [On the Structure and Functions of Conversation in Educational Processes]. In: A. Karpińska & N. Zinzuk (eds.), *Dydaktyczna refleksja o edukacyjnych priorytetach* [*Didactic Reflection on Educational Priorities*] (pp. 179–200). Warszawa: Żak.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (2000). *Analiza danych jakościowych* [*Qualitative Data Analysis*], transl. S. Zabielski. Białystok: Trans Humana.
- Nęcki, Z. (2000). *Komunikacja międzyludzka* [*Interpersonal Communication*]. Kraków–Kluczbork: Antykwa.
- Oelszlaeger-Kosturek, B. (2018). *Nauczyciel i uczeń. Teoria i praktyka odbioru oraz transmisji informacji w edukacji wczesnoszkolnej* [*Teacher and Student. Theory and Practice of Receiving and Transmitting Information in Early School Education*]. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Ostrowska, U. (2000). *Dialog w pedagogicznym badaniu jakościowym* [*Dialogue in a Qualitative Pedagogical Study*]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Retter, H. (2005). *Komunikacja codzienna w pedagogice* [*Everyday Communication in Pedagogy*]. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Rostańska, E. (2010). *Dziecko i dorosły w rozmowie* [*A Child and an Adult in Conversation*]. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Rostańska, E. (2016). Komunikacyjne relacje między dzieckiem i nauczycielem edukacji wczesnoszkolnej [Communication Relations Between a Child and an Early School Education Teacher]. In: K. Kraszewski & I. Paśko (eds.), *Aktywność poznawcza i działaniowa dzieci w badaniach pedagogicznych* [*Cognitive and Operational Activity of Children in Pedagogical Research*] (pp. 37–44). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Rostańska, E. (2018). Trudna komunikacja – trudna edukacja [Difficult Communication – Difficult Education]. *Konteksty Pedagogiczne*, 1(10), 37–48.

- Rostańska, E. (2019). Trudna komunikacja. Porozumiewanie się dziecka i dorosłego w rodzinie i szkole [Difficult Communication. Child-Adult Communication in Family and School]. In: M. Cywińska (ed.), *Edukacyjne przestrzenie sytuacji trudnych dzieci* [*Educational Situational Spaces of Difficult Children*] (pp. 349–369). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Rubacha, K. (2008). *Metodologia badań nad edukacją* [*Methodology of Educational Research*]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Badania nad dyskursem [Discourse Analysis]. In: T.A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Dyskurs jako struktura i proces* [*Discourse as Structure and Process*], transl. T. Dobrzyńska & G. Grochowski (pp. 9–45). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Zalewska-Bujak, M. (2017). Obraz szkolnych relacji komunikacyjnych nauczyciela z uczniami [An Image of Teacher-Student Communication Relations]. *Konteksty Pedagogiczne*, 2(9), 59–76.