Generational predictors of styles of teachers' interaction

Pishchik V.I.^{1*}, Postnikova M.I.², Verzhbyok G.V.³, and Gavrilova A.V.⁴

¹ Don State Technical University, 344002 Rostov-on-Don, Russia

² Northern (Arctic) Federal University, 163002 Arkhangelsk, Russia

³ Psychology Minsk State Linguistic University, 220039 Minsk, Russia

⁴ Lyceum № 1, 346782 Azov, Russia

Abstract. The study of socio-psychological characteristics of intergenerational, pedagogical interaction of teachers from different generations is relevant. The empirical study involved university professors (482 people). The following techniques were used: the method of measuring the type of mentality (Pishchik); of cultural-values differential (Soldatov and others), the questionnaire of interpersonal relations by Rukavishnikov, the technique of "Diagnosis of interpersonal relations" by Leary, the technique of diagnostics of the communicative setting by Boyko, multi-factor personal questionnaire FPI. It is revealed that the dominant styles of intergenerational pedagogical interaction of teachers are indifferent, dialogic, manipulative, conformal. Teachers of the "Soviet" and "Transition" generations are more likely to have dominance in relations, only a small percentage of teachers – friendliness. In this group, the components of generational pedagogical interaction have a different structure: an indifferent and alterocentric style of communication with partners, there is a tendency to submission in relationships with people.

1 Introduction

According to Prensky M., the paradox of modern education is that "digital aborigines" are taught in schools by "digital immigrants" [1]. Mismatches in value structures, lifestyles, relationships, the way of the world lead to contradictions in the relations between representatives of different types of generations. In the educational sphere, this process is considered from different points [2, 3, 4, 5]. The aim of achieving a sense of kinship with students was defined as the main characteristic feature of the professional identity of a teacher [6, 7]. Spilt, Koomen, and Thijs [8] proposed a teacher-student relationship as a facilitator of teacher well-being. It was found out that poor behavior of students makes teachers feel rejected and prevents them from building trust with students [9, 10]. Teaching expectations from the perception of relations with students affect their relationship [11, 12].

* Corresponding author: vladaph@yandex.ru

Mental ideas of teachers about the relationship with students form their affective reactions to the behavior perceived as problematic [13]. Some researchers explain the problem of teaching people of different generations by the fact that in the development of educational programs the "cultural" component is not used, which causes a value gap between the participants of the pedagogical process [14]. Our position in relation to the generations can be characterized as the consideration of generations in terms of their mentalities [5]. The basis of classification is the historical type of mentality. At the same time, we understand mentality as a formation that aggregates value-semantic structures and socio-psychological characteristics.

We suggested that the severity of socio-psychological characteristics (values orientations, communicative settings, interpersonal relations, personal peculiarities) of groups of generations and styles of interaction may be conditioned in teachers depending on their belonging to different types of generations. To prove this hypothesis we conducted a study of university teachers belonging to different generations.

2 Materials and Methods

The empirical study involved university professors from Rostov-on-Don (482 people). The group of the "Soviet" generation teachers was formed by 164 people, of 1952-1963 years of birth, the average work experience in the field of education is 30 years. The group of teachers of the "Transition" generation consisted of the 178 respondents, born in 1964-1980 years, the average work experience is 20 years. The group of "Information" generation teachers consisted of 140 people, born in 1984-1994 years, with the average work experience of 8.5 years.

Initially it was necessary to determine the generational identification of the respondents. For this we used the methodical technique by N. L. Ivanova . The following techniques were used: the method of measuring the type of mentality (V. I. Pishchik); of cultural-values differential (by G. U. Soldatov and others), the questionnaire of interpersonal relations by A. Rukavishnikov, the technique of "Diagnosis of interpersonal relations" by T. Leary, the technique of diagnostics of the communicative setting by V. V. Boyko, multi-factor personal questionnaire FPI.

3 Results

Table 1 shows the average values of identification of teachers with generation type. As it can be seen from the results, it is mostly the age that determined identification with the generation. An exception was made by a group of teachers born in 1964-1968, who defined for themselves not only the identification with the "Transition", but also with the "Soviet" generation. In our opinion, this is due to the fact that these are representatives of generations born on the border of the generations.

Table 1. Generational identification of groups

Respondents' years of birth	Statistics	«Soviet» generation	«Transition» generation	«Information» generation
1952-1963	Average	7,85	3,23	2,20
	Standard deviation	1,41	1,87	1,59
	Dispersion	1,99	3,50	2,53
1964-1980	Average	4,78	5,13	3,83
	Standard	3,44	3,15	2,51

1984-1994	deviation			
	Dispersion	11,83	9,94	6,31
	Average	2,25	3,86	6,80
	Standard deviation	1,66	2,69	2,42
	Dispersion	2,76	7,23	5,85

Teachers aged between 56 and 67 years identify themselves with the "Soviet" generation ($t=56,128$, $p\leq0.001$, lower boundary of confidence interval 42,92, upper boundary 46,19). Teachers aged between 39 and 55 years identify themselves with the "Transitional" generation ($t=48,19$, $p\leq0.001$, lower boundary of confidence interval 36,58, upper boundary 39,81). However, it can be seen that the older teachers in the group of "Transition" generation, the more inclined they are to identify themselves with the "Soviet" generation. Teachers aged between 25 and 35 years identify themselves with the "Information" generation ($t=49,10$, $p\leq0.001$, lower boundary of confidence interval 32,42, upper boundary 35,61).

Having used multiple regression analysis, we were able to identify generational predictors of interaction between teachers belonging to different generations. It was found out that in the group of the "Soviet" generation the most prominent were three styles of interaction: dialogic, indifferent and conformal (Table 2). The largest number of predictors in the model of dialogical style of interaction, including: traditional mentality, control in communication, low irritability, friendliness, sociability, low inconsistency of interpersonal behavior, post-innovation mentality, does not express affect.

The following predictors are presented in the indifferent style of interaction between teachers of the "Soviet" generation: traditional mentality, negative personal experience of communication, less friendliness, neuroticism, less communicative setting. Such teachers behave independently, but are subordinated and expect negativity in the interaction. The predictors of the conformal style of interaction of teachers of the "Soviet" generation are the following: communicative setting, dominance, veiled cruelty to people. These predictors determine the rigidity in the relationship and open the desire of such a teacher to emphasize his superiority on front of the students and to assert themselves at the expense of the students.

Table 2. Generational predictors of interaction of teachers of the "Soviet" generation

Social-psychological characteristics of generation representatives	Interaction styles		
	Dialogic	Indifferent	Conformal
Predictors of the model	10	6	3
R-square	0,97	0,98	0,98
Traditional mentality	0,81**	0,05*	
Negative personal communication experience		1,04**	
Friendliness	0,52**	-0,28*	
Neuroticism	-0,23*	0,49**	
Communicative setting		-0,18**	0,14**
Ind. of volume of interactions in affect sphere		0,33**	
Dominance			0,30**
Veiled cruelty to people			0,07**
Control in	0,80**		

communication			
Irritability	-0,39**		
Sociability	0,55**		
Inconsistency of interpersonal behavior	-0,33*		
Post innovative mentality	0,28**		
Authoritarian	0,61*		
Expressed behavior in the sphere «affect»	-0,45*		

Symbols: ** – $p < ,001$, * – $p < ,01$

The group of teachers of the "Transition" generation is dominated by two styles of interaction: indifferent and manipulative. In Table. 3 the following generational predictors of the indifferent style are presented: transitional mentality, suspicious, not authoritarian, not sacrificial, dependent, not subordinate, friendly, but not sociable, rather introvert, not depressive, not altruistic, not aggressive, irritability, shyness, friendliness, not sociability, not domination. This group includes teachers who identify themselves not only with the "Transition", but also with the "Soviet" generation. Such a teacher is very closed, sometimes invisible, executive, but distanced from the student.

Manipulative interaction model includes the following predictors: being extravert, not depressed, friendly, subordinate, rather femininely, not aggressive, grunting, no sociability, well-founded negativism in judgments about people, transitional mentality. This is a pure type of teacher of the "Information" generation, who is more immersed in himself, in his information world and is not satisfied with many things, is petty in detail.

Table 3. Generational predictors of interaction of teachers of "Transition" generation

Social-psychological characteristics of generation representatives	Interaction styles	
	Indifferent	Manipulative
Number of predictors of the model	17	16
R- square	0,99	0,99
Suspicious	0,61**	
Extraversion	-0,37**	0,29**
Depression	-0,26**	-0,11**
Irritability	0,62**	
Friendliness	0,20**	0,11**
Altruistic	-0,267**	
Subordinate	-0,32**	2,04**
Dominance	0,14**	
Identification with the soviet generation	0,10**	
Masculinity	-0,05**	-0,11**
Shyness	0,11**	
Reactive aggressiveness	-0,12**	-0,66**
Emotional lability	-0,24**	-1,02**
Friendly	0,08**	
Sociability	-0,008**	-0,32**
Grunting in communication setting	0,003**	-0,29**
Dependent	0,001**	
Neuroticism	0,59**	
Authoritarian	-0,82**	
Aggressive	0,35**	
Egoistic	-0,37**	

Transitional mentality	0,02**	
Well-founded negativism in judgments about people	-0,08**	
Post innovative mentality	-0,03**	

Symbols: ** – $p < ,001$, * – $p < ,01$

The group of teachers of the "Information" generation is also dominated by two styles of interaction: indifferent and manipulative. Table 4 shows the following generational predictors of the indifferent style: innovative mentality, grunting (scolding), inconsistency in the relationships, controlling, not sacrificial, not very sociable, but maintains friendly relations. Such a teacher is not interested in the success of students, rather he is more focused on the transfer of information.

Table 4. Generational predictors of interaction of teachers of "Information" generation

Social-psychological characteristics of generation representatives	Interaction styles	
	Indifferent	Manipulative
Number of predictors of the model	6	5
R- square	0,98	0,76
Dialogic style		-0,44**
Conformal style		0,42**
Grunting	0,51**	-0,10*
Hiding unpleasant impression when face with uncommunicative qualities of people		0,14*
Innovative mentality	0,72*	0,36**
Inconsistency in interpersonal behaviour	0,56**	
Control	0,57**	
Identification with the soviet generation	-0,23*	
Alterocentric style	-0,46**	
Friendly	0,53**	-0,40**
Sociability	-0,008**	-0,32**

Symbols: ** – $p < ,001$, * – $p < ,01$

The model of manipulative style of teachers of the "Information" generation of interaction includes such predictors as innovative mentality, not dialogic, conformity, smiling, secrecy, not friendly, not communicative. The presented characteristics indicate that such a teacher cares more about himself, about his well-being, is distanced from students.

4 Conclusion

We define intergenerational pedagogical interaction as a special type of social interaction based on direct or indirect influence of generations representatives on each other as subjects of education, which creates conditions for the development of interpersonal relations in the educational space of the university. Specific socio-psychological characteristics of pedagogical interaction, the type of mentality and the degree of generational identification of generations groups increase the probability of manifestation of the dominant style of intergenerational pedagogical interaction. The dominant styles of intergenerational pedagogical interaction of teachers are: "Soviet" generation - indifferent, conformal, dialogical; "Transitional" - indifferent, manipulative; "Information" generation - indifferent, manipulative.

5 Discussion of results

Individual style of pedagogical communication is, in fact, the behavioral component of the setting on the student and finds its expression in interaction with him, includes desirable and acceptable ways of behavior in communication. In any case it is a probabilistic indicator. Consequently, the presented empirical data have their limitations, indicated by specific situational, cultural and generational contexts. We can not say that the most effective is a dialogical style, rather the ability to apply different pedagogical styles determines the effectiveness of the teacher and ensures his well-being. There are some points of view of researchers in the question about the usefulness of the construct – generation [15, 16]. Some researchers try to prove that it is impossible to determine the boundaries of the phenomenon – generation. We use the construct - generation in our works. Relationships within and between generations are in the center of attention. Generations are bearers of a certain type of mentality. The relationships form the mentality of generations, and historical framework transform and direct the vector of relations.

The article is written with the financial support of RFBR. Project № 18-013-00910 "Dynamics of generation values as a marker of transformation of social relations in the Russian society"

References

1. M. Prensky, MCB Un. Press. **9**, 5 (2001)
2. M.I. Postnikova, The world of science, culture and education. **2**, 78-82 (2010)
3. N. Howe, W. Strauss, Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069 (William Morrow & Company, New York, 1991)
4. B. Gentile, W.K. Campbell & J.M. Twenge, Generational cultures W., DC: APA (A PA, Washington, 2013)
5. V.I. Pishchik, The mentality of generations in fluid modernity (INFRA-M, Moscow, 2019)
6. P. Schutz, J. of E. P., **2(93)**, 299-308 (2001)
7. P.J. Sikes, L. Measor, & P. Woods, Berufslaufbahn und identitat im lehrerberuf (Teacher identity and teacher career) (Bohlau, Koln, 1991)
8. J.L. Spilt, H.M. Koomen, J.T. Thijs, & A. van der Leij, Attachment & Human Development, **14**, 305–318 (2012)
9. J.-E. Nurmi, & N. Kiuru, I. J. of Behavioral Development, **39**, 445–457 (2015)
10. R.M. Klassen, N.E. Perry, & A.C. Frenzel, J. of Educational Psychology, **104**, 150–165 (2012)
11. C. Anneke, M.P. Timmermans, C. Greetje van der Werf, C. M. Rubie-Davies, J. of School Psychology, **73**, 114-130 (2019)
12. H. Ding, C. Margaret Rubie-Davies, Learning and Individual Differences, **74**, A. 101751 (2019).
13. D. Evans, R. Butterworth, G. Urquhart Law, Teaching and Teacher Education, **82**, 55-68 (2019)
14. G.S. Karavaeva, Dialogic interaction of medical school teachers and students (2019) Retrieved from: <http://www.tsutmb.ru/publichnaya-lekcziya-e.i.-grigorevoj>
15. S. M. Campbell, J. M. Twenge, W. K. Campbell, Work, Aging and Retirement, **3(2)**, 130–139 (2017)
16. C. W. Rudolph, R.S. Rauvola, H. Zacher, The Leadership Quarterly, **1(29)**, 44-57 (2018)