Interpersonal relationships: Cognitive appraisals, Emotions and Hope

Georgia Stephanou[*]
University of Western Macedonia, GREECE

Kyriaki Athanasiadou
Hellenic Open University, GREECE

Abstract: This study examined teachers' attributions and emotions for their subjectively perceived interpersonal relationships with their students as positive or negative, and whether hope (pathways thinking, agency thinking) influences the perceived positive or negative interpersonal relationships, the subsequent attributions and emotions, and the impact of attributions on emotions. Fifty teachers, of both genders, completed the questionnaire for each of their five students who were randomly selected from their teaching classes. The results revealed that the positive interpersonal relationships were predominately attributed to stable, personally controllable and self-student controllable factors, whereas the negative interpersonal relationships were primarily attributed to external, external controllable, unstable, and self-student controllable factors. Also, teachers reported positive emotions of high intensity (sympathy, cheerfulness, exciting, love, not anger, calmness) for the positive relationships, and negative emotions of moderate intensity (no enthusiasm, shame, anxiety, no excitement) for the negative relationships. Yet, the high hope teachers made adaptive attributional and emotional appraisals for the positive and, mainly, negative interpersonal relationships. Agency thinking, as compared to pathway thinking, was a better and worse formulator of the appraisals in negative and positive interpersonal relationships, respectively. Hope, additionally, had direct effect on the emotions, beyond that afforded by attributions, particularly in negative interpersonal relationships.

Keywords: *Interpersonal relationship, attributions, emotions, hope, cognitive appraisals.*

Introduction

Interpersonal relationships have been widely considered as a central source of happiness and well-being, and as a buffer against stress (Argyle, 2001; Carr, 2005; Holder & Coleman, 2009; Saphire-Bernstein & Taylor, 2013; Schoebi & Randall, 2015; Stephanou, 2012). This prediction is stronger for the quality of relationships than for objective features of relationships, such as number of friends or length of time being partners (Lucas & Dyrenforth, 2006; Lucas et al., 2008; Saphire-Bernstein & Taylor, 2013).

In education, the quality of the interpersonal relationships, such as peer relations in classroom, teachers and parents, school leaders and teachers and teacher and students, are crucial for the developments of teachers and students (Pennings et al., 2018; Stephanou, 2014; Stephanou & Doulkeridou, 2020; Wubbels et al., 2006). However, although the importance of the interpersonal relationships in education has been recognized a long time ago, from a wide variety of perspectives, little attention has devoted to the parameters and mechanisms that formulate relationships and make them important for happiness and adaptive education development (Maulana et al., 2014; Wubbels et al., 2012; Martin & Collie, 2019; Taylor, 2010). Also, there is far more literature devoted to studying the association of the teacher-student relationship with student outcomes than to association of these relationships with teacher outcomes (Friedman, 2000; Kyriacou, 2001; Pennings et al., 2018; Veldman et al., 2013). The past main research interest is how the teacher-student interpersonal relationships could contribute in understanding student outcomes and achievement motivation (Martin, 2014; Roorda et al., 2011). Clearly, the available literature evident that adaptive interpersonal relationships with the teacher function against stress and risk, and it is a beneficial factor for students' motivation, engagement for school achievement, learning and a rich variety of relevant factors to academic outcomes, such as healthy social, cognitive and emotional functioning, self-esteem and self-worth (Davis, 2003; den Brok et al., 2004; Martin & Dowson, 2009; Maulana et al., 2014; Opdenakker et al., 2012; Pianta, 2006; Pianta et al., 2012; Stephanou, 2007, 2014; Zandvliet et al., 2014).

[*] **Corresponding author:**
Georgia Stephanou, University of Western Macedonia, Department of Early Childhood Education, Greece. ✉ gstephanou@uowm.gr

The teacher-student interpersonal relationships from the teachers' point of view is the central theme of the present study, since the knowledge about how teacher-student relationships impact the teachers' professional and personal lives is extremely limited, although it is widely believed that personal relationships with children afford teachers internal rewards and give meaning to their work (Aldrup et al., 2018; Claessens et al., 2017; Spilt et al., 2011). As Aldrup et al. (2018) point out, this research gap is surprising because establishing a caring relationship with one's students is inherent to the teaching profession and at the core of teachers' professional identity (O'Connor, 2008; van der Want et al., 2014). The existence literature supports the positive role of these relationships in teachers' lives. For example, Veldman et al. (2013) reported positive association of teachers' job satisfaction with the self-reported quality of the teacher-student relationships. Hargreaves (2000) found that teachers' enjoyment of, and motivation for, teaching was in the most formulated by the quality of their interpersonal relationships with their students. Also, other studies reasoned that there cannot be real professional development without personal development (Day & Leitch, 2001; O'Connor 2008). Yet, problematic teacher-student relationships, which are characterized by conflict and low levels of affiliation, are mentioned by teachers to be sources of stress and negative emotions (Yoon, 2002). Similarly, teacher work stress stem from relationships with students (Friedman, 2006).

Focusing on teachers' interpersonal relationships with their students may contribute understanding their professional life, and enhancing their happiness and subjective well-being, as relevant to the topic educational research indicates and positive psychology conceptualizes (Aldrup et al., 2018; Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003; Diener et al., 2005; Pennings et al., 2018; Seligman, 2002, 2005). Understanding, specially, their perceptions of the interpersonal relationships may help understand their professional and emotional lives and development, since happy workers and people are those who report fulfilling relationships (Aldrup et al., 2017 et al., 2018; Buss, 2005; Claessens et al., 2017; Diener, 2000; Diener & Seligman, 2002; Fletcher &Thomas, 1996). Furthermore, building and sustaining positive teacher-student relationships is a main goal for teachers, not meeting this goal is likely to harm teacher well-being (Aldrup et al., 2018; Butler, 2012; Klassen et al., 2012).

Cognition and cognitive process are significant contributors in the development and quality of a close relationship, and so need to be considered in any comprehensive investigation of teacher-student interpersonal relationships (Harvey et al., 2005; Karney et al., 2003; Stephanou & Balkamou, 2011; Stephanou & Doulkeridou, 2020; Wang & Hall, 2018). This study deals with intuitive and attributional appraisals which are two such constructs, and which have been central concepts in the research in the close interpersonal relationships (Collins et al., 2006; Fincham, 2003; Greitemeyer & Weiner, 2003; Harvey, 1987; Harvey & Omarzu, 1999; Prager, 1995; Stephanou, 2005, 2012; Wee, 2017; Weiner, 2000, 2014). Whether partners perceive their relationship as positive or negative, and which explanations or interpretations they make about a given relationship influence their emotions, motivation and behaviour (Blascovich & Mandess, 2000; Flecher et al., 1990; Fletcher & Thomas, 2000; Fincham, 2003; Fitness et al., 2005; Stephanou, 2011; van Doorn et al., 2015). Accordingly, examining teachers' attributions for their interpersonal relationships with their students potentially help explain how these relations can develop and sustain as well as it might help understand teaching and learning. In addition, the attribution perspective of the interpersonal relationships is a phenomenological concept, and, hence, teachers themselves give meaning to their interpersonal relationships. Wubbel et al. (2014) define the teacher-student relationship "as the generalized interpersonal meaning students and teachers attach to their interactions with each other" (p. 364). In line with this speculation, Spilt et al. (2011), for example, revealed that the perceived quality of the teacher-student relationship can mediate the effect of disruptive student behavior on teacher well-being. Similarly, in Aldrup et al.'s (2018) study, the teacher-student relationship was positively related to teacher well-being and mediated the association of teacher-perceived misbehavior with enthusiasm.

This study also, attempting a comprehensive discussion of the teacher-student interpersonal relationships, examines emotions. Emotions are inherently and intensely experienced in the context of interpersonal relationships, are related to cognitive appraisals, influence expectations of the quality of the relationship in the future, and impact on the future behaviour of the partners (Baucom et al., 2006; Berscheid & Ammazzalorso, 2003; Forgas, 2002; Forgas & Smith, 2005; Karney et al., 2003; Parrott, 2003; Rose, 2007; Siemer et al., 2007; Smith & Kirby, 2000; Trope & Gaunt, 2005; Stephanou, 2011). Recent literature has begun to focus on the interdependence in partners' emotional changes, by examining the patterns in emotional dynamics (e.g., Butler, 2011, 2015; Helm et al., 2012; Randall & Butler, 2013; Schoebi, 2008; Schoebi & Randall, 2015). In education, as Lyons and Higgings (2014) mention, the interaction between teacher and learner creates a learning space in which knowledge is constructed and co-constructed, and this space is not just cognitive but it is 'coloured and nuanced by emotions and interpersonal relationships' (p.111). For example, cross-sectional studies have shown that teachers who have a close, conflict-free relationship with their students, experience more positive emotions and work engagement as well as less anger and burnout (Gastaldi et al., 2014; Jo, 2014; Klassen et al., 2012; Milatz et al., 2015). Similarly, a diary investigation found that teachers' more work enthusiasm was impacted by the more connected to their students (Aldrup et al., 2017). However, generally, there is a notable limited empirical research on teachers' emotions and their antecedents (Chen, 2016; Frenzel, 2014; Fried et al., 2015; Hargreaves, 2004; Keller et al., 2016; Pekrun & Schutz, 2007; Stephanou & Mastora, 2013; Stephanou & Oikonomou, 2018; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003).

Despite the wide variety of the antecedents of emotions, they are elicited by appraisals (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Efklides, & Volet, 2005; Frenzel, 2014; Zembylas, 2004). The attributional appraisal perspective to emotions focuses on how specific emotions, such as sadness and anger are elicited, and on the motivational functions they serve in particular relationship (Clore & Ortony, 2010; Frijda, 1993, 2007; Smith & Kirby, 2000; Weiner, 2002, 2005, 2014). For example, if a teacher believes that the student's good behaviour was the significant factor for their good interpersonal relationship then she / he may experience gratitude. Anger combines distress over an undesired event with perceiving the other as responsible for it (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009; Ortony et al., 1988). Once emotions are experienced, they influence partners' on-going appraisals, perceptions, information processing with important consequences in relationship judgments and behaviours (Bless, 2003; Parrott, 2003; Weiner, 2006; Van Doorn et al., 2014). For example, happy partners make more optimistic attributions than unhappy (Forgas, 1994; Planalp & Fitness, 1999). Anger pushes individuals to attribute blame and malicious intentions to others (Fitness & Fletcher, 1993; Keltner et al., 1993).

On the other hand, individual differences, as component of the cognitive schemas individuals develop of themselves and others, influence in affective, cognitive and behavioral responding to relational situations, particularly to negative or ambiguous situations (Demir, 2008; Schoebi & Randall, 2015; Stephanou, 2012; Timmermans et al., 2010). The estimated coping potential is crucial in further emotion differentiation, and in determining the appropriate response to the event by evaluating the resources at one's disposal (Lazarus 1991; Schmidt et al., 2010; Tong & Jia, 2017). Hope, as it is conceptualized in Snyder's (1994, 2005) hope theory, is a significant construct in understanding how individuals deal in close relationships (Smith & Kirby, 2000; Snyder et al., 1997). The Snyder's (2000) cognitive goal- directed conceptualization of hope predicts goal directed behaviour, such as developing- and having- a good interpersonal relationship (see Dixson, 2017; Feldman & Kubota, 2015; Rand et al., 2011; Snyder, 2004). In addition, 'the goal of 'connecting' with other people is fundamental because the seeking of one's goals almost always occurs within the context of social commerce' (Snyder et al., 2005, p. 266). People with high hope enjoy high social desirability, perceive social support, are not characterized by loneliness, enjoy their interactions with others, and are socially competent (Snyder & Lopez, 2007). Also, individuals with high dispositional hope enjoy life, are able to handle stress better and use positive reappraisal for a variety of stressor situations, they not use avoidance and denial behaviour, are effective problem-solvers and believe in success (Dixson, 2017; Gilham, 2000; Snyder, 2000; Snyder et al., 1999; Snyder et al., 2006; Stephanou & Tsoni, 2019).

Hope, influences how individuals interpret and feel in close relationships (Roberts et al., 2005; Stephanou, 2011). Specifically, although in hope theory the focus is on reaching desired future goal-related outcomes, hope is related to attributions for past behaviour, since both theories elaborate pursuit goals and important outcomes (Seligman, 1991; Snyder et al., 2005; Weiner, 2002). Hope is related to emotions in a given close relationship, since goal-pursuit cognitions, such as avoiding or alleviating harm or maximizing benefits in the relationship, cause emotions (Smith & Ellsworth, 1987; Snyder et al., 2005).

In education, a very limited number of researches have focused on the role of hope in teaching and teacher, although the high importance of dispositional hope has long been recognized (see Eren, 2014). Accurately, most of the past studies (e.g., Birmingham, 2009; Bullough, 2011; Hammerness 2003) dealt with teaching, did not involve Snyder's (2005) theory and used qualitative research method. Eren (2014), using Snyder's hope theory, showed that the associations between prospective teachers' emotions for teaching, responsibility for student achievement, and teaching were moderately and negatively mediated by hope.

Conclusively, despite the increased knowledge evidencing the positive role of teacher-student interpersonal relationships in student outcomes, how teachers cognitively appraise these relationships, and the subsequent emotions they experience have been limitedly examined. Moreover, to our knowledge, no study has investigated all three, attributions, emotions and hope, in teacher-student interpersonal relationships. Accordingly, the present investigation expands past research evidence. In doing so, this study is based on Weiner's (2001, 2010, 2014) attributions theory which, incorporating cognitive appraisals and emotions, is helpful in understanding interpersonal relationships (Argyle, 2001; Fincham, 2003; Fitness et al., 2005; Fletcher & Clark, 2003; Hewstone & Antaki, 2001; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2006; Stephanou, 2011; Wand & Hall, 2018). Snyder's (2000) hope theory was also involved because, incorporating waypower and willing power, offers an important construct in understanding how teachers deal and interact with students.

Attributions and Emotions for Interpersonal Relationships

Individuals appraise a relationship by evaluating and by attributing causes (Leary, 2000; Smith & Lazarus, 1990; Trope & Gaunt, 2005; Schoebi & Randall, 2015). The appraisals reflect what the stimulus-relationship- means to the individual and whether it is good or bad (Fincham, 2003; Fitness et al., 2005). Teachers are motivated to understand the causes of their interpersonal relationships with their students or the student's behavior because such an understanding is crucial to their professional role and identity (Aldrup et al., 2018; Van Doom et al., 2014; Wage & Hall, 2018).

Weiner's (1992, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2010, 2014) attribution theory, on which this study is based, represents a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding motivation for achievement outcomes from the intrapersonal perspective, which refers to the attributions individuals make for their performance, and from the interpersonal

perspective, which concerns the attributions made for outcomes experienced by others, and how perceptions of another's responsibility for an outcome contributes to other- directed emotions (gratitude, sympathy, anger) and behaviors (punishment, support) (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2006; Wand & Hall, 2018).

Although, an interpersonal relationship could be attributed to infinite number of attributions, self, other person, situation, environment, self-other person interaction, and relationship itself are the most prominent causes in describing positive and negative relationships (Argyle, 2001; Erber & Gilmour, 1995; Planalp & Rivers, 1996; Stephanou, 2012). However, the causes per se are not crucial, as the location of the causes on attributional dimensions which have psychological and behavioral consequences which have psychological and behavioral consequences (Argyle, 2001; Berscheid & Ammazzalorso, 2003; Fletcher & Thomas, 2000; McAuley et al., 1992; Stephanou, 2005, 2007; Weiner, 2002, 2005). In Weiner's (2002, 2014) theory, attributions are categorized into causal dimensions of locus of causality (internal / external to the person), stability (stable / unstable over time) and controllability (personal and external controllable / uncontrollable).

The perceived quality of the relationship differentiates the attributional pattern (Fiedler et al., 1995; Fincham, 2003). Partners exhibit self-enhancing and self-saving biases (Dix & Grusec, 1985; Stephanou, 2007, 2012; Stephanou & Doulkeridou, 2020), when making attributions for positive and negative interpersonal relationships or the other's behavior. Specifically, individuals tend to attribute the positive interpersonal relationships to themselves (internal, stable, personal controllable, and external uncontrollable), and the negative relationships to the other person and situational factors (Fitness et al., 2005; Gagné & Lydon, 2004; Stephanou, 2005, 2007, 2011; Weiner, 2001, 2002; Ybarra & Stephan, 1999). However, according to some theorists, although the attributional biases of partner have been repeatedly found in different relationship situations (Fincham 1985; Macnow, 2019), this bias may affect satisfaction in relationships, or it could serve as a secondary indicator that the relationship is already distressed. Specifically, the more negative the interpersonal relationship the more the attributions to the other person's constant negative properties (Argyle, 2001; Gilbert & Malone, 1995; Hewstone & Antaki, 2001; Williams & Gilmore, 2008). The respective research in education is extremely limited. Studies in teachers' interpersonal attributions focus on student achievement- and social-related behavior. The empirical studies illustrate that teachers tend to attribute a student failure to factors internal to the student (e.g., student ability, effort) or family influences than teacher- and school-related issues as well as they make internal to the students and stable attributions when explaining performance that matches their own original expectations toward the students (ability, consistent effort, student personality). In the case of success, although teachers take responsibility for student success (e.g., instructional quality), they, at the same time, give credit to students' positive proprieties (e.g., student ability, effort) (Wang & Hall, 2018 for a review).

Theories on intimate relationships conceptualize how interdependent actions and their appraisal shape affective experience and related relationship behaviors (Schoebi & Randall, 2015). Previous researches document that the intuitive appraisal and the attributional appraisal are major source of experienced emotions in interpersonal relationships (Clark et al., 2003; Fletcher, 2002; Smith & Lazarus, 1990; Trope & Guant, 2005; Weiner, 2002). According to Weiner's (2002, 2014) attribution theory, there are 'outcome- dependent' emotions, such as happiness, pleasure and sadness, that are the initial and strongest response to the valence of the relationship. For example, if it is positive, a person fells happy, whereas if it is negative, he / she fells sad. Sanford and Grace (2011), for instance, found that perceptions of threat and neglect in the relationship went along with increases in negative affects. There are also 'attribution-dependent' emotions, such as anger and encouragement, that are influenced by the attributional explanation for the relationship (Oatley & Jenkins, 1998; Weiner, 2002, 2014). For example, a teacher may experience anger to a student if he/she beliefs that the student could and should have behaved differently. In contrast, a teacher may feel encouragement if she / he considers the student's positive dispositional factors as causes for the positive interpersonal relationship. Attributions of responsibility to an intimate partner may play a key role for the elicitation of negative affect, particularly anger, in intimate relationships (Bradbury & Fincham, 1987).

Partners (teacher-student) might experience various and different emotions for the same estimated behavior or interpersonal relationship, depending on the cause selected for explaining the given behavior or relationship. Attributing, for instance, a failure to lack of effort, an individual may experience the emotions of less pride (internal), higher hope (unstable), and guilt (controllable), that, in turn, directly influence behaviors (Wang & Hall, 2018). However, although all attributional dimensions are related to emotions for the partner's (student) behavior and the relationship itself, their prevalence differs across the various emotions (Berndsen & Manstead, 2007; Weiner, 2005, 2006, 2014). Stability most impacts on performance expectations and the emotions of hopefulness/hopelessness, controllability affects perceptions of personal responsibility and the social-related emotions, such as shame, anger and gratitude, while locus of causality mainly influences perceptions of personal competence and the self-related emotions, such as pride in success.

For example, internal attributions for a good interpersonal relationship are associated with the emotions of confidence and pride, whereas external attributions lead to positive behaviors, such as help seeking, or negative responses, such as helplessness, avoidance and lack of persistence. In contrast, attributing a bad interpersonal relationship to inadequate self-factors predicts incompetence, shame, guilt and resignation, whereas attributing unsuccessful events to others causes aggression and vindictiveness (Fincham, 2003; Fitness et al., 2005).

Attributing a good interpersonal relationship to stable factors enhances the relationship expectations, and facilitates relationship engagement, while attributing a negative interpersonal relationship to unstable factors is likely to improve the relationship and minimizes the feeling of hopelessness. In contrast, attributing a negative relationship to stable factors reduces positive expectations, produces the feeling of hopelessness and can lead to learned helplessness, a sense that none effort can lead to good relationship (Fitness et al., 2005; Peterson & Steen, 2005; Seligman, 2002; Weiner, 2001).

Guilt and anger are elicited by controllable causes for negative outcomes, but guilt emerges from internal responsibility, whereas anger is typically elicited by external factors (Stephanou & Balkamou, 2011; 2010; Van Dijk & Zeelenberg, 2002; Weiner, 1992). Further, anger involves the perception that the external agent, often a person, is responsible or blameworthy (Averill, 1982; Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004; Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009; Kuppens & Van Mechelen, 2007). Hate resulted from appraisals of relative powerlessness and a perceived lack of control (Fitness et al., 2005). Also, stable causes maximize feelings of pity, given uncontrollable causes, and feelings of anger, given controllable causes (Graham & Hoehn, 1995).

Overall, the belief that a person -teacher- has about the causes of his / her interpersonal relationship influences his / her emotions for the partner -student-, and his / her expectations for the quality of the relationship in the future (Fletcher, 2002; Siemer et al., 2007; Stephanou, 2011; Weiner, 2001, 2014). Then, emotions and expectations influence the individual's actual behavior toward the partner, and the relationship itself (Fincham, 2003; Fletcher & Clark, 2002; Fletcher & Thomas, 2000; Weiner, 2001, 2014).

Association of Hope with Attributions and Emotions for Interpersonal Relationship

According to Snyder (2000, p. 8), hope is the "sum of perceived capabilities to produce routes to desired goals, along with the perceived motivation to use those routes". The three key components of the Snyder's theory are the conceptualization of a goal, the developed routes to obtain the conceptualized goal (pathway thinking), and the motivation to obtain the conceptualized goal (agency thinking) (Snyder, 2000; Snyder & Lopez, 2007). Although agency and pathway are highly and reciprocally related, they are separate constructs (Chang & Banks, 2007; Dixton, 2017; Magaletta & Oliver; 1999; Rand & Cheavens, 2009; Snyder, Harris et al., 1991). Agency thinking is the motivational component in hope theory, and it is particularly crucial in the case of impediments (Snyder, 1994).

The majority of the studies support that hopeful people, like optimistic people, expect positive outcomes even when they face difficulties, in which they insist in pursuit their goals and regulate themselves, using effective coping strategies, so they enhance the chances to achieve their goals (Carver & Scheier, 2005; Scheier et al., 2000; Peterson, 2000; Seligman, 1991). Higher-hope individuals also tend to pursue goals more energetically and with greater confidence than their lower-hope counterparts, which leads to the greater likelihood of achieving goals (Snyder et al., 1991). Hopeful people, additionally, focus not only on future goals but also on goals they believe they can achieve (Nolen-Hoeksema & Davis, 2005; Snyder, 2000). Similarly, previous researchers also document the positive association of hope with positive affect, personal adjustment, self-beliefs and perceived quality of life (see Marques et al., 2017), better handling of stress (Chang, 1998) and stressful life events (Hellman & Gwinn, 2017; Valle et al., 2006), and lower depression and anxiety (Ong et al., 2006). Also, hopeful individuals are more optimistic about the future, develop more and longer-term life goals and have higher success expectations (Snyder et al., 2006).

The abovementioned literature suggest that hope could be a critical construct to understand how teachers deal with others and work towards goals, such as developing a good interpersonal relationship with their students, in an adaptive way. Accordingly, a high hope person/teacher might use adaptive attribution pattern in explaining positive or negative interpersonal relationship. Probably, a high- hope teacher, as an optimistic teacher does, attribute failure to external, unstable and specific factors instead of internal, stable and global factors (Scheier & Carven, 1985; Snyder et al., 2005; Seligman, 2002). Similarly, in Snyder's hope theory, emphasizing the thinking processes, 'goal-pursuit cognitions cause emotions' (Snyder et al. 2005, p. 258). Specifically, positive emotions result from perception of successful goal pursuit which reflects unimpeded movement toward the goal or effective overcoming the obstacles. In contrast, negative emotions are formulated by the perception of unsuccessful goal pursuit which may result from insufficient agency thinking and / or pathway thinking or the ineffective ability to overcome the problem.

Research Aim and Hypotheses

This study aimed at examining teachers' attributions and emotions for their subjectively perceived positive and negative interpersonal relationships with their students, and whether dispositional hope (pathways thinking, agency thinking) influences the perceived positive or negative interpersonal relationships, the subsequent attributions and emotions, and the impact of attributions on emotions.

The hypotheses of the study were the following:

The perceived positive interpersonal relationships will be in the main attributed to self- related factors (internal, personally controllable, stable), whereas the perceived negative interpersonal relationship will be most ascribed to

student- or external- related factors (Hypothesis 1a). The group with the positive interpersonal relationships will predominately discriminated from the group with the negative interpersonal relationships by the attributional dimension of locus of causality (Hypothesis 1b).

The participants will report various positive emotions for their positive interpersonal relationships with their students, while they will experience various negative emotions for their negative interpersonal relationships (Hypothesis 2a). The group with the good interpersonal relationships will be separated from the group with the bad interpersonal relationships mainly due to outcome-dependent emotions (Hypothesis 2b).

Hope (both agency thinking and pathway thinking) will contribute to adaptive attributional pattern for the perceived positive and, in particularly, bad interpersonal relationships (Hypothesis 3a). Hope will be a beneficial factor most to stability than to any other attributional dimension (Hypothesis 3b). The valence of the prediction of pathway thinking and agency thinking will vary between and within attributional dimensions and perceived bad or good interpersonal relationships.

Hope (both agency thinking and pathway thinking) will have positive effects on the experienced emotions for the estimated as good and, manly, negative interpersonal relationships (Hypothesis 4a). Hope will be a more powerful predictor of the expectancy- related emotions than of the rest of the emotions (Hypothesis 4b). The valence of the prediction of pathway thinking and agency thinking will vary between and within the emotions for perceived bad and good interpersonal relationships (Hypothesis 4c).

Attributional dimensions (each of them on specific kind of emotions) and hope will have positive effects of the emotions for the interpersonal relationships (Hypothesis 5a). Hope will enhance the impact of attributions on emotions, predominately in the negative interpersonal relationships (Hypothesis 5b). This influential role of hope will differ across the attributional dimensions and within each attributional dimension, exhibiting the most effect on stability (Hypothesis 5c). Pathway thoughts and agency thought will differ in the beneficial power to impact of attributions on emotions (Hypothesis 5d).

Method

Participants

The participants were 50 teachers, of both genders (23 male, 27 female), who randomly came from 10 state junior high schools from various regions of southern Greece. Most of the teachers taught the subjects of math/physics/technology, literature and a foreign language, while fewer of them taught other school subjects, such as physical education and artist. They reported teaching experience from 5 to 31 years with balance among years of teaching experience, and their age ranged from 34 to 58 years. The teachers reported good interpersonal relationships with 197 of their total 250 students, while they reported bad relationships with 53 of their students.

Measurements

Perceptions of the quality of interpersonal relationships

Teachers' perceptions of the quality of their interpersonal relationships with their students were examined by filling a five- point four items ("How satisfied are you with the interpersonal relationship with the student?") scale. Responses ranged from 1=Not at all to 5= Totally. The construction of the scale was based on Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (STRS) (Pianta, 1999), on the Inventory of Teacher-Student Relationships (ITSR) (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), and on past similar researches. This scale is a reliable and valid research instrument in examining the sense of the quality of an interpersonal relationship (Stephanou, 2012; Stephanou & Balkamou, 2011). In this study Cronbach's Alpha value was .69.

The participants themselves defined their relationships as positive or negative by responding to the relationship scale twice. Accurately, the teachers filled it for the current quality of their relationship with their students, and, then, mentioned the lowest value in each item over which their relationship would be the desired positive one. Teachers who indicated that the current relationship was lower than the indicated as positive labelled the group of negative interpersonal relationships, while those whose relationship was equal or higher than the indicated one formed the group of positive relationships.

Attributions for interpersonal relationship

Teacher's attributions for the subjectively estimated interpersonal relationship with their students as positive or negative were assessed through the modified Causal Dimension Scale II (CDSII) (McAuley et al., 1992). The modified version of the CDSII was based on past researches on interpersonal relationships (Fincham, 2003; Fletcher, 2002; Fletcher & Thomas, 1996); and has proved a reliable and valid research instrument in examining attributions for intimate interpersonal relationships in Greek population (Stephanou, 2012). The participants, first, wrote down the most important factor which, according to their opinion, influenced the perceived level of the quality of their interpersonal

relationship with each of their students, then indicated on a 5- point item (ranging from 1=not at all to 5= very much) how much this factor contributed to the given relationship, and, finally, classified that cause along the attributional dimensions of locus of causality (internal / external causes to him/ herself), stability (stable / unstable cause over time), personal controllability (controllable / uncontrollable causes by their own), external controllability (controllable / uncontrollable causes by others), student's locus of causality (internal / external causes to his/her student), student's controllability (controllable / uncontrollable causes by the student), self-student interactive locus of causality (internal / external causes to interaction self-student) and self-student interactive controllability (controllable / uncontrollable causes by the interaction self-student). Each subscale consists of three items, ranging from the negative pole 1= not at all stable to the positive pole 5 = totally stable. Cronbach's Alpha were .85 for locus of causality, .81 for stability, .86 for personal controllability, .90 for external controllability, .78 for student's locus of causality, .76 for student's controllability, .90 for self-student locus of causality, and .86 for self-student controllability.

Emotions for interpersonal relationships

Teachers' emotions for their interpersonal relationships with their students were examined by mentioning the extent to which they experienced the emotions of happiness, sympathy, pleasure, pride, encouragement, love, not anger-anger, cheerfulness, calmness-nervousness, not anxiety- anxiety, enthusiasm, optimism and excitement. The emotions had the form of adjectives with two opposite poles, with the positive pole having the high score of 5 and the negative one having the low score of 1 (e.g., happy 5 4 3 2 1 unhappy, calm 5 4 3 2 1 nervous). The scale is a reliable and valid measure in assessing emotions for interpersonal relationships, and its consistency was relied on past researches (Fischer & Manstead, 2008; Forgas, 2002; Stephanou, 2007, 2012; van Kleef, 2009; Schutz & DeCuir-Gunby, 2002; Weiner, 2000, 2005). Cronbach's Alpha was found .82.

Hope

Dispositional hope was estimated by the Adult Hope Scale (AHS) (Snyder et al., 1991) which consists of four distractive items, four agency thinking items (e.g., "My past experiences have prepared me well for my future") and four pathways thinking items (e.g., 'I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are important to me"). Responses ranged from 1 = "Definitely false" to 8 = "Definitely true", with higher scores indicating greater levels of hope. The scale was independently translated from English into Greek by two familiar to the topic researches, and, then, there was a backward translation by a native English speaker. The feedback was positive for the Greek version of the scale. In the present study, Cronbach's Alpha was found .68 and .65 for agency thinking and pathways thinking, respectively.

Personal factors

The participant responded to a personal information scale regarding personal and demographical factors, such as age, gender and teaching experience.

Procedure

Teachers indicated the class in which they taught most of his/her teaching hours, as it was estimated that the high frequency of interaction between the students and the teachers increases the possibilities for developing and shaping the between them interpersonal relationships. In cases where the teaching schedule did not vary the hours, random sampling was applied for the selection of the class. Then, five students were randomly selected from each participating class. All the participants completed the questionnaire for each of their five students.

Data collection was performed in the middle of a school year, to ensure that the teachers had enough time to form an impression about their interpersonal relationships with their students. Also, the participants completed, first, the hope scale, and, one week later, the scales of the perceived quality of their relationships with their students, and the subsequent emotions and attributions.

Oral and written information about the aim of this study were provided to the teachers, and they were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. To match the questionnaires that were responded by the same teacher, the participants were asked to choose a code name and use it on across all of the scales. They were also asked to use an additive code name across all of the scales for each of their students.

Data Analyses

Univariate and multivariate statistical analyses between and withing groups of the positive and negative interpersonal relationships were performed to examine possible effects of the perceived quality of the interpersonal relationships on attributional and emotional appraisals. A series of regression analysis was conducted to examine the impact of hope on attributions and emotions within each group of interpersonal relationships as well as hierarchical regression analyses were performed to assess the role of hope in the impact of attributions on each of the experienced emotions for the positive and negative interpersonal relationships.

Results

Attributions for the Positive and Negative Interpersonal Relationships

One-way MANOVA analysis with the eight attributional dimensions as dependent variables and the perceived interpersonal relationship (positive / negative) as between-subjects factor revealed a significant effect, $F_{(8, 241)}$ = 42.48, p < .01, η^2 =.58.

The results from the subsequent ANOVAs and Discriminant Function analysis (Table 1), with the perceived interpersonal relationship (positive /negative) as grouping variable and attributional dimensions as predictor variables, revealed that stability, discriminating power = .61, n^2= .43, followed by student's personal controllability, discriminating power = .52, n^2= .27, locus of causality, discriminating power = .21, n^2= .08, self-student interactive locus of causality, discriminating power= .18, n^2= .06, and personal controllability, discriminating power = .14, n^2 = .04, was the most powerful attributional dimension in discriminating the group with the positive interpersonal relationships from the group with the negative interpersonal relationships. It was also found that the attributional dimensions of self-student interactive controllability, external controllability and student's locus of causality had no significant contribution in discriminating the two groups of interpersonal relationships.

Furthermore, the above results and observation of the descriptive statistics on Table 1 indicate that the teachers made internal, personal controllable, external uncontrollable, controllable and internal to the students, self-student interactive internal and, predominately, student's controllable, self-student interactive controllable and stable attributions for the perceived positive interpersonal relationships. Contrarily, they attributed their perceived negative interpersonal relationships with their students to external controllable, unstable, student's internal and controllable, and, mainly, external and self-student interactive controllable factors.

The above findings in the most and partly confirmed Hypothesis 1a and Hypothesis 1b respectively.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and results from Discriminant analysis for teachers' attributional dimensions for their perceived positive and negative interpersonal relationships with their students

Attributional dimensions	Positive relationships		Negative relationships		Wilks' Lambda	Discriminating power	n^2	F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD				
Locus of causality	8,25	2,88	6,3	1,73	0,92	0,21	0,08	22
Personal controllability	9,32	3,27	7,48	1,08	0,97	0,14	0,03	7,15
Stability	11,61	2,5	7,35	2,3	0,66	0,61	0,34	128,7
External controllability	7,92	3,74	8,3	2,96	0,99	-0,04	0	0,48
Student's locus of causality	8,23	1,78	7,62	1,25	0,98	0,1	0,01	3,85
Student's personal controllability	11,96	2,69	8,17	1,84	0,73	0,52	0,27	93,8
Self-student interactive locus of causality	9,65	2,97	7,92	1,26	0,94	0,18	0,06	15,83
Self-student interactive controllability	10,2	3,29	9,79	2,27	0,99	0,03	0	0,035

Note: F(1, 248) $\geq$ 7.15, p < .01; F(1, 248) < 7.15, p > .05.

Emotions for the Positive and Negative Interpersonal Relationships

MANOVA analysis revealed significant effect of the perceived interpersonal relationship (positive /negative) on teachers' emotions, $F_{(12, 237)}$ = 79.38, p < .01, n^2 = .80, p < .01. To clarify the findings, univariate analyses within and between groups were conducted.

The results from two repeated measures ANOVAs, one for each group of interpersonal relationship (positive / negative), in which emotions was the within-subjects factor, showed a variability of the intensity of the emotions that the teachers experienced for the perceived positive, $F_{(12, 237)}$= 48.75, p < .01, η^2 = .76, and negative $F_{(12, 237)}$= 78.37, p < .01, η^2 = .93, interpersonal relationships with their students. Specifically, the post hoc pairwise comparisons and inspection on the scores on Table 2 illustrate that the teachers experienced positive emotions of high intensity, particularly sympathy, cheerfulness, exciting, love, encouragement and calmness, and negative emotions of low intensity of anger and anxiety for the positive relationships, whereas, in the negative relationships group, they experienced negative emotions, predominately no enthusiasm, shame, anxiety, no excitement, displeasure and sadness.

The findings from ANOVAs and Discriminant analysis (Table, 2), which was performed to examine the set of emotions that best discriminated the two groups of teachers' relationships, illustrated that the teachers felt better for their positive than negative interpersonal relationships with their students, and that the emotion of not anxiety-anxiety, discriminating

power= .75, η²= .68, followed by the emotions of cheerfulness, discriminating power= .64, η²= .57, calmness, discriminating power= .55, η²= .53, exciting, discriminating power= .53, η²= .51, and enthusiasm, discriminating power= .50, η²= .48, was the most powerful emotion in discriminating the one from the other group of teachers.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and findings from Discriminant analysis for teachers' emotions for their perceived positive and negative interpersonal relationships with their students

Emotions	Positive relationships		Negative relationships		Wilks' Lambda	Discriminating power	n²	F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD				
Happiness	3.96	0.62	2.81	0.52	.62	.41	.38	152.04
Sympathy	4.58	0.57	3.72	0.88	.77	.28	.23	74.38
Pleasure	4.20	0.66	2.81	1.11	.65	.37	.35	133.75
Pride	4.03	0.87	2.57	0.95	.69	.34	.31	113.76
Love	4.34	0.67	3.96	0.71	.95	.12	.05	12.64
Encouragement	4.31	0.70	3.06	0.87	.68	.43	.32	118.75
Not anger-anger	4.75	0.45	3.49	1.05	.59	.44	.40	169.12
Cheerfulness	4.48	0.57	2.83	0.64	.43	.64	.57	333.90
Excitement	4.38	0.67	2.58	0.91	.49	.53	.51	254.37
Optimism	4.32	0.73	2.98	0.84	.65	.31	.34	130.86
Calmness/ nervousness	4.74	0.47	2.98	1.18	.47	.55	.53	274.73
Not anxiety-anxiety	4.70	0.54	2.79	0.53	.32	.75	.68	517.76
Enthusiasm	3.94	0.75	2.30	0.50	.52	.50	.48	226.74

Note: All F(1, 248)- values are significant at the .01 level of significance; The nature of the emotions is positive and negative in the positive and negative interpersonal relationship group, respectively.

The above findings in the most confirmed Hypotheses 2a and 2b.

Effects of Hope on Attributions for the Positive and Negative Interpersonal Relationships

To examine the role of hope in attributions within each group of interpersonal relationships (positive / negative), correlation coefficients and a series of regression analysis (Table 3), with agency thinking and pathway thinking as predictive variables and each of the attributional dimensions as predicted variable, were conducted. The results from these analyses showed the following.

Higher-hope teachers, as compared to lower-hope teachers, made more personal controllable, stable, student's internal and controllable, and self-student interactive controllable attributions for their perceived positive interpersonal relationships with their students. In contrast, the former, in comparison to the later, attributed the negative interpersonal relationships to more external, personal uncontrollable, unstable, external controllable, and self-student interactive uncontrollable factors.

Hope proved a more powerful predictor of the attributional dimensions for the perceived negative interpersonal relationships than for the perceived positive relationships. Specifically, agency thoughts and pathways thoughts, together, had a positive effect on the attributional dimensions, explaining an amount of the variance from 11% (personal controllability) to 57% (external controllability) in the negative interpersonal relationships group, and from 5% (student's personal controllability) to 9% (stability) in the positive interpersonal relationships.

Pathways thoughts in the most explained a significant variability of attributions for the positive interpersonal relationships, while agency thoughts evidenced unique contribution in the generation of most of the attributional dimensions in the negative interpersonal relationships group.

The findings confirmed Hypotheses 3a, whereas Hypotheses 3b and 3c were partly confirmed.

Table 3. Findings from regression analyses for the effects of teachers' hope (agency thinking, path thinking) on the attributional dimensions for their positive and negative interpersonal relationships with the students

	Predictors Hope	Positive interpersonal relationships				Negative interpersonal relationships			
		R^2	F	b	t	R^2	F	b	t
Locus of causality	Agency thinking			-- -	---			.43	4.20
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.25	8.75	.17	2.00
Personal controllability	Agency thinking			.28	3.50			.38	2.80
	Path thinking	.07	7.30	---	---	.11	3.20	---	---
Stability	Agency thinking			.30	4.00			.21	2.35
	Path thinking	.12	12.45	---	---	.25	9.00	---	---
External controllability	Agency thinking			---	---			.41	4.00
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.57	33.10	.20	2.15
Student's locus of causality	Agency thinking								
	Path thinking	.06	6.10	.24	2.30	--	--	---	---
Student's personal controllability	Agency thinking							.22	2.10
	path thinking	.05	5.55	.22	2.20	.30	10.65	.48	3.60
Self-student locus of causality	Agency thinking			---	---			.28	2.60
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.25	8.25	---	---
Self-student controllability	Agency thinking			---	---			.28	2.60
	Path thinking	.09	9.60	.29	3.70	.23	8.00	---	---

Note: $F \geq 5.55$, $p < .01$; $F <= 5.55$, $p < .05$; F--, $p > .05$; t---, $p > .05$, $t \geq 2.35$, $p < .01$, $t > 2.35$, $p < .05$.

Effects of Hope on Emotions for the Positive and Negative Interpersonal Relationships

The results from correlations coefficients and a series of regression analyses, with agency thinking and pathway thinking as predictive variables and each of the emotions as predicted variable, within each group of interpersonal relationship (perceived positive / negative) (Table 4) showed that (a) agency thinking and pathways thoughts, in combination, was a significant predictor of teachers' emotions for their positive interpersonal relationships, R^2 ranged from .06 (optimism) to .26 (happiness), and, mainly, of their emotions for their negative interpersonal relationships, R^2 ranged from .14 (anger) to .29 (shame), (b) the higher the hope was, the more intense the positive emotions (predominately, love and happiness) were for the positive interpersonal relationships, and the less intense the negative emotions (mainly, discouragement, hate, and shame) were for the negative interpersonal relationships, (c) the relative power of pathway thinking and agency thinking in formulating emotionς varied across emotions and between the two groups of the interpersonal relationships, and (d) pathway thinking, compared to agency thinking, was a better predictor of most of the emotions in the positive interpersonal relationships, while in the negative interpersonal relationships the reverse was the case.

The above findings partly confirmed the Hypotheses 4a and 4b, while they confirmed Hypothesis 4c.

Table 4. Findings from regression analyses for the effects of teachers' hope (agency thinking, path thinking) on their emotions for the positive and negative interpersonal relationships with their students

	Predictors Hope	Positive interpersonal relationships				Negative interpersonal relationships			
		R²	F	b	t	R²	F	b	t
Happiness	Agency thinking			.23	2.90			.38	2.90
	Path thinking	.26	34.00	.27	3.45	.16	4.80	---	---
Sympathy	Agency thinking			.29	3.95			.43	3.35
	Path thinking	.18	21.00	.31	4.20	.17	5.01	---	---
Pleasure	Agency thinking			---	---			---	---
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.20	6.45	.32	2.50
Pride	Agency thinking			.32	4.35			.42	3.05
	Path thinking	.13	14.23	---	---	.29	10.00	.19	2.25
Love	Agency thinking			--	---			.43	3.45
	Path thinking	.24	31.44	.31	4.25	.26	8.80	.18	2.20
Encouragement	Agency thinking Path thinking			.29	3.85			.45	4.84
		.25	32.00	.20	2.40	.24	7.82	---	---
Not angry-angry	Agency thinking			---	---			---	---
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.14	4.25	.40	2.95
Cheerfulness	Agency thinking			.28	3.80			.38	2.60
	Path thinking	.15	16.00	.18	2.20	.14	4.35	---	---
Excitement	Agency thinking			---	---			---	---
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.18	5.30	---	---
Optimism	Agency thinking	.06		---	---			.40	2.95
	Path thinking		5.90	.24	3.00	.22	6.88	---	---
Calmness	Agency thinking							---	---
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.19	5.30	---	---
No anxiety-anxiety	Agency thinking							.33	2.45
	Path thinking	--	--	---	---	.20	6.45	---	---
Enthusiasm	Agency thinking			---	---			.21	2.35
	Path thinking	.16	18.96	.28	3.70	.23	7.70	.25	2.80

Note: F > 4.25, p < .01; F ≤ 4.25, p < .05; F--, p >.05; t > 2.35, p < .01; t ≤ 2.35, p < .05; t ---, p >.05; The nature of the emotions is positive and negative in the positive and negative interpersonal relationship group, respectively.

Effects of Hope on the Impact of Attributions on Emotions for the Perceived Positive and Negative Interpersonal Relationships

Twenty-six separate hierarchical regression analyses (Table 5) were performed to examine the role of hope and attributions in the generation of teachers' emotions for their perceived positive and negative interpersonal relationships with their students, and the role of hope in the effect of attributions on emotions. All of the attributional dimensions were entered simultaneously into first step of the analysis, while agency thoughts and pathway thoughts were entered into the second step of the analysis.

The results from these analyses indicated that the two sets of predictors had complementary and positive effects on emotions but their relative power in influencing them varied between positive and negative interpersonal relationships and within each emotion. Also, hope had direct effect on the emotions (not on all), beyond the influence of the attributions, suggesting that the teachers with higher hope (mainly, agency thinking) were more likely to use the specific attributional pattern and enjoy their relationships with their students more than the teachers with lower hope. Accurately, the results showed that (a) hope and attributions, together, explained a significant amount of the variance of

the emotions for the perceived positive interpersonal relationships, R^2 ranged from .22 (exciting) to .60 (pride), and, particularly, for the perceived negative interpersonal relationships, R^2 ranged from .35 (anxiety) to .89 (pessimism), (b) hope -agency thinking and pathways thinking, together- improved the effect of the attributions on the emotions of pleasure, pride, optimism, enthusiasm and, mostly, happiness and love for the positive interpersonal relationships, and it enhanced that impact of attributions on most of the emotions for the negative interpersonal relationships, R^2ch ranged from .05 to. 15 (sadness), (c) agency thinking had unique effect on most of the emotions in the negative interpersonal relationships, whereas pathway thinking had unique effect on the emotions of pleasure, optimism and enthusiasm in the positive interpersonal relationships, (d) stability, followed by self-student interactive controllability and locus of causality, compared to the rest of the attributional dimensions, were better predictors of most of the emotions for the positive interpersonal relationships, while personal controllability, followed by external controllability, student's locus of causality and self-student interactive controllability played the most significant role in the emotions for the negative interpersonal relationships.

Table 5 Results from hierarchical regression analyses for the effects of hope (agency thinking, path thinking) on the impact of attributions on emotions for the positive and negative interpersonal relationships

Emotions	Predictors	Steps	R^2	R^2ch	Fch	F	beta	t
				Positive interpersonal relationships				
Happiness	Attributions	1st	.21			6.15	S: .39	4.45
	Hope	2nd	.35	.15	21.30	10.25	AH: .27	3.95
Sympathy	Attributions	1st	.39			14.90	ILC: .63	3.98
	Hope	2nd	.39	--	--	12.00	--	--
Pleasure	Attributions	1st	.38			14.50	S: .48	6.10
	Hope	2nd	.41	.03	4.50	12.92	PH: .21	2.70
Pride	Attributions	1st	.48			16.90	S:.47	3.00
	Hope	2nd	.60	.13	18.55	10.30	AH: .23	3.21
Love	Attributions	1st	.39			15.00	IC: .59	4.10
	Hope	2nd	.59	.21	21.50	19.00	AH: .24	4.00
Encouragement	Attributions	1st	.28			9.10	S: .47	4.15
	Hope	2nd	.28	--	--	7.50	---	---
Not angry- angry	Attributions	1st	.26			8.50	SC: .44	3.85
	Hope	2nd	.27	--	--	6.80	---	---
Cheerfulness	Attributions	1st	.33			11.50	ILC: .55	4.90
	Hope	2nd	.33	--	--	9.25	---	---
Excitement	Attributions	1st	.21			6.36	ILC: .45	3.75
	Hope	2nd	.22	--	--	5.30	---	---
Optimism	Attributions	1st	.40			16.00	PC: .46	6.12
	Hope	2nd	.44	.04	5.30	14.45	PH: .16	2.10
Calmness	Attributions	1st	.24			7.60	SC: .51	4.35
	Hope	2nd	.24	--	--	6.35	---	---
No anxiety-anxiety	Attributions	1st	.50			7.90	IC: .53	5.00
	Hope	2nd	.50	--	--	6.35	---	---
Enthusiasm	Attributions	1st	.27			8.85	IC: .45	4.30
	Hope	2nd	.38	.10	15.40	11.25	PH: .29	3.55
				Negative interpersonal relationships				
							SLC: .68	3.40
	Attributions	1st	.79			9.40	AH: .35	2.60
Unhappiness	Hope	2nd	.85	.06	6.70	10.80	HA: .33	2.20

Table 5. Continued

Emotions	Predictors	Steps	R²	R²ch	Fch	F	beta	t
Not sympathy	Attributions	1st	.55			6.65	LC: .56	3.70
	Hope	2nd	68	.13	8.50	8.80	HA: .50	3.62
Displeasure	Attributions	1st	.72			14.40	PC: .6O	3.30
	Hope	2nd	.74	--	--	12.10	---	---
Shame	Attributions	1st	.75			16.90	PC: .60	4.00
	Hope	2nd	.83	.08	9.65	20.70	AH: .52	6.35
Hate	Attributions	1st	.76			17.50	PC: .77	5.10
	Hope	2nd	.82	.06	6.90	19.00	HP: .38	2.70
Discouragement	Attributions	1st	.84			28.56	IC: .40	3.80
	Hope	2nd	.89	.05	6.10	32.63	AH: .53	3.60
Anger	Attributions	1st	.60			8.35	SLC: .53	2.65
	Hope	2nd	.60	--	--	6.40	HA: .35	2.10
Sadness	Attributions	1st	.51			5.75	SLC: .23	3.00
	Hope	2nd	.66	.15	9.60	8.30	AH: .53	2.70
No excitement	Attributions	1st	.39			3.50	ILC: .80	3.35
	Hope	2nd	.45	.07	7.00	3.50	AH: .28	3.20
Pessimism	Attributions	1st	.73			14.55	PC: .25	2.40
	Hope	2nd	.73	--	--	12.00	AH: .44	3.95
Nervousness	Attributions	1st	.34			3.00	LS: .75	4.90
	Hope	2nd	.43	.09	9.30	3.22	---	---
Anxiety	Attributions	1st	.30			2.35	---	---
	Hope	2nd	.35	--	--	2.30	---	---
No enthusiasm	Attributions	1st	.62			8.90	IC: .40	3.85
	Hope	2nd	.68	.06	4.50	8.85	PH: .52	2.50

Notes: LC = Locus of causality; PC= Personal controllability; S= Stability; EC= External controllability; ILC= Self-student interactive locus of causality; IC= Self-student interactive controllability; SLC= Student locus of causality, SC= Student controllability; AH= Agency hope; PH= Pathway hope; Fch- and F- > 4.50, p < .01; Fch- and F- $\leq$ 4.50, p < .05; t > 2.65, p < .01, t $\leq$ 2.60, p < .05; ---, and --: p > .05.

The above findings partly confirmed Hypotheses 5b and 5d, while they in the main confirmed Hypotheses 5a and 5c.

Discussion

This study provides insight into teachers' attributions and emotions for the interpersonal relationships with their students that have been limitedly examined, and it stresses the role of dispositional hope in the attributional appraisal and emotional experience for the interpersonal relationships.

Attributions for the Interpersonal Relationships

The findings from the present study regarding the attributional pattern of the teacher-student interpersonal relationships in the main complimented our hypotheses and past researches. The high variability of the attributions for the interpersonal relationships underlines the high importance of such relationships in teachers' professional identity, since the individuals try to explain the high ego involvement tasks (Argyle, 2001; Holder & Coleman, 2009; Wang & Hall, 2018; Weiner, 2014). Similarly, the attributional pattern within- and between- the perceived positive and negative interpersonal relationships reinforced previous empirical studies, which have documented a strong positive association between attributional processes and relationship satisfaction (Fincham, 2003), and it indicated the high importance of the desirable good relationships for the participants (Harvey et al., 2005; Hoglund et al., 2008; Weiner, 2002, 2005, 2010). Specifically, by attributing the positive interpersonal relationships to stable and personal positive properties, along with the student- related factors, and self-student interactive internal and controllable causes, the participants enhanced themselves, ensured high expectations of satisfactory relationship in the future, rose the chances to support

the students, multiplied the possibilities of positive future relationships, and, simultaneously, indicated the crucial role of the student in forming a good relationship (Fiedler et al., 1995; Fincham, 2003; Fletcher & Clark, 2002; Lauermann & Karabenick, 2013; Rusbult et al., 2003; Weiner, 2001). By ascribing the negative interpersonal relationships to external-related factors, along with the student- and self-student- negative controllable factors, the teachers protected their ego and their role as a caring person, enhanced the expectations of future good relationship, and underlined the crucial role of the student in forming positive interpersonal relationships (Noddings 1996; Wang & Hall, 2018; Weiner, 2001). Although this specific attributional pattern seems to be adaptive, it should be mentioned that considering the other person-partner as responsible for the negative interpersonal relationship minimizes the chances for better relationship (Fletcher, 2002; Planalp & Rivers, 1996; Weiner, 1995). Teachers' sense of personal responsibility, in addition, is positively related to student outcomes and their own teaching, job satisfaction and engagement (Eren, 2014; Guskey 1984; Halvorsen et al., 2009; Lauermann & Karabenick, 2013; Matteucci & Gosling 2004; Polat & Mahalingappa, 2013; Silverman 2010).

As compared to other attributional dimensions, stability was the most powerful in discriminating the two groups of the interpersonal relationships. This specific finding, might be associated with teachers' initial good relationship expectations, since a good care teacher intend to develop good relationships with his/her students. Accordingly, teachers implicated unstable factors for the relationships that were not consistent with their initial expectations, confirming similar past researches (Berscheid & Ammazalorso, 2003; Bless, 2003; Trope & Gaunt, 2005; Wang & Hall, 2018).

Emotions for the Interpersonal Relationships

The findings regarding the emotions in the most confirmed our predictions and previous researches. Accurately, the teachers experienced various emotions and a variety of intensity of emotions for their interpersonal relationships with their students. They also felt positive emotions of moderate to high intensity for the positive relationships, and negative emotions of moderate to low intensity for the negative relationships. These results show the high importance of the good relationships in teachers' professional- and self- identity (Becker et al., 2014; Erb, 2002; Frenzel, 2014; Forgas & Smith, 2005; Frijda, 1993, 2009; Hargreaves, 2000; Lasky, 2000; Pekrun, 2006; Stephanou et al., 2013; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003; Weiner, 2005; Zembylas, 2003). Further, as Split et al. (2011) propose 'relationships with students can only be harmful or beneficial to the wellbeing of teachers when teachers have a need or desire for personal relationships with students'.

Relationships intentions and expectations could partly explain the participants' emotions. Teachers might have indented and expected positive interpersonal relationships with their students and confirmation of them influenced intense positive emotions (see Bless, 2003; Trope & Gaunt, 2005), while the unexpected bad relationships led to negative emotions. This argument is related to the Berscheid's (1983) emotion-in-relationships model which supports that the greater the interruption when one partner does something unexpected, or fails to do something expected, the higher the intensity of the experienced emotions. Yet, it seems that the negative relationships were against the teachers' goals and desires, since under such conditions individuals experience negative emotions (Berscheid & Ammazalorso, 2003; Carver & Scheier, 2000; Forgas, 2002; Frijda, 2007, 2009; Parrott, 2003). A possible explanation for the lack of negative emotions of high intensity may emanate from the participants' great range of teaching experience (Chen, 2016; Stephanou & Oikonomou, 2018). Research has shown that teachers with long professional experience have been exposed to difficulties and have overcome challenging situations that allow them to develop robust skills and be confident (see Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Ross et al., 1996; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007; Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). However, research needs to examine this speculation.

Also, as supported by previous studies (e.g., Acee et al., 2010; Becker et al., 2014; Demetriou et al., 2009; Pekrun et al., 2010; Stephanou et al., 2013), by the contention that emotions cannot be understood without understanding the social context in which they emerge (Boiger & Mesquita 2012; Efklides & Volet, 2005; Frijda, 2009), by the interpersonal interaction view of the emotions for the interpersonal relationships (Fischer & Manstead, 2008; van Kleef, 2009), and by the Weiner's (2001, 2010) interpersonal attributions, teachers predominately experienced social-, goal and task (relationship itself)-, other- and interaction (self-student)- related emotions, such as not anger, calmness, sympathy, love, exciting and enthusiasm, for the positive interpersonal relationships, and emotions, such as not enthusiasm, not exciting, displeasure and anxiety, for the negative interpersonal relationships. In addition, in line with these speculations and Weiner's (2002, 2005) theory, the participants felt self- and outcome- related emotions, such as pride/shame, cheerfulness / sadness and happiness /unhappiness.

In addition, rewarding other studies and Weiner's (2002, 2005) interpersonal attribution theory, the group of the positive interpersonal relationships was discriminated from the group of the negative interpersonal relationships predominately by the outcome- and interaction (self-student)- related emotions, such as not anxiety-anxiety, cheerfulness, calmness, excitement and enthusiasm.

Interestingly, and in consistency with other researches (e.g., Stephanou & Oikonomou, 2018), the teachers seem to consider the development of their interpersonal relationships because, based on Seligman's (2002) view of classification of emotions, they experienced emotions which are related to the past (e.g., pride/ shame), the present (e.g., pleasure / displeasure) and the future (e.g., encouragement/ discouragement).

It should be mentioned, however, that the experience of some certain negative emotions does not facilitate future good interpersonal relationships. For example, previous empirical investigation illustrate that anger is positively related to attribute malicious intentions to other, anxiety enhances the belief that threating events are about to occur, and sadness shapes malicious attributions for conflicts in close relationships (Fitness et al., 2005; Forgas, 1994, 1995; Planalp & Fitness, 1999). Further, teachers' excessive anxiety has negative impact on their well-being and professional performance, and on their students' progress (Becker et al., 2015; Kyriacou, 2001; Lazarus, 2006), while a moderate level of anxiety activates the teachers to redouble their efforts to achieve their professional goals (Pekrun et al., 2007).

The results from the current study also reinforced previous findings (e.g., Bradbury & Fincham, 1987; Fitness & Fletcher, 1993; Planalp & Fitness, 1999; Stephanou & Balkamou, 2011) in intimate relationships, showing that teachers experienced discrete emotions by cognitively appraised their interpersonal relationships with their students along the attributional dimensions. As expected, attributions were more powerful contributor in the generation of the emotions in the negative than positive interpersonal relationships, confirming the notion that individuals search for explanations of their negative than positive experiences (Weiner, 2002, 2005).

However, the pattern of the impact of the attributions on the emotions is partly in line with the Weiner's (2005, 2010) theory which proposes specific emotional consequences of each attributional dimension. On the other hand, it is in consistency with the Weiner's notion regarding the occurrence of mixed emotions, for example, attributing negative outcome (interpersonal relationship) to lack of effort leads to less pride (locus of causality) and to higher motivating emotions, such as encouragement and confidence (stability). Specifically, stability, followed by self-student interactive controllability and locus of causality were found to be the most significant predictors of most of the emotions for the positive interpersonal relationships, while personal controllability, followed by external controllability, student's locus of causality and self-student interactive controllability, played a significant role in the emotions for the negative interpersonal relationships, underling the interactive nature of the emotions in the interpersonal relationships (Schoebi & Randall, 2015). The positive effect of the self-student interactive attributions on the emotions is an indication of the significant role of the sense of 'being together' in teacher-student relationship development and enhancement (Butler, 2015; Becker et al., 2015; Wang & Hall, 2018). The impact of the external controllable attributions on teachers' emotions (mainly in negative relationships) might hint the effects of the unpredictable school- and classroom- related factors on the development of the teacher-student relationship, and the subsequent emotions (Becker et al., 2015; Frenzel, 2014; Frenzel & Stephens, 2013; Stephanou & Oikonomou, 2018). The positive role of personal controllability in the emotional experience is in accordance το Weiner's (2000) notation that controllability accounts for responsibility witch is related to emotions, and with other studies evidencing the association of teachers' emotions with their attributes of responsibility to students and themselves (Matteucci, 2007; Matteucci & Gosling, 2004). This specific finding indicates the necessity of examining responsibility and blame attributions, along with causal attributions (Fincham, 2003; Murray, 2003).

The Role of Hope in Attributions and Emotions for the Interpersonal Relationships

The findings regarding hope, confirming in the main our predictions, previous studies (Dixson et al., 2017; Elbaz 1992; Eren, 2014; Snyder et al., 2005) and Snyder's (2000) hope theory, revealed that the teachers with high hope enjoyed their interpersonal relationships with their students, and used adaptive appraisal for their good relationships. Similarly, in contrast to low-hope teachers, high-hope teachers suffered less for their bad interpersonal relationships, and they used effective appraisal of the bad interpersonal relationships. Yet, hope served as a better indicator variable for the emotions and the appraisals in the negative than positive interpersonal relationships, supporting previous research evidence documenting the high hope people's use of optimistic and adaptive reappraisal for a variety of stressor situations (Gilham, 2000; Snyder et al., 1999). Overall, these findings sustain that the high hope teachers, not the low hope teachers, searched for something positive, a consistent finding with previous empirical evidence (Carver & Scheier, 2005; Snyder et al. 1991; Wong & Lim 2009).

The valence of the prediction of pathway thinking and agency thinking varied between and within both attributions and emotions for the interpersonal relationships as well as it varied between and within bad and good interpersonal relationships. This specific finding is an indication that hope is interactively constructed by these two elements, as Snyder's theory supports (Snyder et al., 1991; Snyder et al, 2005). Also, the high agency teachers, generally, reported more adaptive attributional and emotional pattern for their bad interpersonal relationships with their students than the high pathway hope teachers, whereas the reverse was the case in the good interpersonal relationships. This may support the notion that agency thinking shares similarity with self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), and, it, being the motivational component of hope, is crucial in the case of difficulties or confronts, like negative interpersonal relationships (Snyder, 1994). However, despite these differences, when interventions are being developed, attention should be given to both constructs of hope, since, according to Snyder's (2002) contention, neither is more adaptive.

The results for the attributions, additionally, showed that, as predicted, hope most impacted on stability than any other attributional dimensions for the positive interpersonal relationships, while, unexpectedly, it mainly influenced external controllability and student's personal controllability for the negative interpersonal relationships, hinting, probably, the desire and assurance only for the former relationships. These findings may also support other findings which reported

that high-hope as compared with low-hope individuals tend to present themselves more positively and social desirable (Snyder, Hoza, et al., 1997; Taylor, 1989). However, research is needed to examine this speculation. Also, hope influenced controllable attributions, supporting other studies which have documented the association of hope with controllability and responsibility for interpersonal relationships and achievement outcomes (Eren, 2014; Hammerness, 2003). Moreover, in the bad interpersonal relationships, the teacher self- related attributional dimensions were most affected by the agency thinking, while the student- and self-student- related attributions were most influenced by pathway thinking. This specific finding is another indication that hope consists of both of them, and that both contribute into coping with the various stressor situations. Research needs to verify their relative role in teachers' interpersonal relationships- related procedures.

The pattern of the effects of hope on emotions is also consistent with empirical evidence showing the important role of hope in expectancy (encouragement / discouragement, optimism/ not optimism, enthusiasm / non enthusiasm)-, goal pursuit (pleasure/ displeasure, cheerfulness / sadness, anxiety) other-related (love / hate, sympathy)-, self (pride / shame)- related affects. Furthermore, hope had direct impact on the emotions for the interpersonal relationships, beyond that afforded by attributions.

Limitations, and Implications of the Findings into Interpersonal Relationships and Future Research

There are some limitations in this study which could be considered fruitful investigation lines in the future. This study examined dispositional hope but an individual may have hope for a specific goal which initially is based on her/his trait hope level (Edwards et al., 2007; Snyder, 1994). Also, data were gathered from 50 junior high school teachers; hence, future research should be evolved into different educational levels, and expands the number of the participants. This study focused on teacher-student interpersonal relationships at one point of time. To better understand these relationships, as suggested by other researches (e.g., Butler, 2015; Martin & Collie, 2019; Schoebi & Randall, 2015), it is interesting to examine the interdependence between individual processes at the interaction level, to link these measures with both momentary and stable individual and relational outcomes.

Despite these limitations, this study contributes to- and expands the extant research in hope and in interpersonal relationships. Precisely, the investigation contributes into knowledge about teachers' attributions and emotions for their own interpersonal relationships, contrarily to the majority of the past researches on teacher attributions having focused predominately on the implications of attributions for students. It also provides additional knowledge about hope in the interpersonal relationships, examining the role of hope in cognitive and emotional appraisals of the bad and good interpersonal relationships.

Teachers' interpersonal relationships with their students constitute a significant aspect of their professional life, as the attribution and emotion patterns suggest. Consequently, strengthening teacher-student relationships could support teacher well-being, by interventions based on the relationship-focused reflection program (Spilt et al., 2012), which help teachers reflect on critical interactions, their own emotional experiences with the student, and the student's perspective. Also, given research indicates that attributional retraining (Seligman, 2002) helps to change maladaptive attributional pattern of interpersonal relationships. Still, accordingly to Van der Want et al. (2015), teachers can enhance their relationships with students by becoming more aware of the meanings they attach to this relationship in specific situations. Similarly, understanding the nature and function of the emotions within good/bad interpersonal relationships is essential. In addition, teachers are needed to be aware that emotional expression influences their students' -partners- emotions and behavior (Clark et al., 1996; Van Kleef et al., 2010; Van Klee et al., 2011).

Hope proved a meaningful factor in interpersonal relationships. Accurately, teachers had certain hope level which impacted on the estimation of their interpersonal relationships with their students as good or bad, and on the subsequent attributions and emotions, mainly in bad relationships. Higher hope teachers, in contrast to low-hope counterparts, reported adaptive attributional and emotional pattern for their interpersonal relationships. Accordingly, hope thinking could be enhanced through interventions, based on Snyder's theory and respective researches (e.g., Feldman & Dreher, 2011). In doing so, attention should be given to both agency thinking and pathway though.

More research is needed to fully understand the role of hope in interpersonal relationships. Research also needs to examine the effects of teachers' beliefs and expectancies about the interpersonal relationships with their students on the observed associations as well as to investigate the consequences of the present emotional and cognitive pattern on relationship development.

Conclusively, the findings from this study contributes into research and practice that may help teachers develop and sustain good interpersonal relationships, with possible predictability of mindful professional life and personal well-being.

References

Acee, T. W., Kim, H., Kim, H. J., Kim, J., Kim, J-I., Chu, H-N., R., Kim, M., Cho, Y., & Wicker, F. W. (2010). Academic boredom in under- and over-challenging situations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 35*(1)*,* 17–27.

Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Ludtke, O. (2017). Does basic need satisfaction mediate the link between stress exposure and well-being? A diary study among beginning teachers. *Learning and Instruction, 50*, 21-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.11.005

Aldrup, K., Klusmann, U., Ludtke, O., Göllner, R., & Trautwein, U. (2018). Student misbehavior and teacher well-being: Testing the mediating role of the teacher-student relationship. *Learning and Instruction, 58*, 126-136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.05.006

Argyle, M. (2001). Social relationships. In M. Hewstone, W. Stroebe, J. P. Codol, & G. M. Stepheson (Eds.), *Introduction to social psychology.* Blackwell.

Aspinwall, L. G., & Staudinger, U. M. (2003). A Psychology of Human Strengths: Some Central Issues of an Emerging Field. In L. G. Aspinwall & U. M. Staudinger (Eds.), *A Psychology of Human Strengths: Fundamental Questions and Future Directions for a Positive Psychology* (pp. 9-22). Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

Averill, J. (1982). *Anger and Aggression: An Essay on Emotion.* Springer-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5743-1

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy*. Freeman.

Baucom, D. H., Epstein, N. B., & Stanton, S. (2006). The treatment of relationship distress: Theoritical perspectives and empirical findings. In A. L. Vangelistic, & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 750-773). Cambridge University Press.

Becker, E. S., Goetz, T., Morger, V., & Ranellucci, J. (2014). The importance of teachers' emotions and instructional behavior for their students' emotions – An experience sampling analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 43*, 15-26.

Becker, E. S., Keller, M. M., Goetz, T., Frenzel, E. C., & Taxer, J. L. (2015). Antecedents of teachers' emotions in the classroom: An intraindividual approach. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 635. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00635

Berkowitz, L., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2004). Toward an understanding of the determinants of anger. *Emotion, 4,* 107–130. https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.4.2.107

Berndsen, M., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2007). On the relationship between responsibility and guilt: Antecedent appraisal or elaborated appraisal? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37,* 774-792.

Berscheid, E. (1983). Emotion. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. H. Harvey, T. L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. Mclintock, I. A. Reptan, & D. R. Peterson (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 110 -168). Freemen.

Berscheid, E, & Ammazzalorso, H. (2003). Emotional experience in close relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 308- 330). Blackwell.

Birmingham, C. (2009). The disposition of hope in teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *36*(4), 27–39.

Blas, L. D. (2007). A circumplex model of interpersonal attributes in middle childhood. *Journal of Personality, 75*(4), 863-897.

Blascovich, J., & Mandes, W. B. (2000). Challenge and threat appraisals: The role of affective cues. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and Thinking: The role of affect in social cognition* (pp. 131 – 152). Cambridge University Press.

Bless, H. (2003). The consequences of mood on the processing of social information. In A. Tesser, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology: Intraindividual processes* (pp. 391- 412). Oxford: Blackwell.

Boiger, M., & Mesquita, B. (2012). The construction of emotion in interactions, relationships, and cultures. *Emotion Review*, *4*(3), 221-229.

Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. D. (1987). Affect and cognition in close relationships: Towards an integrative model. *Cognition and Emotion, 1,* 59-87.

Bullough, R. V. (2011). Hope, happiness, teaching, and learning. In C. Day & C. K. Lee (Eds.), *New understandings of teacher's work. Professional learning and development in schools and higher education* (Vol. 6, pp. 15-30). Springer.

Buss, D. (2005)**.** *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*. Wiley.

Butler, E. A. (2011). Temporal interpersonal emotion systems the "TIES" that form relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*(4), 367–393.

Butler, E. A. (2012). Emotion regulation in cultural context: Implication for wellness and illness. In S. Barnow & N. Balkin (Eds.), *Cultural variations in psychopathology* (93-114). Hogrefe.

Butler, E. A. (2015). Interpersonal affect dynamics: It takes two (and time) to tango. *Emotion Review. 7*, 336-341. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915590622

Carver, C. S., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2009). Anger is an approach-related affect: evidence and implications. *Psychological Bulletin, 135,* 183–204. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013965

Carr, A. (2005). *Positive psychology*. Routledge.

Carver, C. S., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2009). Anger is an approach-related affect: Evidence and implications. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(2), 183–204. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013965

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2000). Scaling back goals and recalibration of the affect system are processes in normal adaptive self-regulation: understanding 'response shift' phenomena. *Social Science and Medicine, 50*, 1715-1722.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2005). Optimism. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 231 -256). University Press.

Chang, E. C. (1998). Hope, problem-solving ability, and coping in a college student population: Some implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 54,* 953–962.

Chang, E. C., & Banks, K. H. (2007). The color and texture of hope: Some preliminary findings and implications for hope theory and counseling among diverse racial/ethnic groups. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13,* 94–103. https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.13.2.94

Chen, J. (2016). Understanding teacher emotions: The development of a teacher emotion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 55,* 68–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.01.001

Claessens, L.C.A., Van Tartwijk, J., Van der Want, A. C., Pennings, H.J.M., Verloop, N., Den Brok, P. J., & Wubbels, T. (2017). Positive teacher-student relationships go beyond the classroom, problematic ones stay inside. *The Journal of Educational Research, 110,* 478-493. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1129595

Clark, M. S., Fitness, J., & Brissette, I. (2003). Understanding people's perceptions of relationships is crucial to understanding their emotional lives. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 253- 278). Blackwell.

Clark, M. S., Pataki, S., & Carver, V. (1996). Some thoughts and feelings on self-presentation of emotions in relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Knowledge structures in close relationships: A social psychological approach* (pp. 247- 274). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Clore, G. L., & Ortony, A. (2010). Appraisal theories: How cognition shapes affects into emotion. In M. Lewins, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barret (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 628-644). Guilford.

Collins, N. L., Ford, M. B., Guichard, A. C., & Allard, L. M. (2006). Working models of attachment and attribution processes in intimate relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 201-219.

Davis, H. A. (2003). Conceptualizing the role and influence of student-teacher relationships on children's social and cognitive development. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(4), 207-234.

Day, C., & Leitch, R. (2001). Teachers' and teacher educators' lives: The role of emotion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(4), 403-415.

Demetriou, H., Wilson, E., & Winterbottom, M. (2009). The role of emotion in teaching: Are there differences between male and female newly qualified teachers' approaches to teaching? *Educational Studies, 35*(4), 449–473.

Demir, M. (2008). Sweetheart, you really make me happy: Romantic relationship quality and personality as predictors of happiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*(2), 257-277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-007-9051-8

den Brok, P., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2004). Interpersonal teacher behaviour and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 15,* 407-442.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 96*, 542- 575.

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being. The science of happiness and a proposal for national index. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 34 – 43.

Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2005). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 63-73). University Press.

Diener, E., & Seligman, M. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological Science, 13*, 81-84.

Dix, T. H., & Grusec, J. E. (1985). Parent attribution processes in the socialization of children. In I. E. Siegel (Ed.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (pp. 177–199). Erlbaum.

Dixson, D. D. (2017). *Hope across achievement: Examining psychometric properties of the children's hope scale across the range of achievement.* SAGE Open. https://doi.org/7.2158244017717304

Dixson, D. D., Worrell, F. C., & Mello, Z. (2017). Profiles of hope: How clusters of hope relate to school variables. *Learning and Individual Differences, 59,* 55-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.08.011

Edwards, L. M., Rand, K. L., Lopez, S. J., & Snyder, C. R. (2007). Understanding hope: A review of measurement and construct validity research. In A. D. Ong & M. H. M. van Dulmen (Eds.), *Series in positive psychology. Oxford handbook of methods in positive psychology* (pp. 83–95). Oxford University Press.

Erb, C. S. (2002). *The emotional whirlpool of beginning teachers' work* [Paper presentation]. Annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Studies in Education, Canada, Toronto.

Erber, R., & Gilmour, R (1995). *Theoretical frameworks for personal relationships*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eren, A. (2014). Uncovering the links between prospective teachers' personal responsibility, academic optimism, hope, and emotions about teaching: a mediation analysis. *Social Psychology of Education 17*(1), 73-114.

Ellsworth, P. C., & Scherer, K. R. (2003). Appraisal processes in emotion. In R. J. Davidson & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *Handbook of Affective Sciences* (pp. 572-596). Oxford University Press.

Feldman, D. B., & Dreher, D. E. (2011). Can hope be changed in 90 minutes? Testing the efficacy of a single-session goal-pursuit intervention for college students. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13,* 745–759. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9292-4.

Feldman, D. B., & Kubota, M. (2015). Hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and academic achievement: Distinguishing constructs and levels of specificity in predicting college grade-point average. *Learning and Individual Differences, 37*, 210–216. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.lindif.2014.11.022.

Fiedler, K., Semin, G. R., Finkenauer, D., & Berkel, I. (1995). Actor- observer bias in close relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 525 – 538.

Fincham, F. D. (1985). Attribution processes in distressed and nondistressed couples: II. Responsibility for marital problems. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 94*(2), 183–190. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.94.2.183

Fincham, F. D. (2003). Attributions in close relationships: From Balkanization to Integration. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 3-31). Blackwell.

Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2008). Social functions of emotion. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 456–468). The Guilford Press

Fitness, J., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1993). Love, hate, anger and jealousy in close relationships: A cognitive appraisal and prototype analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65,* 942-958.

Fitness, J., Fletcher, G. J. O., & Overall, N. (2005). Interpersonal attraction and intimate relationships. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 258-278). Sage.

Fletcher, G. J. O. (2002). *The new science of intimate relationships*. Basil Blackwell.

Fletcher, G. J. O., & Clark, M. S. (2002). *Handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes.* Basil Blackwell.

Fletcher, G. J. O., & Clark, M. S. (2003). Introduction. In G. J. O., Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes.* Blackwell.

Fletcher, G. J. O., Fitness, J., & Blampied, N. M. (1990). The link between attributions and happiness in close relationships: The role of depression and explanatory style. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*, 243-255.

Fletcher, G. J. O., & Thomas, G. (1996). Close relationship lay theories: Their structure and function. In G. J. O. Fletcher & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Knowledge structures in close relationships: A social psychological approach.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fletcher, G. J. O., & Thomas, G. (2000). Behavior and on-line cognition in marital interaction. *Personal Relationships, 7,* 111 – 130.

Forgas, J. P. (1994). Sad and guilty? Affective influences on the explanation of conflict episodes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,* 56-68.

Forgas, J. P. (1995). Mood and judgement: The affect infusion model (AIM). *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(1), 39-66.

Forgas, J. P. (2002). Feeling and doing: Affective influences on interpersonal behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*, 1 – 28.

Forgas, J. P., & Smith, C. A. (2005). Affect and Emotion. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 161 -189). Sage.

Frenzel, A. C. (2014). Teacher emotions. In R. Pekrun & A. Linnenbrink (Eds.), *International handbook of emotions in education* (pp. 494-519). Routledge

Frenzel, A. C., & Stephens, E. J. (2013). Emotions. In N. C. Hall & T. Goetz (Eds.), *Emotion, Motivation, and Self-regulation: A Handbook for Teachers* (pp. 1-56). Emerald.

Fried, L., Mansfield, C., & Dobozy, E. (2015). Teacher emotion research: Introducing a conceptual model to guide future research. *Issues in Educational Research, 25*(4), 415–441.

Friedman, I. A. (2000). Burnout in teachers: Shattered dreams of impeccable professional performance. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*, 595-606.

Friedman, I. A. (2006). Classroom management and teacher stress and burnout. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 925–944). Erlbaum.

Frijda, N. H. (Ed.). (1993). *Appraisal and beyond: Special Issue of Cognition and Emotion*. Erlbaum.

Frijda, N. H. (2007). *The laws of emotion*. Erlbaum.

Frijda, N. H. (2009). Emotions, individual differences, and time course: Reflections. *Cognition and Emotion, 23,* 1444-1461.

Gagné, F. M., & Lydon, J. E. (2004). Bias and accuracy in close relationships: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*(4), 322-338.

Gastaldi, F. G.,Pasta, T., Longobardi, C., Prino, L. E., & Quaglia, R. (2014). Measuring the influence of stress and burnout in teacher-child relationship. *European Journal of Education and Psychology, 7*, 17-28. https://doi.org/10.1989/ejep.v7il.149

Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias: The what, when, how and why of unwarranted dispositional inference. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 21 - 38.

Gilham, J. (2000). *The science of optimism and hope*. Templeton Foundation Press.

Graham, S., & Hoehn, S. (1995). Children's understanding of aggression and withdrawal as social stigmas: An attributional analysis. C*hild Development, 66,* 1143-1161.

Greitemeyer, T., & Weiner, B. (2003). Asymmetrical attributions for approach versus avoidance behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 1371-1382.

Guskey, T.R. (1984). The influence of change in instructional effectiveness upon the affective characteristics of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *21*(2), 245–259.

Hammerness, K. (2003). Learning to hope, or hoping to learn? The role of vision in the early professional lives of teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *54*(1), 43–56.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Mixed emotions: Teachers' perceptions of their interactions with students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*, 811–826.

Hargreaves, A. (2004). Inclusive and exclusive educational change: Emotional responses of teachers and implications for leadership. *School Leadership & Management, 24*(3), 287–309.

Harvey, J. H. (1987). Attributions in close relationships: Research and theoretical development. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 5,* 8-20.

Harvey, J.H., & Omarzu, J. (1999). Minding the close relationship. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 1,* 223-239.

Harvey, J., Pauwels, B., & Zickmund, S. (2005). Relationship connections: The role of minding in the enhancement of closeness. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 423 - 434). Oxford: University Press.

Halvorsen, A. L., Lee, V. E., & Andrade, F. H. (2009). A mixed-method study of teachers' attitudes about teaching in urban and low-income schools. *Urban Education*, *44*(2), 181-224.

Hellman, C. M., & Gwinn, C. (2017). Camp HOPE as an intervention for children exposed to domestic violence: A program evaluation of hope and strength of character. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 34*, 269–276. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-016-0460-6

Helm, J. L., Sbarra, D., & Ferrer, E. (2012). Assessing cross-partner associations in physiological responses via coupled oscillator models. *Emotion, 12,* 748–762.

Hewstone, M., & Antaki, M. (2001). Attribution theory and social explanations. In M. Hewstone, W. Stroebe, J. P. Codol, & G. M. Stepheson (Eds.), *Introduction to social psychology* (pp.111-141). Basil Blackwell.

Hoglund, W. L. G., Lalonde, C. E., & Leadbeater, B. J. (2008). Social-cognitive competence, peer rejection and neglect, and behavioral and emotional problems in middle childhood, *Social Development, 17*(3), 528-553.

Holder, M. D., & Coleman, B. (2009). The contribution of social relationships to children's happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 10,* 329-349.

Jo, S. H. (2014). Teacher commitment: Exploring associations with relationships and emotions. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 43,* 120-130.

Kalish, Y., & Robins, G. (2006). Psychological predispositions and network structure: The relationship between individual predispositions, structural holes and network closure. *Social Networks, 28*(1), 56-84.

Karney, B. R., McNulty, J. K., & Bradbury, T. N. (2003). Cognition and the development of close relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 32-59). Blackwell.

Keller, M. M., Woolfolk Hoy, A. E., Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2016). Teacher enthusiasm: Reviewing and redefining a complex construct. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*, 743-769. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9354-y

Keltner, D., Ellsworth, P. C., & Edwards, K. (1993). Beyond simple pessimism: Effects of sadness and anger on social judgement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64,* 740-752.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *American Psychological Association, 102*(3), 741-756.

Klassen, R. M., Perry, N. E., & Frenzel, A. C. (2012). Teachers' relatedness with students: An underemphasized component of teachers' basic psychological needs. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(1), 150–165. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026253

Kuppens, P., & Van Mechelen, I. (2007). Interactional appraisal models for the anger appraisals of threatened self-esteem, other-blame, and frustration. *Cognition and Emotion, 2*1, 56–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930600859219

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher Stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review, 53*(1), 27-35.

Lasky, S. (2000). The cultural and emotional politics of teacher–parent interactions. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*, 843–860.

Lauermann, F., & Karabenick, S. A. (2013). The meaning and measure of teachers' sense of responsibility for educational outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *30*, 13–26.

Lazarus, R., S. (1991). *Emotions and adaptation*. Oxford University Press.

Lazarus, R., S. (2006). Stress and Emotions: A new Synthesis. Springer.

Leary, M. R. (2000). Affect, cognition and the social emotions. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and Thinking: The role of affect in social cognition* (pp. 331-356). University Press.

Lucas, R. E., & Dyrenforth, P. S. (2006). Does the existence of social relationships matter for subjective well-being? In K. D. Vohs & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Self and Relationships: Connecting Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Processes* (pp. 254-273). Guilford,

Lucas, R. E., Dyrenforth, P. S., & Diener, E. (2008). Four myths about subjective well-being. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 2001-2015.

Lyons, C. W., & Higgings, A. (2014). The role of emotions and interpersonal relationships in educational reform. In D. Zandvliet, P. den Brok, T., Mainhard, & J. W. F. van Tartwijk (Eds.), *Interpersonal relationships in education: From theory to practice* (pp. 111-132). Rotterdam: Sense.

Macnow, A. S. (2019). *MCAT Behavioral Sciences Review 2018-2019.* Kaplan

Magaletta, P. R., Oliver, J. M. (1999). The hope construct, will, and ways: Their relations with self-efficacy, optimism, and general well-being. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 55,* 539-551.

Marques, S. C., Gallagher, M. W., & Lopez, S. J. (2017). Hope- and Academic-Related Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *School Mental Health, 9*(3), 250-262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-017-9212-9

Martin, A. J. (2014). Interpersonal relationships and students' academic and non-academic development: What outcomes peers, parents, and teachers do and do not impact. In D. Zandvliet., P. den Brok, T. Mainhard, & J. Tartwijk (Eds), *Interpersonal relationships in education: From theory to practice* (pp. 9-24). Sense.

Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2019). Teacher–student relationships and students' engagement in high school: Does the number of negative and positive relationships with teachers matter? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 111*(5), 861–876. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000317

Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (2016). The role of teacher-student relationships in unlocking students' academic potential: Exploring motivation, engagement, resilience, adaptability, goals, and instruction. In K. R. Wentzel & G. Ramani (Eds), *Handbook of social influences on social-emotional, motivation, and cognitive outcomes in school contexts* (pp. 158-177). Routledge.

Martin, A. J., & Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal Relationships, Motivation, Engagement, and Achievement: Yields for Theory, Current Issues, and Educational Practice. *Review of Educational Research 79*(1), 327-365.

Matteucci, M. C. (2007). Teachers facing school failure: the social valorization of effort in the school context. *Social Psychology of Education*, *10*(1), 29–53.

Matteucci, M. C., & Gosling, P. (2004). Italian and French teachers faced with pupil's academic failure: The 'norm of effort'. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *19*(2), 147–166.

Maulana R, Opdenakker, M. C, & Bosker, R. (2014). Teacher-student interpersonal relationships do change and affect academic motivation: a multilevel growth curve modelling. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 459-82. https://doi.org/ 10.1111/bjep.12031.

McAuley, E., Duncan, T. E., & Russell, D. W. (1992). Measuring causal attributions: The revised Causal Dimension Scale (CDSII). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 566-573.

Milatz, A., Luftenegger, M., Schober, B. (2015). Teachers' relationship closeness with students as a resource for teacher wellbeing: A response surface analytical approach. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01949

Noddings, N. (1996). The caring professional. In S. Gordon, P. Benner, & N. Noddings (Eds.), *Caregiving: Readings in knowledge, practice, ethics, and politics* (pp. 160–172). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Davis, C. G. (2005). Positive responses to loss: Perceiving benefits and growth. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 598 - 607). University Press.

Oatley, K., & Jenkins, J. (1998). *Understanding emotions*. Blackwell.

O'Connor, K. E. (2008). "You choose to care": Teachers, emotions and professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 117–126.

Ong, A. D., Edwards, L. M., & Bergeman, C. S. (2006). Hope as a source of resilience in later adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*, 1263-1273.

Opdenakker, M., Maulana, R., & den Brok, P. (2012). Teacher–student interpersonal relationships and academic motivation within one school year: Developmental changes and linkage. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 23, 95-119*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2011.619198

Ortony, A., Clore, G. L., & Collins, A. (1988). *The cognitive structure of emotions*. University Press.

Parrott, W. G. (2003). The nature of emotions. In A. Tesser, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology: Intraindividual processes* (pp. 375- 390). Blackwell.

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control- value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational Psychology Review, 18,* 315-341.

Pekrun, R., Frenzel, A., Goetz, T., & Perry, R. P. (2007). The control- value theory of achievement emotions: An integrative approach to emotions in education. In P. A. Schutz, & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *Emotion in education* (pp. 13-36). Academic Press. doi:10.1016/B978-012372545-5/50003-4

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Daniels, L. M., Stupnisky, R. H., & Perry, R. P. (2010). Boredom in Achievement Settings: Exploring Control-Value Antecedents and Performance Outcomes of a Neglected Emotion. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(3), 531-549.

Pekrun, R., & Schutz, P. A. (2007). Where Do We Go from Here? Implications and Future Directions for Inquiry on Emotions in Education. In P. Schutz & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *Emotion in Education* (pp. 313-331). Academic Press

Pennings, H. J. M., Brekelmans, M., Sadler, P., Claessens, L. C. A., van der Want, A. C., & van Tartwijk, J. (2018). Interpersonal adaptation in teacher-student interaction. *Learning and Instruction, 55*, 41-57.

Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist, 55*, 44-55.

Peterson C., & Steen, T. A. (2005). Optimistic explanatory style. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 244 -256). University Press

Pianta, R. C. (2006). Classroom management and relationships between children and teachers: Implications for research and practice. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 685–710). Erlbaum.

Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Allen, J. P. (2012). Teacher-student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom interactions. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 365–386). Springer Science + Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_17

Planalp, S., & Fitness, J. (1999). Thinking / feeling about personal and social relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*, 731-750.

Planalp, S., & Rivers, M. (1996). Changes in knowledge of personal relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Knowledge structures in close relationships: A social psychological approach.* Lawrence Erlbaum.

Polat, N., & Mahalingappa, L. (2013). Pre- and in-service teachers' beliefs about ELLs in content area classes: A case for inclusion, responsibility, and instructional support. *Teaching Education*, *24*(1), 58–83.

Prager, K. J. (1995). *The psychology of intimacy.* Guilford.

Rand, K. L., & Cheavens, J. S, (2009). Hope theory. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (323 - 333). Oxford University Press.

Rand, K. L., Martin, A. D., & Shea, A. M. (2011). Hope, but not optimism, predicts academic performance of law students beyond previous academic achievement. *Journal of Research in Personality, 45(*6), 683–686. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.08.004

Randall, A. K., & Butler, E. A. (2013). Attachment and emotion transmission within romantic relationships: Merging intrapersonal and inter-personal perspectives. *Journal of Relationships Research, 4,* 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2013.10

Roberts, M. C., Brown, K. J., Johnson, R. J., & Reinke, J. (2005). Positive psychology for children: Development, prevention, and promotion. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 663 - 686). University Press.

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research, 81*, 493-529. https://doi.org//10.1007/s10648-011-9170-y

Rose, A. J. (2007). Structure, content, and socioemotional correlates of girls' and boys' friendships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 53*(3), 489-506.

Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12,* 385-400. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00046-M

Ruehlman, L. S., & Wolchik, S. A. (1988). Personal goals and interpersonal support and hindrance as factors in psychological distress and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 293- 301.

Rusbult, C. E., Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2003). Interdependence in close relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 359 – 387). Blackwell.

Sanford, K., & Grace, A. J. (2011). Emotion and underlying concerns during couples' conflict: An investigation of within-person change. *Personal Relationships*, *18*(1), 96–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475–6811.2010.01317.x

Saphire-Bernstein, S., & Taylor, S. E. (2013). Close Relationships and Happiness. In I. Boniwell, S. A. David, & A. C. Ayers (Eds.), Oxford Handbook of Happiness (pp. 821–833). Oxford University Press.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology, 4*(3), 219–247. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.4.3.219

Scheier, M., Carver, C., & Bridges, M. (2000). Optimism, pessimism and psychological well-being. In E. Chang (Ed.), *Optimism and Pessimism: Theory, Research and Practice.* American Psychological Association.

Schmidt, S., Tinti, C., Levine, L. J., & Testa, S. (2010). Appraisals, emotions and emotion regulation: An integrative approach. *Motivation and Emotion, 34*(1), 63–72. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-010-9155-z

Schoebi, D. (2008). The coregulation of daily affect in marital relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(3), 595–604. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.595

Schoebi, D., & Randall, A. K. (2015). Emotional Dynamics in Intimate Relationships. *Emotion Review, 7*(4), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915590620

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2006). Competence and Control Beliefs: Distinguishing the Means and Ends. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (p. 349–367). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Schutz, P. A., & DeCuir-Gunby, J. T. (2002). Inquiry on emotions in education. *Educational Psychologist, 37*, 125-134. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702_7.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realise your potential for lasting fulfilment*. Free Press.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). *Learned optimism*. Knopf.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Positive psychology, Positive prevention, and Positive therapy. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 3- 9). University Press.

Siemer, M., Mauss I., & Gross, J. (2007). Same situation-different emotions: How appraisals shape our emotions. *Emotion, 7,* 592-600.

Silverman, S. K. (2010). What is diversity? An inquiry into preservice teacher beliefs. *American Educational Research Journal*, *47*(2), 292–329.

Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1987). Patterns of appraisal and emotion related to taking an exam. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 475 – 488.

Smith, C. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1990). Emotions and adaptation. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 609 – 637). Guilford

Smith, C. A., & Kirby, L. D. (2000). Consequences require antecedents: Toward a process model of emotion elicitation. In J. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and Thinking: The role of affect in social cognition* (pp. 83 – 106). Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, (1994). Hope and optimism. In V. S. Ramachandren (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behaviour* (Vol. 2, pp. 535-542). Academic Press.

Snyder, C. R. (2000). *Handbook of hope.* Academic press.

Snyder, C. R. (2004). Hope and depression: A light in the darkness. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23,* 347–351. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.23.3.347.35458.

Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind*. Psychological Inquiry, 13,* 249-275. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1304_01

Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., & Michael, S. T. (1999). Hoping. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Coping: The psychology of what works* (pp. 205-231). Oxford University Press.

Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., & Sympson, S. C. (1997). Hope: An individual motive for social commerce. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice, 1,* 107-118.

Snyder, C. R., Feldman, D. B., Taylor, J. D., Schroeder, L. L., & Adams, V. (2000). The roles of hopeful thinking in preventing problems and enhancing strengths. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 15,* 262-295.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S.T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 570-583.

Snyder, C. R., Irving, L., & Anderson, J. R. (1991). Hope and health: Measuring the will and the ways. In C. R. Snyder & D. R. Forsyth (Eds.), *Handbook of Social and clinical psychology: The health perspective* (pp. 285 – 305). Pergamon.

Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J., (2007). *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical explorations of human strengths*. Sage Publications

Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L. R, & Sigmon, D. R. (2005). Hope theory. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 257 -276). University Press.

Snyder, C. R., Shorey, H. S., & Rand, K. L. (2006). Using hope theory to teach and mentor academically at-risk students. In W. Buskist & S. F. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of the teaching of psychology* (pp. 170-174). Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470754924.ch29

Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T. (2011). Teacher Well-being: The Importance of Teacher-Student Relationships. *Educational Psychology Review*, *23*, 457-477. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9170-y

Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T., & van der Leij, A. (2012).   Supporting teachers' relationships with disruptive children: The potential of relationship-focused reflection.   *Attachment & Human Development, 14,* 305-318. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2012.672286

Stephanou, G. (2005). Academic performance and interpersonal relationships [in Greek]. In F. Vlachos, F. Bonoti, P. Metallidou, I. Dermitzaki, & A. Efklides (Eds.), *Human behavior and learning. Scientific Annals of the Psychological Society of Northern Greece* (Vol. 3, pp. 201-228). Ellinika Grammata.

Stephanou, G. (2011). Children friendship: The role of hope in attributions, emotions and expectations. *Psychology, 2*(8), 875-888.

Stephanou, G. (2014). Feelings for Child-Teacher Relationship, and Emotions about the Teacher in Kindergarten: Effects on Learning Motivation, Competence Beliefs and Performance in Mathematics and Literacy. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 22*(4), 457-477.

Stephanou, G. (2012). Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood: Perception-Partner Ideal Discrepancies, Attributions, and Expectations. *Psychology, 3*(2), 150-160.

Stephanou, G. (2007). Students' appraisals and emotions for interpersonal relationships with teachers. In S. Vosniadou, D. Kayser, & A. Protopapas, *Proceedings of The European Cognitive Science Conference 2007* (pp. 568 - 574). Lawrence Erlibaum Associates.

Stephanou, G, & Balkamou, K. (2011). Children's attributions and emotions for their friendships with their best friend. *Psychology Research, 1*(6), 392-409*.*

Stephanou, G., & Doulkeridou, M. (2020). Parental competence beliefs and attributions for achievement in kindergarten: Effects on parent expectations for later school achievement. *International Journal of Social Science Research, 8(2),199-224.* https://doi.org/*10.5296/ijssr.v8i2.16766* ,

Stephanou, G., Gkavras, G., & Doulkeridou, M. (2013). The role of teachers' self- and collective- efficacy beliefs on their job satisfaction and experienced emotions in school. *Psychology, 4(*3), 268-278. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2013.43A040

Stephanou, G., & Mastora, M. (2013). Teachers' attributions and emotions for their teaching over a kindergarten year. *International Journal of Advances in Psychologyv, 2*(3), 137-156.

Stephanou, G., & Oikonomou, A. (2018). Teacher Emotions in Primary and Secondary Education: Effects of Self-Efficacy and Collective-Efficacy, and Problem-Solving Appraisal as a Moderating Mechanism. *Psychology, 9*, 820-875.

Stephanou, G., & Tsoni, F. (2019). Effects of metacognition on performance in mathematics and language- multiple mediation of hope and general self-efficacy. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 11,* 30-52.

Sutton, R. E., & Wheatley, K. E. (2003). Teachers' emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review*, *15*, 327–358.

Taylor, S. E. (1989). *Positive illusions: Creative self-deception and the healthy mind*. Basic Books.

Taylor, S. E. (2010). Social support: A review. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Health Psychology* (pp. 189-214). Oxford University Press.

 Timmermans, T., Van Mechelen, I., & Kuppens, P. (2010). The relationship between individual differences in intraindividual variability in core affect and interpersonal behavior. *European Journal of Personality, 24*(8), 623-638.

Tong, E. M. W., & Jia, L. (2017). Positive emotion, appraisal, and the role of appraisal overlap in positive emotion co-occurrence. *Emotion, 17*(1), 40-54. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000203

Trope, Y., & Gaunt, R. (2005). Attribution and person perception. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 190 -208). Sage.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 944-956.

Valle, M. F., Huebner, E. S., & Suldo, S. M. (2006). An Analysis of Hope as a Psychological Strength. *Journal of School Psychology, 44,* 393-406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.03.005

Van der Want, A. C., Den Brok, P., Beijaard, D., Brekelmans, M., Claessens, L., & Pennings, H. J. M. (2015). Teachers' interpersonal role identity. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 59,* 424-442. http://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.904428.

Van Dijk, W. W., & Zeelenberg, M. (2002). Investigating the appraisal patterns of regret and disappointment. *Motivation and Emotion, 26,*321–33.1

Van Doorn, E. A., van Kleef, G. A., & van der Pligt, J. (2015). Deriving meaning from others' emotions: Attribution, appraisal, and the use of emotions as social information. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6, 1077.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01077

Van Doorn, E. A., Van Kleef, G. A., & Van der Pligt, J. (2014). How instructors' emotional expressions shape students' learning performance: the roles of anger, happiness, and regulatory focus. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143*(3), 980–984. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035226

Van Kleef, G. A. (2009). How Emotions Regulate Social Life: The Emotions as Social Information (EASI) Model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18*(3), 184-188.

Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2010). An interpersonal approach to emotion in social decision making: The emotions as social information model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 42,* 45–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(10)42002-X

Van Kleef, G. A., Van Doorn, E. A., Heerdink, M. W., & Koning L. F. (2011). Emotion is for influence. *European Review of Social Psychology, 22*(1), 111–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2011.627192

Veldman, I., Van Tartwijk, J., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2013). Job satisfaction and teacher-student relationships across the teaching career: Four case studies. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 32*, 55-65.

Wang, H., & Hall, N. C., (2018). A systematic review of teachers' causal attributions: prevalence, correlates, and consequences. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9,* 1-22. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02305

Wee, J. R. H. (2017). *How and when do attributions affect relationship satisfaction? Judgments of partner suitability and implicit theories of relationships* [Doctoral dissertation, Singapore Management University]. SMU Dissertations and Theses Collection. https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/etd_coll_all/42

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories and research.* Sage.

Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct.* Guilford.

Weiner, B. (2001). Intrapersonal and interpersonal theories of motivation from an attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 12*, 1-14.

Weiner, B. (2002). *Social emotions and personality inferences: A Scaffold for a new direction in the study of achievement motivation* [Key Speech]. The 8th WATM & Motivation and Emotion Conference, Moskow, Russia.

Weiner, B. (2003). The classroom as a courtroom. *Social Psychological Education, 6,* 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021736217048

Weiner, B. (2005). Motivation from an attribution perspective and the social psychology of perceived competence. In Elliot, A. J., & Dweck, C. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* (pp. 73-84). Guilford.

Weiner, B. (2006). *Social motivation, justice, and the moral emotions: An attributional approach*. Erlbaum.

Weiner, B. (2010). The development of an attribution-based theory of motivation: A history of ideas. *Educational Psychology, 45,* 28–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/0046152090343

Weiner B. (2014). The attribution approach to emotion and motivation: history, hypotheses, home runs, headaches/heartaches. *Emotion Review, 6*, 353–361.

Williams, B., & Gilmore, J. (2008). Annotation: Sociometry and peer relationships. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatric, 35,* 997-1013.

Wolters, C. A., & Daugherty, S. G. (2007). Goal Structures and Teachers' Sense of Efficacy: Their Relation and Association to Teaching Experience and Academic Level. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(1), 181-193.

Wong, S. S., & Lim, T. (2009). Hope versus optimism in Singaporean adolescents: Contributions to depression and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 648–652

Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., den Brok, P., Wijsman, L., Mainhard, T., & van Tartwijk, J. (2014). Teacher-student relationships and classroom management. In E. T. Emmer, E. Sabornie, C. Evertson, & C. Weinstein (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (2nd ed., pp. 363–386). Routledge.

Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., den Brok, P., Levy, J., Mainhard, T., & van Tartwijk, J. (2012). Let's make things better: Development in research on interpersonal relationships in education. In T. Wubbels, P. den Brok, J. van Tartwijk, & J. Levy (Eds.) *Interpersonal relationships in education: An overview of contemporary research* (pp. 225–250). Sense Publishers.

Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Den Brok, P., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in The Netherlands. In C. Evertson, & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research practice and contemporary issues* (pp. 1161-1191). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ybarra, O., & Stephan, W. G. (1999). Attributional orientation and the prediction of behavior: The attribution-prediction bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 718- 727.

Yoon, J. S. (2002). Teacher characteristics as predictors of teacher- student relationships: Stress, negative affect, and self-efficacy. *Social Behavior and Personality, 30,* 485-493.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Caring for Teacher Emotion: Reflections on Teacher Self-Development. *Studies in Philosophy & Education, 22*(2), 103-125. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022293304065

Zembylas, M. (2004). The emotional characteristics of teaching: An ethnographic study of one teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 185-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.09.008

Zandvliet, D., den Brok, P., Mainhard, T., & van Tartwijk, J. W. F. (Eds.) (2014). *Interpersonal relationships in education: From theory to practice*. Sense.