

Adaptation and Validation of a Teacher-Student Rapport Scale in Mexican EFL Classrooms

*Adaptación y Validación de una Escala
de Rapport Profesor-Alumno en Aulas
de Inglés como Lengua Extranjera (EFL)
en México*

Autores:

Arleth Galvan Frausto - agfrausto@docentes.uat.edu.mx

Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas

Elsa Fernanda González Quintero - efgonzalez@docentes.uat.edu.mx

Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas

Fecha de envío:

22 de Julio de 2025

Fecha de aceptación:

7 de Octubre de 2025

Fecha de publicación:

30 de Octubre de 2025

ABSTRACT

Rapport is key in the classroom, as it generates a positive environment that motivates students to actively participate in their learning (Rowan and Grootenboer, 2017). Studies have highlighted its importance since it influences engagement, performance, and academic motivation (Zhang, 2023; Meng, 2021). However, in English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching, this concept has not been studied widely. To fill this gap, this study aimed to validate an adapted questionnaire to measure teacher rapport at a public state university in northeastern Mexico. The study employed a quantitative, non-experimental research method grounded in psychometric validation procedures. The research question was: To what extent is the instrument a valid and reliable measure of teacher rapport? Results supported the hypothesis that the scale would demonstrate a clear factor structure, reliability ($\alpha \geq .91$), and validity. The results confirmed the reliability of the questionnaire, thus contributing to research on teacher rapport in EFL teaching.

KEY WORDS:

Teacher-student rapport, EFL, adaptation, validation, higher education.

RESUMEN

Rapport es clave en el aula, ya que genera un ambiente positivo que motiva a los estudiantes a participar activamente en su aprendizaje (Rowan y Grootenboer, 2017). Estudios han destacado su importancia ya que influye en el compromiso, el rendimiento y la motivación académica (Zhang, 2023; Meng, 2021). Sin embargo, en la enseñanza de inglés como lengua extranjera, este concepto no se ha estudiado ampliamente. Este estudio tuvo como objetivo validar un cuestionario adaptado para medir rapport docente en una Universidad pública estatal en México. El estudio empleó un método de investigación cuantitativo, no experimental basado en procedimientos de

validación psicométrica. La pregunta de investigación fue ¿Hasta qué punto es el instrumento una medida válida y confiable de rapport del docente? Los resultados respaldaron la hipótesis de que la escala demostraría una estructura factorial clara, confiabilidad ($\alpha \geq .91$) y validez, contribuyendo así a la investigación sobre rapport en EFL.

PALABRAS CLAVE:

Rapport docente-alumno, enseñanza del idioma inglés como lengua extranjera, adaptación, validación, educación superior.

Introduction

Rapport is commonly defined as a harmonious and empathetic connection between individuals, characterized by mutual understanding, trust, and effective communication (Mercer and Gkonou, 2020; Rowan and Grootenboer, 2017). In educational contexts, particularly in language learning environments, rapport plays a pivotal role in shaping classroom dynamics, enhancing student motivation, and fostering a supportive atmosphere conducive to learning (Zhang, 2023; Wang et al., 2021; Meng, 2021). Despite its recognized importance, rapport has not been studied widely in the Mexican context (Jordán and Codana, 2019; Orduña, 2019; Magaña, 2022), although rapport has been explored in other fields, there remains a need for more context-specific investigations that examine how rapport is perceived in diverse educational settings.

This research seeks to address the identified gap by examining the dynamics of rapport in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms in Mexico, with the objective of enriching current perspectives through a culturally contextualized lens.

This study is situated within the field of educational psychology and language pedagogy, specifically focusing on the dynamics of teacher-student rapport in EFL settings. The research aligns with the broader interest in understanding how affective factors influence learner engagement and academic success in higher education. The specific research topic is the development and validation of a psychometric instrument to measure teacher-student rapport in undergraduate EFL classrooms. The study adopts a descriptive and evaluative approach, descriptive in its exploration of students' perceptions across various rapport dimensions, and evaluative in its assessment of the reliability and validity of the instrument designed to capture those perceptions.

Despite the recognized importance of teacher-student rapport in promoting motivation and well-being, the Mexican EFL context lacks standardized tools to assess it. This study bridges that gap by validating a culturally relevant scale for higher education, enabling educators to evaluate and improve relational dynamics in a more data-driven way.

Theoretical Framework

Rapport seems to be as important as both a foundational element of instruction and the initial point of engagement in the learning process, it is perhaps one of the critical components of educational interaction. "Rapport can be built by educators in the class by advancing free expression, respecting learners' mentalities, giving fitting criticism, utilizing humour, displaying eagerness in learners' education, and being delicate and enthusiastic" (Weimer, 2010, cited in Meng, 2021, p. 4).

According to the benefits of rapport between teacher and students, it is showed that rapport can help to get a better educational performance, and the students' scholar commitment becomes more outstanding because the students feel that their teachers like them (Wang y Eccles, 2013, cited in Meng, 2021). "Rapport has also been shown to lower student anxiety in the classroom" (Coupland, 2003, cited in Webb and Barrett, 2014, p. 11). In EFL classrooms, it is suggested to keep in mind that the role of the teacher is to work with human beings and each of them come from different contexts which has to be taken on account at the moment of planning and teaching, so that the situation in the classroom will be personalized, therefore, the probability to obtain better results would be higher.

On the contrary, "a negative teacher-student relationship may lead to stress, anxiety, and aggression in students" (Hashemi, 2011; Alnuzaili and Uddin, 2020, cited in Zhou, 2021, p. 1). If the teacher does not care about having a good rapport with the student, it may impact on the acquisition of knowledge. Therefore, "instructor-student relationships are a critical component of an effective classroom." (Web and Barrett, 2014, p. 10). In addition, Hooks (2003) argues that the classroom should be "a life-sustaining and mind-expanding, a place of liberating mutuality where teacher and student together work in partnership" (cited in Rowan and Grootenboer, 2017, p. 12).

The process of teaching and learning a language is a complex process, which implies that both the teacher and the student have skills that help them understand the language so that they can use it in common contexts. This process has been studied through an approach that focuses on how the student learns the language; an area of emphasis that is surprisingly lacking is the development of rapport between teachers and students (Dyrenforth, 2014; Zhou, 2021), that is, the impact that teaching practice, and more specifically rapport, has on the learning of a second language has rarely been studied (Zhou, 2021).

The teacher is the intellectual actor in this scene, since he is the one who plans and organizes each activity, which in turn will help the student to practice the language, but in addition to these, the teacher must have skills to interact affectively and effectively with the students in order to motivate them to develop these previously planned activities because language learning is an intrinsically friendly interaction (Mercer and Gkonou, 2020), so the nature of the teacher student connection is very significant in the foreign language learning environment (Wang et al., 2021).

Furthermore, an indispensable tool in learning to make students feel comfortable when expressing their ideas using the target language is to apply rapport strategies, "fostering rapport is claimed to improve engagement, degree of satisfaction, and collaboration, leading to effective engagement in the learning process" (Zhang, 2023, p. 1). As put forward by Wilson et al. (2010), to establish rapport in classrooms, teachers should pay attention to students' interests, value their beliefs and ideas, and allow them to freely express their feelings toward instruction (cited in Zhou, 2021).

From the theoretical perspective of the use of rapport, empirical evidence indicates that teachers can acquire and use various skills, such as rapport, in order to function effectively in multicultural and multilingual contexts (Dyrenforth, 2014), this is in order to help students obtain better results in their academic performance. Rapport has a huge impact on knowledge acquisition, meaningful learning, and academic engagement by students (Wilson and Ryan, 2013; Zhou, 2021; Castro and Morales, 2015). Likewise, Murray (1997) argued that professor-student rapport is associated with student learning (cited in Wilson et al. 2010) since it seems to be an indispensable tool for teacher that helps the students with more difficulties.

Methodology

This quantitative survey study applied statistical methods to assess a questionnaire's psychometric qualities. A cross-sectional design was used, collecting student data at one time point to examine their views on teacher rapport. The instrument, adapted from Wilson et al. (2010), grounded on relevant theoretical foundations to support content validity. It featured Likert-scale items (1 = Always to 5 = Never) measuring various rapport dimensions in EFL settings, such as emotional support, responsiveness, and interpersonal connection (Wilson et al. (2010).

The study took place at a public, multi-campus university in northeastern Mexico, and participants were undergraduate students in basic-level EFL courses, studying degrees such as education, child welfare, and applied linguistics. In order to ensure the instrument's relevance and clarity within a Mexican educational context, particularly in EFL classrooms, the instrument underwent a systematic adaptation process. The first step involved translating the original items from English to Spanish to minimize potential misunderstandings due to language barriers. Following the translation, a group of undergraduate students from a Faculty participated in a collaborative review process. During this phase, the instrument was read aloud by the teacher, and students were invited to provide feedback on the clarity and comprehensibility of each item. Items that were perceived as unclear or culturally inappropriate were either modified or removed entirely. The primary purpose of this adaptation was to create a culturally and linguistically appropriate tool for assessing teacher-student rapport in Mexican EFL classrooms. This localized version aims to preserve the theoretical integrity of the original scale while enhancing its applicability and validity in a new educational setting.

After that, a convenience sampling method was used due to time and resource constraints, prioritizing accessibility over random selection (Mertler, 2022). This approach suited the study's goal of instrument validation rather than broad generalization. In total, 95 students voluntarily participated (25 men, 69 women, 1 undisclosed), with ages ranging from 18 to 21. Prior approval to conduct research within the classrooms was obtained from the corresponding academic authorities.

The data collection process began at the start of the January–May 2025 semester. The researcher identified EFL classrooms and coordinated with English teachers through institutional channels to schedule classroom visits. During each visit, students were invited to participate, and the questionnaire was accessed via a QR code distributed in class, allowing for efficient digital data entry using Microsoft Teams Forms. Prior to completing the questionnaire, participants received an informed consent form detailing the study's objectives, emphasizing the voluntary nature of their involvement, and guaranteeing both anonymity and confidentiality. Participants were clearly advised of their right to omit any question and to discontinue their participation in the questionnaire at any point without consequence and request the removal of their data prior to publication. The objectives of the study and detailed instructions for completing the instrument were reiterated in the consent form. Throughout the application process, the researcher remained present in the classroom to address questions and ensure a smooth and ethical administration.

A total of 95 questionnaires were initially collected, and the data underwent a statistical validation process using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26.0.1 to ensure the instrument's reliability and accuracy in measuring teacher-student rapport.

The first step involved screening for missing values; no missing data were identified, which confirmed the completeness of the dataset. Descriptive statistics were then computed, including

measures of central tendency (means and frequencies), dispersion (standard deviation and range), and distribution characteristics. As noted by Mertler (2022), descriptive statistics are essential in summarizing and interpreting large datasets by providing an overview of patterns before applying more complex statistical tests (Table 1).

To verify the normality of the distribution, skewness (asymmetry) and kurtosis values were examined. According to Hair et al. (2014), acceptable values fall within the range of ± 3 . A skewness close to zero indicates a symmetrical distribution, while kurtosis assesses the concentration of data points around the mean. These indicators help determine whether the data meet the assumptions of normality, which is a prerequisite for many statistical modelling techniques (Hair et al., 2014). Based on these results, 18 questionnaires were removed due to the presence of atypical values (outliers), reducing the valid sample size to 77 participants.

Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics for Rapport Questionnaire items (N = 77)

Item Number	Survey Item	Mean	SD	Min	Max
1	Mi profesor (a) de inglés y yo nos llevamos bien.	4.6105	.91436	1.00	5.00
2	Le envío correos o le mando mensajes por Teams a mi profesor(a) de inglés cuando así lo requiero.	2.8211	1.50869	1.00	5.00
3	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es comprensivo (a).	4.7474	.58288	3.00	5.00
4	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es considerado (a).	4.8105	.49022	3.00	5.00
5	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es irrespetuoso(a).	4.9053	.58480	1.00	5.00
6	Me siento incómodo que mi profesor(a) de inglés sepa que necesito ayuda.	4.1579	1.29907	1.00	5.00
7	Yo entiendo lo que mi profesor(a) de inglés espera de mi académicamente.	4.1368	1.07793	1.00	5.00
8	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es consciente de la cantidad de esfuerzo que pongo en la clase.	4.3789	.81448	2.00	5.00
9	Yo respeto a mi profesor(a) de inglés.	4.9684	.22844	3.00	5.00
10	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es un mentor(a) o guía para mí.	4.6421	.74256	2.00	5.00
11	Siento que no pertenezco a la clase de mi profesor(a) de inglés.	1.7158	1.23481	1.00	5.00
12	Mi profesor(a) de inglés nos motiva a los estudiantes a realizar preguntas y comentarios en clase.	4.7053	.75616	1.00	5.00
13	Mi profesor(a) de inglés no es amigable.	4.5474	1.14640	1.00	5.00
14	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es accesible.	4.8421	.46849	3.00	5.00
15	Me disgusta mi profesor(a) de inglés.	4.7579	.75394	1.00	5.00
16	Mi profesor(a) de inglés hace la clase agradable.	4.7895	.52379	3.00	5.00

Item Number	Survey Item	Mean	SD	Min	Max
17	Me siento cómodo discutiendo mis asuntos académicos con mi profesor(a) de inglés.	3.8842	1.33579	1.00	5.00
18	Me gustaría tomar otras clases que mi profesor(a) de inglés enseña.	4.1684	1.19086	1.00	5.00
19	El lenguaje corporal de mi profesor(a) de inglés dice: "No me molesten".	4.7579	.80841	1.00	5.00
20	Mi profesor(a) de inglés mantiene contacto visual conmigo.	3.6316	1.26367	1.00	5.00
21	Mi profesor(a) de inglés se siente cómodo(a) pidiendo a la clase que dé ejemplos.	4.4421	.91925	1.00	5.00
22	Realmente me gusta asistir a la clase de inglés.	4.5579	.38431	1.00	5.00
23	Mi profesor(a) de inglés desmotiva los debates en clase.	4.6105	1.01368	1.00	5.00
24	Mi profesor(a) de inglés y yo nos comunicamos bien.	4.3789	.98044	1.00	5.00
25	Mi profesor(a) de inglés explica durante todo el tiempo que estamos en la clase sin permitir que participen los alumnos.	4.3895	1.23163	1.00	5.00
26	Mi profesor(a) de inglés está ansioso(a) por ayudar a sus estudiantes.	4.3368	1.11671	1.00	5.00
27	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es compasivo.	4.6105	.77590	1.00	5.00
28	Mi profesor(a) de inglés me motiva a tener éxito.	4.6737	.64317	3.00	5.00
29	Mi profesor(a) de inglés me conoce por mi nombre.	4.2000	1.20813	1.00	5.00
30	Siento que he aprendido mucho menos de este profesor(a) de inglés comparado con otros profesores(as) que he tenido en el pasado.	3.7579	1.64844	1.00	5.00
31	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es seguro de sí mismo(a).	4.8632	.45219	3.00	5.00
32	Mi profesor(a) de inglés disfruta de su trabajo.	4.8526	.48308	3.00	5.00
33	Mi profesor(a) de inglés se preocupa por sus estudiantes.	4.7368	.60513	3.00	5.00
34	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es entusiasta.	4.7053	.65026	3.00	5.00
35	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es un modelo que seguir.	4.7368	.60513	2.00	5.00
36	Mi profesor(a) de inglés quiere hacer la diferencia.	4.4526	1.05959	1.00	5.00

Item Number	Survey Item	Mean	SD	Min	Max
37	Mi profesor(a) de inglés sabe escuchar.	4.8211	.54537	3.00	5.00
38	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es confiable.	4.7684	.59166	3.00	5.00
39	Mi profesor(a) de inglés es injusto(a).	4.6842	.95942	1.00	5.00
40	Mi profesor(a) de inglés dedica tiempo extra para repasar un concepto o tema si los estudiantes así lo necesitan.	4.4211	.94056	1.00	5.00

To identify the latent dimensions of the teacher rapport construct, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted using principal components extraction. The suitability of the dataset for factor analysis was first tested using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The KMO index yielded a value of .857, which, according to Kaiser (1974), is considered "meritorious," indicating that factor analysis was appropriate. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 1141.6$, $p < .001$), confirming that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix and that the variables shared sufficient common variance (Table 2).

Table 2.
KMO and Bartlett's test of Sphericity

Test		Value
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy		0.857
Bartlett's test of sphericity	Approx. Chi-square	1141.615

The principal components analysis identified twenty-one components with eigenvalues exceeding 1.00, indicating a complex and multifaceted structure underpinning the rapport construct. To evaluate the scale's reliability and internal consistency more thoroughly, Cronbach's Alpha was calculated. The 21-item scale produced a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .919, exceeding the commonly accepted threshold of .70 (Howitt and Cramer, 2011), and thus demonstrating excellent internal consistency (Table 3).

Table 3
Reliability statistics

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha
Teacher Rapport	21	0.919

Following the exploratory analysis, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to evaluate the hypothesized factor structure of the rapport questionnaire, ensuring alignment between the proposed model and the empirical data (Howitt and Cramer, 2011). To further assess construct validity, analyses of convergent and discriminant validity were performed. These tests confirmed that the questionnaire reliably measured the intended construct, teacher-student rapport, while appropriately distinguishing it from unrelated dimensions (Hair et al., 2014). In addition, criterion validity was examined by comparing the results of the instrument with existing validated measures, reinforcing the scale's practical applicability and theoretical relevance within academic contexts.

Results

Descriptive statistics were computed for the initial 40 items included in the rapport questionnaire. Mean scores ranged from 1.7158 (Item 11) to 4.9684 (Item 9), with standard deviations ranging from 0.228 to 1.64. While most items demonstrated acceptable variability ($SD \geq 0.50$), some items indicated ceiling effects (e.g., Items 9, 14, 31, and 32), where extremely high mean values and low standard deviations suggested a lack of discrimination across participants.

During the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), several items were identified as candidates for removal based on statistical and conceptual considerations. The following criteria guided the refinement process. The first criteria was low variability and limited informational value; that is, items with extremely high mean scores and low standard deviations indicated that most participants responded similarly, reducing their ability to differentiate between varying levels of rapport. For example, items 9, $SD = .228$; item 14, $SD = .468$; item 22, $SD = .384$; item 31, $SD = .452$; item 32, $SD = .483$

The second criteria was ambiguous factor loading or cross-loading, this means that some items failed to load clearly onto a single factor, suggesting conceptual overlap or measurement inconsistency. Item 2 got a moderate mean (2.82) and high standard deviation (1.5), so it was removed because this item likely cross-loaded between technological access dimensions.

The third criteria was conceptual redundancy, that is, items that closely resembled others with stronger statistical performance were removed to enhance the scale's frugality and avoid unnecessary repetition. For example, item 25, $SD = 1.23$; item 26, $SD = 1.11$; item 29, $SD = 1.20$. Finally, item 36, $SD = 1.05$.

The last criteria to remove the items was negatively worded items because they posed potential confusion. For example, items 5, $SD = .584$; item 6, $SD = 1.29$; item 13, $SD = 1.14$; item 15, $SD = .753$; item 19, $SD = .808$; item 23, $SD = 1.01$; and item 39, $SD = .959$ were removed because it negatively framed traits. What is more, item 11, $SD = 1.23$) was removed because it may have been misunderstood by some students or interpreted through a broader lens of school belonging, rather than specific teacher rapport. Finally, item 30, $SD = 1.64$ was removed because it introduces an interpersonal comparison across teachers, rather than evaluating the current rapport directly.

Following this systematic evaluation, 19 items were removed, resulting in a refined 21-item scale that demonstrated improved psychometric properties, conceptual clarity, and internal consistency. The final instrument provides a more precise measurement of teacher-student rapport while maintaining strong reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .919$) and validity indicators.

The descriptive analysis of the final 21 items revealed that the majority demonstrated high levels of positive perception regarding teacher-student rapport. Specifically, 17 items fell within the "very low frequency" range ($M = 4.20-5.00$), which, based on the scale's reversal, reflects strong agreement with positive rapport behaviours. These included indicators such as teacher empathy, accessibility, motivation, and enthusiasm. A smaller group of items, including statements related to understanding academic expectations and communication clarity, fell within the "low frequency" band ($M = 3.40-4.19$), suggesting slightly more variation in student experiences (Table 4).

This pattern supports the reliability of the refined scale and highlights key strengths in the teacher-student rapport as perceived by participants. Overall, the categorization reinforces the

instrument's internal validity and its alignment with theoretical dimensions of affective support, encouragement, and interpersonal connection.

Table 4
Categorization of Retained Items Based on Mean Values

Perception Level	Mean Range	Items
Very High Frequency (Strong Positive Perception)	1.00 – 1.79	(None of the retained items fell in this range)
High Frequency (Positive Perception)	1.80 – 2.59	(None of the retained items fell in this range)
Moderate Frequency (Neutral to Mildly Positive)	2.60 – 3.39	(None of the retained items fell in this range)
Low Frequency (Less Agreement / Mild Concern)	3.40 – 4.19	Item 7, 17, 18, 20
Very Low Frequency (Strong Agreement / High Rapport)	4.20 – 5.00	Items 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 16, 21, 24, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40

The objectives established for this study were fulfilled through a comprehensive and methodologically sound validation process. The development and refinement of a psychometric instrument to measure teacher-student rapport in undergraduate EFL classrooms culminated in the construction of a statistically robust 21-item scale.

Discussion

The adapted version of Wilson et al. (2010) instrument demonstrated strong internal consistency and was well-received by participants, suggesting that the construction of rapport retains its significance across cultural and linguistic contexts. These results align with previous research by Wilson et al. (2010), who emphasized the role of rapport in enhancing student engagement and academic motivation (Li, 2022; Meng, 2021; Park, 2016; Wilson and Ryan, 2013). Similarly, studies conducted in other EFL contexts (Li, 2022; Park, 2016; Webb and Barrett, 2014) have highlighted the importance of interpersonal connection in language learning environments. The consistency of these findings suggests that rapport is a universally relevant construct, though its expression may vary depending on cultural norms and classroom dynamics. However, some divergences were observed. For instance, while Wilson and Ryan (2013) and Meng (2021) identified student motivation, and perceived learning as a dominant factor, the study made by Li (2022) found that rapport facilitates the increasing EFL students' well-being and Park (2016) and Web and Barret (2014) found that teachers' rapport strategies help create a positive learning environment.

Other important factor is the positive link between teacher-student rapport and student outcomes (Wilson and Ryan, 2013). This may reflect cultural differences in how rapport is interpreted and valued.

Overall, the results underscore the importance of adapting measurement tools to fit the linguistic and cultural context of the target population. The adapted instrument not only preserved the theoretical foundation of the original scale but also provided insights into the specific rapport-building strategies that resonate with Mexican EFL learners. These findings have practical implications for teacher training programs, suggesting that fostering rapport should be a

deliberate and culturally responsive component of pedagogical practice.

Limitations

One limitation of this study lies in the adaptation and application of the rapport scale exclusively within undergraduate contexts, which may constrain its generalizability to other professor–student settings across diverse educational levels. As a second limitation, additional testing is needed to determine whether there is a correlation between teacher rapport and English language performance, specifically oral skills. Therefore, future improvements or adaptations may be provided in order to conduct a study whose aim is to examine whether the rapport scale correlates with this variable.

Implications For Research and Practice

These findings carry some pedagogical implications. First, the validated instrument offers teachers and program administrators a diagnostic tool for assessing relational effectiveness in EFL classrooms. By systematically monitoring rapport, institutions can better tailor professional development initiatives to strengthen communication, empathy, and student support practices. Second, the strong student endorsement of rapport behaviours aligns with research demonstrating that interpersonal dynamics are central to motivation, engagement, and language acquisition. Therefore, investing in rapport-building strategies should be considered an integral part of curriculum design and teacher training programs.

Thirdly, the scale's psychometric validation opens the door for its application across broader educational contexts. As rapport is inherently context-sensitive, future studies might explore how cultural variables, gender dynamics, or teacher experience influence the expression and perception of rapport. Longitudinal research could also trace how rapport evolves over time and what impact it has on students' academic outcomes or retention in language programs.

Finally, researchers are encouraged to replicate this validation process with larger and more diverse samples, possibly incorporating comparative studies between institutions, regions, or academic levels. Cross-cultural adaptations of the instrument could further enhance its utility for international education settings. Incorporating student interviews or classroom observations would also enrich the data by triangulating quantitative scores with lived experiences.

Conclusions

This study presents a significant contribution to the field of language education by developing and validating a reliable instrument for measuring teacher–student rapport in EFL contexts. In direct response to the guiding research question, To what extent is the proposed 40-item questionnaire a valid and reliable instrument for measuring teacher–student rapport in EFL undergraduate classrooms? The findings demonstrate, through rigorous statistical analyses, including descriptive procedures, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, and reliability testing, a coherent and psychometrically sound 21-item scale emerged. The high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .919$) and strong agreement across items suggest that rapport is a salient and positively perceived component of students' classroom experience at the undergraduate level. These outcomes affirm that the research objectives were not only met, but that the validated instrument represents a meaningful contribution to the assessment of relational dynamics in language education settings. It provides a foundation for further studies and practical applications aimed at deepening understanding of rapport as a critical element in effective pedagogy. Moreover,

researchers may adapt or expand upon the scale to examine how rapport influences academic performance, motivation, retention, or well-being. By framing rapport not only as an abstract concept but as a measurable and actionable element of classroom life, this work bridges theory and practice, inviting further research, dialogue, and innovation in teacher-student relationships. Ultimately, the study underscores that behind every meaningful learning experience lies a relationship built on respect, empathy, and shared purpose.

References

- Castro, M. and Morales, M. (2015). Classroom environments that promote learning from the perspective of school children. *Revista electrónica Educare*, 19(3), 1-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15359/ree.19-3.11>
- Dyrenforth, T. (2014). *Classroom Success through rapport building* [Tesis de Maestría, Center for Faculty Excellence, United States Military Academy].
- Hair, J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., and Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM): An Emerging Tool in Business Research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106-121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128>
- Howitt, D. and Cramer, D. (2011). *Introduction to SPSS Statistics in Psychology*. Loughborough University.
- Jordán, J. and Codana, A. (2019). La influencia del profesor apasionado en la mejora académica y el desarrollo personal de sus alumnos. *Estudios Sobre Educación*, 36, 31-51. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.36.31-51>
- Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>
- Li, S. (2022). On the role of teacher-student rapport on English as a foreign language students' well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(822013), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.822013>
- Magaña, D. (2022). Competencias interpersonales, efectos en autoeficacia y competencias para el desempeño en el trabajo: perspectivas del pregrado. *Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal*, 32, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.15174/au.2022.3458>
- Meng, Y. (2021). Fostering EFL/ESL Students' State Motivation: The Role of Teacher-Student Rapport. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(754797), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.754797>
- Mercer, S., Gkonou, C. (2017). Teaching with Heart and Soul in T. Gregersen and P. MacIntyre (Ed.), *Innovative Practices in Language Teacher Education* (Vol. 30, pp. 103-124. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51789-6_6
- Mertler, C. (2022). *Quantitative Research Methods*. SAGE Publications

- Orduña, K. (18-22 de noviembre de 2019). *El eje interpersonal de la socio-afectividad en estudiantes universitarios de una modalidad a distancia* [Ponencia]. XV Congreso Nacional de Investigación Educativa COMIE 2019, Ciudad y Puerto de Acapulco, Guerrero, México.
- Park, M. (2016). Integrating rapport-building into language instruction: A study of Korean foreign language classes. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 109-130.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2015.1116103>
- Rowan, L. and Grootenboer, P. (Ed.). (2017). *Student engagement and educational rapport in higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wang, Y., Derakhshan, A. and Zhang, L. (2021). Researching and Practicing Positive Psychology in Second/Foreign Language Learning and Teaching: The Past, Current Status and Future Directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(731721), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731721>
- Webb, N. and Barrett, L. (2014). Instructor-student rapport in Taiwan ESL classrooms. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 2(2), 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.2.2.9>
- Wilson, J. and Ryan, R. (2013). Professor-Student Rapport Scale: Six Items Predict Student Outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 40(2), 130-133.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628312475033>
- Wilson, J., Ryan, R. and Pugh, J. (2010). Professor-Student Rapport scales predicts students outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 37(4), 246-251.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00986283.2010.510976>
- Zhang, B. (2023). The Relationship Between Teacher-Student Rapport and EFL Learners' Engagement in Online Scaffolding Setting. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 52, 1685-1705. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-023-09954-3>
- Zhou, X. (2021). Toward the positive consequences of teacher-student rapport for students' academic engagement in the practical instruction classrooms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(759785), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.759785>



Este texto está protegido por una licencia [Creative Commons 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Usted es libre para Compartir —copiar y redistribuir el material en cualquier medio o formato— y Adaptar el documento —remezclar, transformar y crear a partir del material— para cualquier propósito, incluso para fines comerciales, siempre que cumpla la condición de:

Atribución: Usted debe dar crédito a la obra original de manera adecuada, proporcionar un enlace a la licencia, e indicar si se han realizado cambios. Puede hacerlo en cualquier forma razonable, pero no de forma tal que sugiera que tiene el apoyo del licenciante o lo recibe por el uso que hace de la obra.

[Resumen de licencia](#) - [Texto completo de la licencia](#)

This call is addressed to: Professors – Researchers, graduate students from any Bachelor of Arts in English Letters and Masters in Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics programs, and any researchers and scholars who wish to publish research articles, research essays, or thesis results, all related to topics of the Journal: Language Teaching and Learning, Applied Linguistics, Values, and Culture.

The sections of the Journal are:

- Research Papers: Graduates' & teachers' voices – National and international research articles.
- Updating Language Teaching Professionals: CIEX Symposiums Proceedings.
- Personal Development and Growth: Moral Values and Culture Essays.

The guidelines for writing and presenting the proposals are described below:

1. Title: in English and in Spanish.

2. Summary (in English and Spanish, 150 words), containing the following aspects:

- a) Introduction:** This section describes the context where the research was carried out, the reason why the research was carried out, and the importance of the study.
- b) Purpose:** Here the writer states and explains the research objectives, intentions, questions, or hypothesis.
- c) Research method:** In this part, the author mentions and justifies the research approach and method that were selected, briefly describes the subjects, the context, and the research procedures, as well as the instruments that were used for the data collection.
- d) Results:** Here, the writer presents the main findings, the degree to which the research objectives were reached, and the answers to the research questions.
- e) Conclusion:** This section presents the main conclusions, the importance of the findings, considering the contribution to the theory, the research area, or professional practice, and suggesting practical uses of the results, as well as possible applications for further research.

3. Body of the article:

- a) Key words.** Five, in English and Spanish.
- b) Introduction:** It presents the research topic area, and the research topic, mentioning if it is descriptive, explanatory, evaluative, correlational, interpretative, etc. Also, it emphasizes the research problem.
- c) Literature review:** It presents the main terms, concepts, theoretical claims or principles, models, etc. analyzing and discussing the ideas presented by the main authors who have studied the topics related to the research or study presented. The references should not be more than 10 years after their publication, except from those classical research works.
- d) Research methodology:** It describes the research approach: qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods.
- e) Describe the research method:** case study, phenomenology, action-research, classroom research, longitudinal research, transversal research, experimental research, cause-experimental research, etc.
 - Describe the **data type** (describe and justify the data base, universe, or sample, etc.)
 - Characterize the **subjects** (describe the participants in the research).
 - **Context** (describe the geographic and institutional context where the research was carried out).
 - **Instruments** (describe the research instruments used to collect information and data).
 - **Data analysis** (explain the way the data was systematized and analyzed).
- f) Main findings.** Synthesize, present, interpret, and argue the most significant results found and the proposal, if the case of developing one.
- g) Conclusions.** Describe the main conclusions generated from the answers to the research questions.
- h) Main limitations of the study** (related to the geographical or institutional context, or knowledge area and the research process).

i) **Main implications and impact of the research.** Describe the main benefits of the research and the possible applications of the proposal.

Topics for the articles:

Topics of the articles should be recent and relevant for the academic community and should address one of the following research lines.

1. Language learning and teaching theories
2. Language professional competencies
3. Language teaching approaches and methods
4. Alternative language learning and teaching theories
5. Curriculum design: design of language programs
6. Design, selection, and adaptation of language teaching materials and activities
7. Language learning evaluation
8. Language and culture
9. Human values in language teaching
10. Personal development and growth in language professionals
11. Research and professional development
12. Educational technology in languages

Format:

- Title using Arial font, size 14
- Text using Arial font, size 12
- Margins: top 2.5, bottom 2.5, left 2.5, right 2.5.
- Spaces: 1.5
- No indented paragraphs

Length of the articles:

- 8 to 15 pages containing text (from 3000 to 5000 words approximately)
- Containing 20 to 40 references (using the American Psychological Association APA format)

Languages: The articles can be written in English or Spanish.

The editorial process includes a review by a strict pair of "blind" reviewers and using Plagius software to verify that ethical standards are respected and that there is no plagiarism in any of the documents. Then, authors are advised to verify the submissions including the call elements and format in advance.

The evaluation of submissions starts in the editorial process, which may end in declining submissions if they do not match the call and format requirements. When the editorial board accepts a submission, it continues to the double-blind peer review process as the final evaluation with the following results:

- a) Accept Submission or Accept Submission with Modifications
- b) Revisions Required or Resubmit for Review
- c) Decline Submission

It is important to mention that if a blind reviewer declines the article or essay, it will not be accepted.

The proposals are uploaded to the platform in Word format without the authors' names.

The proposals need to be sent with an attached Word file containing a 100-word authors' biodata.

In addition, authors need to add the declaration of originality in Word format and signed.

Please upload the articles on the CIEX JOURNAL

WEBSITE: <http://journal.ciex.edu.mx>

Deadline to send the proposals: July 31st, 2025.

Editor: Hugo Enrique Mayo Castrejón, M.A. - ciex.journal@gmail.com

LICENCIATURA EN INGLÉS

MAESTRÍA EN LA ENSEÑANZA DEL IDIOMA
INGLÉS Y LINGÜÍSTICA APLICADA



El Centro de Idiomas Extranjeros "Ignacio Manuel Altamirano"

CONVOCA

A los aspirantes interesados en cursar la **Licenciatura en Letras Inglesas** (Modalidades: Presencial y/o en línea) o la **Maestría en la Enseñanza del Idioma Inglés y Lingüística Aplicada** a participar en el Concurso de Selección para el ingreso al Ciclo Escolar 2025-2026, presentando el examen de admisión que se realizará mediante previa cita hasta el 29 de agosto de 2026, conforme a los siguientes:

REQUISITOS

Los interesados en participar deben realizar todos los trámites y procedimientos institucionales, además de cumplir con los requisitos descritos en el cronograma y el instructivo correspondiente a esta Convocatoria, los cuales son:

- » Leer y aceptar los términos y condiciones de la convocatoria y su instructivo.
- » Realizar el registro en las fechas establecidas en esta Convocatoria.
- » Comunicarse a la institución para realizar una cita para el examen de admisión.
- » Pagar el derecho de examen de selección.
- » Presentar el examen de selección y una evaluación de valores y actitudes en el lugar, día y hora señalados, mediante previa cita.
- » Ser aceptados mediante un concurso de selección, dentro de los periodos que al efecto se señalen.
- » Recibir una carta de aceptación por parte del Comité Evaluador de la institución.
- » En caso de ser seleccionado en la **Licenciatura en Letras Inglesas**, contar con Certificado de Bachillerato con un promedio mínimo de ocho (8.0) o su equivalente y entregarlo con la demás documentación solicitada el día y en el lugar establecidos, de acuerdo con los términos señalados en la institución.
- » En caso de ser seleccionado en la **Maestría en la Enseñanza del Idioma Inglés y Lingüística Aplicada**, contar con Título de Licenciatura, Cédula Profesional, Carta de motivos, Certificación TOEFL (500 puntos mínimo).

Informes:

Teléfono: 747 49 4 79 73

WhatsApp: 747 108 1203

Página web: www.ciex.edu.mx

Correo electrónico: info@ciex.edu.mx

CONVOCA TORIA

CIEX JOURN@L

INNOVATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

No. 21

RESEARCH PAPERS

Students' & Teachers' Voices

VALUES AND CULTURE

Personal Development and Growth

CIEX SYMPOSIUM SUMMARIES

Updating Language Teaching Professionals

