

COMMUNICATIVE IMAGE OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENT TEACHER

Bieliaieva O.M.

*Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine
"Ukrainian Medical Stomatological Academy", Poltava
PhD, Associate Professor*

Communicative image of Higher Educational Establishment teacher was considered. The content of such notions as "communication", "intercourse", "pedagogical communication" was differentiated. The main models of pedagogical communication were analyzed, taking into consideration perceptive and interactive components. The author substantiates idea that knowledge of psychological, content-related and processual principles of pedagogical communication promotes socialization of the teacher, provides high level of pedagogical skills and serves as effective method of formation and correction of Higher Educational Establishment teacher image.

Keywords: Higher Educational Establishment teacher image, communication, perception, interaction, models of pedagogical communication.

Problem setting. The study of the problem concerning teacher image of Higher Educational Establishment has great practical and theoretical importance considering transformations that characterize all spheres of Ukrainian society. Among various factors that determine the relevance of this work, the following should be noted:

- 1) communicative image of teacher is an integral part of professional culture and indicator of pedagogical skills;
- 2) personal image of teacher as the official representative of Higher Educational Establishment is an integral component of such complex process as

creating a positive image of any Higher Educational Establishment, that leads to its successful promotion on the market of educational services;

3) the study of image enables to determine its influence degree on social well-being of teacher, appropriateness of teacher image to education system, which depends on socio-economic, political, ideological, cultural, historical and other factors;

4) positive image of teacher ensures maintaining one of the fundamental humanistic pedagogical principles in practice — the “principle of “education through personality”.

Recent research and publications analysis. The works of the scientists [3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 10; 12; 14; 15], who considered various aspects of teacher image (teacher or lecturer) from the standpoint of communication theory, psychology, pedagogics, sociology become of great importance for the implementation of outlined problem scientific research. This fact gives grounds for stating new interdisciplinary branch — pedagogical imagology, which, according to A. Kaliuzhnyi [3], gives the opportunity to take another look both at education process in Higher Educational Establishments and also teachers.

Paper objective. The article is aimed to consider the communicative aspect of teacher image and to analyze the main pedagogical communication models including perceptual and interactive components.

Paper main body. The word “image” appeared in European and Slavic languages from Latin. In Latin-Russian dictionary Y. Dvoretzkyi [2, P. 375] represents several meanings, among which are the following: 1) depiction; 3) image; 4) reflection; 5) vision, visibility; 6) visuality, mental picture, imagination, notion, idea. The notion “image” appeared in pedagogics from advertising and PR sphere (PR – public relations) and was being investigated extensively since last century 90-ies. The most often teacher image is represented as a totality of external and internal personal, individual and professional qualities of the teacher that enable effective teaching.

S. Yakusheva [15] defined the image of teacher as an integrative quality of personality, synthesis of intellectual, appearance characteristics, kinetic, communicative, environmental (material and social) and artistic culture, which was a multifunctional system and the most important component of pedagogical skills. While studying the image of teacher from Gestalt psychology approach, T. Turkot identified the following components [10, P. 486-487]:

- professionalism and competence;
- erudition;
- creative energy;
- high level of general and pedagogical culture;
- psychologically-individual qualities (empathy, responsiveness, reflexivity, friendliness, ability to prevent conflicts, following of Roman law postulate “Homo res sacra (est)” — “Man is a sacred thing”);
- good physical and mental health;
- external aesthetic attractiveness (perfect neatness, appropriate clothing, makeup, jewelry, gait, posture, friendly smile, facial expression).

The comprehensive study of teacher image is not possible without considering such integral component of its structure as communicative. To avoid terminological inaccuracies it is necessary to differentiate the meaning of such notions as “communication”, “converse”, “pedagogical communication”. So, communication is a purposeful process of information transferring or exchange between two or more entities and also their influence using semiotic system [9, P. 28]. Regarding mentioned scientists approaches [1; 11] we consider that communication is not identical with converse, but is only one of its components (including perception and interaction). Perceptual aspect of communication involves perception processes of one another partners while communicating and establishment of mutual understanding on this basis, interactive aspect includes organization of interaction between communicating individuals, i.e. exchange not only knowledge and skills, but also actions [1, P. 22]. Interaction in psychology is determined as “the process of direct or indirect influence of objects (subjects) on

each other, providing their mutual conditionality and intercommunication [13, P. 46]”.

The distinction between the notions “communication” and “converse” enables to accept the definition of pedagogical communication (PC) proposed by A. Kuzminskyi, which defines PC as totality of methods and means, while practising ensures education and training objectives achievement and defines the nature of interaction between two main subjects of pedagogical process [4, P. 143].

The knowledge of psychological, content-relative and processual basics of PC contributes to the teacher socialization, provides a high level of teaching skills and serves as an effective means of academic staff image formation or correction. The Belarusian researcher O. Murashov emphasized: “... formation of the positive image results in the process of working on the so-called negative students communication scenarios, that serve as a means for “studying” the teacher as a person ... [6, P. 142]”.

Among various classifications of PC styles the best known nowadays is the classification proposed by M. Talen (see table 1).

Table 1

Model	Characteristics
“Socrates”	Teacher is the supporter of discussions and debates that are purposely initiated by him during lessons, thereby provoking students to stand for their own positions and views.
“The head of group discussion”	Teacher is the mediator in achieving cooperation between students. The most important result of discussion for “the head of group discussions” is the achievement of democratic consent.
“Master”, “Maitre”	Teacher is behavior pattern not only in educational process but also in life.
“The General”	Teacher is the leader, who always right about everything, requires strict discipline and obedience from the students, strict directions implementation.
“Manager”	Teacher is focused on ensuring quality control and final teaching result by encouraging students independence and their initiatives.
“Trainer”	Teacher is the encourager of successful group

	educational activities by creating “corporate” atmosphere in the student group. In this model the main point is collective positive final result.
“Guide”	Teacher is the encyclopedist. He/she masters pedagogical methods and techniques, intelligent, but laconic, restrained, tactful. Being technically perfect, this teacher is often frankly boring.

According to another typology arranged on the basis of students observations [8] teachers are divided into “eternal students”, “former sailors”, “indifferent”, “envious”, “limited”, “boss”. However, there are “foodies”, “friends”, “clock punchers” among teachers.

Table 2

Model	Characteristics
“Eternal students”	Teachers who understand the student, perceive as a person, enjoy discussing different topics, have high intellect and professionalism.
“Former sailors”	Teachers who are trying to establish military discipline, when “discipline” means total and absolute acceptance of their point of view; appreciate “slavery”, but not intelligence and ability to think logically, try to crush personality, student’s own self by means of administrative measures and influences.
“Formalists”	Teachers who “serve” their time: allow students to do what they please, as long as they do not interfere with them .
“Indifferent”, “envious”, “limited”, “boss”, “clock punchers”	Teachers who do not correspond to the ideal generated in students according to their professional and personal qualities.
“Foodies”, “friends”	Teachers who get the utmost students respect, because they “go full force”, “enjoy working with students”. The most appreciated teacher image for the student.
“Standard”	Teacher knows the subject, loves his work, he is difficult to communicate with, stubborn, ambitious, is not interesting neither to himself nor to students. In students opinion, this is the most common type of teacher.

Presented above classifications, in our opinion, are perceptually oriented, whereas the interactive PC aspect is introduced in them rather superficially. The

classification, based on the works of V. Kan-Kalik and discussed in the works of T. Turkot [10] and M. Filonenko [12] is more applicable for determining interactive PC component and teacher image as a whole (see table 3).

Table 3

Model	Characteristics
“Mont Blanc”	Teacher “is overlooking” the audience like a mountain top: he is far-off the students, avoids personal interaction with them, ignores or perceives superficially students applyings or proposals. Communicative interaction is limited to formal contacts in this model and, as a rule, confined only to the information presentation, resulting in the emergence of the so-called “halo of alienation” and psychological barriers between teacher and students. The feedback from the students is virtually absent. The personal image of teacher is negative.
“Chinese wall”	Teacher makes an attempt to establish the psychological contact with students, understands them, assists in solving problems, but at the same time emphasizes his status, demonstrates the superiority, has a tendency to mentoring. The superficial feedback from the students is present.
“Locator”	Communicative interaction of teacher with students has a differentiated, selective nature: the teacher focuses on low-achieving or high-achieving students. The entirety of communicative subject-subject interaction is frustrated, deforming and can ultimately have negative influence not only on the individual lecturer image, but also on Higher Educational Establishment as a whole.
“Grouse”	The model is inherent in teachers, stuck in their scientific work, but have a low level of methodical and communicative culture. The teacher hears only himself, his attention is not directed at the student. The lack of tolerance becomes a hindrance to the perception of critical remarks and proposals, adequate response to them. The connection “teacher-student” is missing.
“Hamlet”	Teacher is very responsive to the opinion of the student audience, he is more concerned about the external side of his pedagogical activities than its contents. Despite attempts to win the students favor and authority, such teacher, as a rule, is not respected among students.
“Robot”	The activity of teacher is strictly regulated by programmes and instructions. The so-called “paper matters” are in the foreground of such teacher.

	Communication with students is tactful, but without emotional coloring — the teacher ignores psychological condition of the student, age-specific, gender, ethnic peculiarities. As a consequence, the students attitude to such teachers is indifferent or negative.
“I myself” or “Brood-hen”	Teacher tries to perform all the functional duties scrupulously according to the basic directions of teacher’s activity in Higher Educational Establishments (educational, scientific-methodical, scientific-research, educational, consultative), but special attention is paid to educational work. Taking into account a large amount of problems that such teacher tries to solve, as a rule, he becomes the “victim” of “emotional burnout” syndrome that leads to disappointment in the results of his own scientific and educational activities, low self-esteem, doubts about abilities in scientific work and lack of time for self-education and professional development.
“Union”	Teacher is self-critical, creative. Communicative interaction with students is aimed at cooperation and mutual understanding. The teacher is inherent in tolerance and empathy. The most productive model, which provides a positive image of certain teacher and educational establishment as a whole.

The undeniable positives of this classification, in our opinion, is that it is not only analyzes possible models of pedagogical interaction, but highlights its advantages and disadvantages, what is crucial for constructing or correcting the lecturer's image.

Conclusions. *Sensu strictiore* teacher’s personality, his communicative image, the ability and desire to establish a dialogue with students, the ability to pedagogical communication, but not representation of certain amount of subject knowledge, understanding and adequate perception of the student not as a slave but as an equal partner serve as indicators of pedagogical culture in general and pedagogical skills in particular. *Sensu largo* a positive image affects not only the social well-being of the teacher, his professional self-realization, but also ensures the formation of positive image of Higher Educational Establishment.

Prospects for further research in this direction is projected in profound study of pedagogical communication processes based on teachers education qualification and educational establishment profile.

References

1. Butenko N. Yu. Komunikativni protsesi u navchanni. - Kyiiv: KNEU, 2004. - 383 s.
2. Dvoretzkiy I. H. Latinsko-russkiy slovar. Okolo 50 000 slov / Iosif Hananovich Dvoretzkiy. - [3-e izd., ispr.]. - Moscow: Russkiy yazyk, 1986. - 840 s.
3. Kalyuzhnyi A. A. Psihologiya formirovaniya imidzha uchitelya. - Moscow: Gumanitar. izd. tsentr VLADOS, 2004. - 222 s.
4. Kuzminskiy A. I. Pedagogika vischoyi shkoli. - Kyiiv: Znannya, 2005. - 486 s.
5. Ivanova E. Metodichni zasadi rozrobki vlasnogo imidzhu yak vazhlivoyi skladovoyi formuvannya komunikativnoyi kompetentnosti maybutnogo vchitelya muziki//Imidzh suchasnogo pedagoga, No. 2-3 (91-92), 2009.
6. Murashov A. A. Rechevoy aspekt professionalnogo imidzha pedagoga// Obrazovatelnyie tehnologii, No. 2, 2013.
7. Naumova E. A. Traktovka ponyatiya professionalnogo imidzha prepodavatelya vuza: sotsiologicheskiiy podhod [Elektronnyiy resurs]// Sovremennyye problemy nauki i obrazovaniya, No. 6, 2012. - Access mode: <http://www.science-education.ru>.
8. Pedagogika i psihologiya vyisshey shkolyi ; pod. red. prof. M. V. Bulanovoy-Toporkovoy. - Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks, 2002. - 544 s.
9. Selivanova O. S. Osnovi teoriiy movnoyi komunikatsiyi. - Cherkasy: Vid-vo Chabanenko Yu. A., 2011. - 350 s.
10. Turkot T. I. Pedagogika vischoyi shkoli. - Kyiiv: Kondor, 2011. - 628 s.
11. Ustemirov K., Shametov N. R., Vasilev I. B. Professionalnaya pedagogika. - Almaty: TOO "Aknur i K", 2005. - 432 s.
12. Filonenko M. M. Psihologiya spilkuvaniya. - Kyiiv: Tsentr uchbovoyi literaturi, 2008. - 224 s.
13. Shapar V. B. Suchasniy tлумachniy psihologichniy slovnik : Blizko 2500 terminiv. - Kharkiv: Prapor, 2005. - 640 s.

14. Shefer O. V. Otrazhenie korporativnoy kulturyi vuza v imidzhevom diskurse : avtoref. dis. na soiskanie uchen. stepeni kand. filol. nauk : spets. 10.02.12. "Teoriya yazyika". - Cheliabinsk, 2007. - 26 s.
15. Yakusheva S. D. Pedagogicheskiy imidzh sovremennogo prepodavatelya vyisshey shkolyi [Elektronnyiy resurs]. - Access mode: <http://sibac.info/index.php>.