



ISSN 2450-6486

www.ehs.eeipsy.org

DOI: 10.38014/ehs-ss.2021.2.13

UDK 159.9. 316.6



Inessa HARKUSHA,
Andriy KRYZHANOVSKYI

Theoretical review of interpersonal problems of teacher and students interaction

INESSA HARKUSHA, ANDRIY KRYZHANOVSKYI. **Theoretical review of interpersonal problems of teacher and students' interaction.** *The article is devoted to the theoretical problems of interpersonal interaction between teacher and students in higher education institutions. Researchers consider pedagogical communication and relationships in the student academic group as an important prerequisite for pedagogical management of the educational process in higher education institutions. It is asserted that the term "interrelation" is often used for relationships between people. It is determined that pedagogical communication is the interaction of the teacher with students and the content is the exchange of information. It is noted that the interrelations "teacher-student" mean purposeful interaction of subjects of the pedagogical process and are determined by general socio-psychological mechanisms, social and role functions of partners and social norms of the institution of higher education. Relationships are distinguished that differ into primary and secondary ones, where it is established that, in contrast to primary relationships,*

secondary ones ("teacher-student" relationship) are rarely characterized by high emotional involvement and the participants in the relationship can be easily replaced. The three-component model of the mindset is characterized: cognitive (knowledge, understanding by the teacher of the child's inner world), emotional (the teacher's attitude to the student) and behavioral (the choice of means and methods of influence). It is noted that sympathy and antipathy determine the circle of persons with whom contact is maintained in the collective and the assimilation of group norms of behavior is carried out. It has been proven that the enthusiasm for the common cause of students and teachers, friendly disposition, combined with an interest in science, in a future profession, give rise to a joint creative search. The emphasis is made on the fact that every teacher of a higher education institution must constantly analyze his activities, behavior, relationships with colleagues and students.

Key words: *interpersonal interaction, relationships, institutions of higher education, teacher, student, communication, pedagogical communication.*

For Ukrainian higher educational institutions, upbringing is a process of interaction between a student and a teacher. In this two-sided process, as pointed out by V.M. Miasyshchev, demanding, condescending, loving, unfriendly-attentive, disrespectful and fair or biased and etc. attitude towards the student can be manifested, and the student – to respond to it with respect, love, fear, hostility, sincere or ostentatious attitude [25, p. 21].

N.O. Berezovin and Ya.L. Kolominskyi showed that the correct interpersonal relationships between the teacher and students correlate with organizational influences: the number of "organizational" measures increases in comparison with disciplinary ones, positive assessments prevail over the negative ones, direct educational influences are increasingly being replaced by indirect ones [3].

In pedagogical psychology, it is asserted that "the characteristics of a human personality are the product of its relationships with other people in the process of development, product of influence, example, attachment, authority of both individuals and groups" [25, p. 29]. Noting the particular importance of the concept of attitude for psychology, V.M. Miasyshchev wrote that "basically, that is, in relation to people, these relations are of a bilateral nature. They act not only as the attitude of an S-person to another person as an object-subject, but also as a relationship of two subjects" [25, p.162].

The purpose of our article is to determine the theoretical problems of interpersonal interaction between a teacher and students.

The pedagogical process is a combination of two types of attitudes. Firstly, it is the attitude to the subject, which, in the scientific-theoretical approach, acts as an external thing (that is, the S-O relationship). Secondly, it is the relationship between teacher and student, that is, the S-S relationships. It is undesirable to subordinate them in the scientific-theoretical approach, since this puts them into objectively-material content, which makes the student an object of technologically-subject manipulations. This complicates the personal communication. On the contrary, personal communication between a teacher and a student creates the most favorable environment for the process of education and training.

At the same time, in works on the problems of psychology and pedagogy of higher education, pedagogical communication and relationships in the student academic group, as well as in the "teacher-student" system, are beginning to be considered by researchers as an important prerequisite for pedagogical management of the educational process in a higher educational institution, increasing its efficiency [1]; means of enhancing the cognitive activity of students [7; 8, etc.]; their successful adaptation to study at a higher educational institution; component of the pedagogical skill of a teacher of a higher educational institution [12; 13, etc.] etc.

As T.V. Dmytrova rightly notes, "the concepts of "relationship", "interrelation", "communication" are used as synonyms, and often quite arbitrarily subordinate to each other. This leads not only to terminological confusion, but also to a fuzzy, inadequate interpretation of the results of experimental research" [11, p.120].

The term "interrelation" is often used to refer to relationships between people. Based on the semantics of the term, it should be emphasized that this is necessarily the mutual relationship of a person to a person. Under this condition, the relationships acquire the properties of "recurrence and symmetry" [11, p.121].

Interrelation is the relationship of either the really interacting parties, or the relationship of the subjects in which interaction is possible. Not all relationships between people are mutual. Interrelations are spoken of only when there are direct interpersonal relationships.

The terms "personal interrelations" and "interpersonal interrelations", according to T.V. Dmytrova, are identical. Interpersonal is generally a characteristic of mutual relationship between two or more people, with the statement that the interaction is mutual [4, p. 436]. The substitution of

the concept of “interrelation” with the concept of “communication” and vice versa seems to be inappropriate.

Despite the close connection between communication and interrelation, it is necessary to emphasize, as noted by A.V. Mudryk, that they are not identical. Communication is an objective process of interaction between people who can be united by a variety of subjective relationships. The reason for communication is joint life activity. It is realized both in the case of a positive attitude of its participants to each other, and in the case of a negative attitude, and even in the case of their complete indifference to each other. That is, the concept of “attitude” expresses the internal, essential side of the subject-subjective relationships, and the concept of “communication” – their external side [24]. This is also confirmed by “the search for ways to change interrelations and regulate relationships through changing communication, that is, it is possible to optimize interpersonal relationships through optimization of communication” [11].

Traditionally, communication is considered (O.O. Bodalov, V.N. Kunitsyna, V.N. Panforov, M.P. Pikelnikova, Yu.P. Stepkin, T.F. Fedotova) as the interaction of people, the content of which is the information exchange using various means of communication to establish interrelations between people.

More correct, in our opinion, is the understanding of communication as one of the forms of the whole variety of human relationships. This approach is realized, for example, in the definition of pedagogical communication as “a diverse form of interrelations and mutual influences of a pedagogue and students” [16, p.71].

An integrated approach to the study of communication (B.D. Paryhin, V.M. Sokovnin and etc.) is presented as most consistent with the current state of the study of this problem. We consider to be quite close the scientific idea of B.D. Paryhin, who notes that “there is a reason to consider communication as a complex and multifaceted process that can act simultaneously as a process of interaction between individuals, as an information process, as an attitude of people to each other, as a process of their mutual influence on each other, and as a process of their empathy and mutual understanding of each other” [26, p.178].

This approach is also realized in understanding the essence of communication, which includes three interrelated processes: information exchange; people cognition of each other; formation and development of interpersonal relationships. These points are especially emphasized

when defining the concept of “professional pedagogical communication” which means “a system of techniques and methods that ensure the implementation of the goals and tasks of pedagogical activity, organize and direct the socio-psychological interaction of a pedagogue and a student. The content of this interaction is the information exchange, interpersonal cognition, organization and regulation of relationships using various communicative means in order to provide educational impact, as well as a holistic pedagogically expedient self-presentation of the pedagogue's personality in the audience. The pedagogue acts here as an activator of this process – he organizes and guides it” [15, p.10].

We have found that pedagogical communication is “interaction between a teacher and students, the content of which is the information exchange. The result that the participants in communication should come to is the implementation of educational influence on students and the optimization of interrelations between them and pedagogue” [31, p.5]. One more characteristic complements the presentation. Full communication presupposes mutual understanding and the possibility of mutual influence of people on each other. These sides also take place in the interaction of a teacher with students, the content of which is determined by the tasks and process of professional and pedagogical training of the future teacher.

Understanding communication as an exchange of values (H. Liimets) allows one to define interrelations as a certain stable system of exchange of values. “The interrelations that have developed, in turn, affect the further exchange process. interrelations have a strong influence on the processes of interaction and communication” [21, p. 66].

It is worth noting that the interpersonal relationship is “the relations between people, which are subjectively experienced and objectively manifested in the nature and ways of mutual influences of people in the course of joint activities and communication. It is a system of mindsets, orientations, expectations, stereotypes and other dispositions through which people perceive and evaluate each other. These dispositions are mediated by the content, goals, values and organization of joint activities and serve as the basis for the socio-psychological climate formation in the group” [29, p. 378]. For example, T.K. Chuhuiv considered 4 types of students' attitude to teachers: sympathy, sympathy with a share of criticism, indifference, negative attitude.

At the same time, we state that by the “teacher-student” relationship we mean the purposive interaction of the subjects of the pedagogical process, which is determined by the goal and tasks of joint educational

and professional activities, is defined by both general socio-psychological mechanisms and clearly defined socio-role functions of partners and rules, as well as social norms of a higher educational institution.

In the context of the educational process, students are involved in a variety of relationships that are activated in the pedagogical system "teacher-student", "student-academic group", "student-coursemate", "student-parents" and others. They constitute a hierarchy in which different groups can be distinguished according to the degree of their importance in the human value system. So, can be distinguished relationships associated with the subject of communication (the content of educational and professional, labor activity), with the attitude to other people, first of all to the pedagogue, coursemates, society, which is represented in this situation by the most social institution (higher educational institution), its norms and statutory requirements, finally, to oneself as a person. The range of relationships, based on the above-mentioned, is very wide and varied. They can be designated as subject (for example, attitude to the natural and human sciences, fundamental and applied knowledge), organizational and executive (to the regulatory requirements of schools and institutions of higher education), organizational and managerial (subordination and dependencies), professional, etc.

Based on the scientific research of foreign psychologists, the relationships are distinguished, which differ into primary and secondary ones. Primary relationships are "long-term relationships based on strong emotional bonds and a sense of responsibilities to another person. Unlike secondary ones, they are rather diffuse, covering many roles, behavior patterns and situations; they are usually not limited by strict rules of interaction, and the people participating in them tend to know each other very well. Primary relationships are such that one of their participants cannot simply be replaced by another new person" [4, p.131]. Secondary relationships – "relatively short-term bond between people, which is characterized by limited interaction, fairly clear rules and social roles. Unlike primary relationships, they are rarely characterized by high emotional involvement and the participant in the relationship can be easily replaced" [4, p. 131].

It is clear that by the nature and content of the interaction, the "student-teacher" relationship is likely to be a secondary relationship.

The fact that certain social relationships acquire personal being in pedagogical communication is noted in the studies of O.Yu. Hordin, who discussing the business and personal relationships of students,

rightly asserts that it is impossible to assume that the first (business) exist impersonally. "Official and unofficial relationships of schoolchildren always remain their personal relationships, since these are relationships of real persons" [9, p. 63].

In addition, N.D. Domina identifies different types of relationships between the teacher and the students: the relationship according to the role of the teacher in the life of the team – purposeful leadership, non-interference, suppression; according to emotions – cordial, tough; relationships in accordance with education goals – right and wrong; according to the educational essence – dignifying, perverted, etc. [10].

V.O. Kutiev classifies relationships according to their role and place in the student's life. He identified three types of relationships: a) relationships with an emphasis on the pedagogue's activity, on his leading role in the group; b) relationships with an emphasis on the role of the advisor-teacher in the life of children; c) relationships of equality with the joint educational activities with the students [19].

In psychology, a three-component mindset model is acceptable, which includes *cognitive*, *emotional* and *behavioral* components. In modern works on pedagogical activity, all these components are indicated. For example, V.O. Kan-Kalyk and H.O. Kovalov distinguishes "attitude, behavior and reflection", which are actually the emotional, behavioral and cognitive components of the mindset. Ya.L. Kolominskyi, analyzing and summarizing the studies of various authors and his own experimental data, confirms the need to identify three interrelated components in the structure of human interaction: *behavioral*, *emotional* and *cognitive*.

The *emotional* is the leading one of three components (the pedagogue's attitude to the student), which is associated with the *cognitive* component (knowledge, the pedagogue's understanding of the child's inner world) and the *behavioral* component (the choice of means and methods of influence).

All interactions have three interrelated components. "*Behavioral* includes: results of activity, actions, style of activity and deeds; facial expressions, gestures, pantomime, locomotion and, finally, speech, that is, everything in which a human personality is manifested and can be observed by other people. The *emotional* component includes everything that is associated with states and can be fixed at the levels of physiological registration and subjective reports. These are, first of all, positive and negative emotional states, conflict of states (personal, interpersonal), emotional sensitivity, satisfaction with oneself, partner, work, etc. The

Table 1.

Characteristics of the cognitive component of the relationship “teacher-student”, depending on the socio-perceptual features of the teacher (based on the analyzed literature)

Stereotypic level	Partially stereotypic level	Creative level
The teacher does not have the desire and ability to deeply know the student;	There is a desire to get to know the student, but there are no social-perceptual skills;	There is a desire and there are skills for a deep knowledge of the student's personality;
the teacher determines the characteristics of the student's behavior on the basis of very general and superficial ideas about him;	determines the characteristics of the student's behavior based on insufficiently detailed ideas about him;	determines the characteristics of the student's behavior based on general and detailed ideas about him;
the teacher forms a biased characteristic of the student;	the student's characteristic is quite objective, but not dynamic enough;	a generally positive and dynamic characteristic of the student is formed;
the teacher creates unfavorable conditions for the development of the student;	insufficiently favorable conditions are created, since the teacher does not stimulate the creative potential of the student;	the teacher creates favorable conditions for the student development, fulfilment of his creative potential;
it is difficult to change himself and his behavior even with obvious changes in the student development.	changes himself, but does not keep pace with the changes that occur in the development of the student.	dynamic behavior, taking into account the current and near development of the student.

cognitive component of a human personality, which interacts, includes all mental processes associated with cognition (of environment and oneself). These are sensation, perception, representation, memory, thinking, fantasy. The cognitive component is characterized by all the features of mutual understanding between partners, including adequacy and identification” [30, p.161-162].

V.M. Miasyshchev consistently revealed the interdependencies that connect people's knowledge of each other, the attitude that they experience at the same time, and their “behavior” with each other when they have to work together, study, relax and just live together. He distinguishes three components in the structure of communication: *people reflecting each other, relationships between them and interaction (“mutual behavior”) with each other* [25].

In psychological science there are also slightly different approaches to identifying the structure of relationships in general and pedagogical communication in particular. Thus, some scientists supplement the considered three-component structure with other components, for example: practical or practical-transformative; value-orientation; perceptual or cognitive; emotional or affective [16 p.72-73].

It is also important to take into account the fact that pedagogical communication is characterized by certain social parameters, which in the educational process acquire a socio-pedagogical, socio-psychological character: the social roles and positions of both parties, content of social activity (educational and cognitive, socio-political, etc.), the nature of the relationship, etc. [2, p. 11].

The study of L.K. Velytchenko suggested that S-S relationships, manifested due to the need for communicative and altruistic experiences, are more important for students than S-O relationships associated with the need for praxical and gnostic experiences. The results showed that "the communicative and praxical elements of educational and professional activities are more significant for students of the pedagogical field of education than the gnostic ones. Strengthening the gnostic component in the educational and professional activities can be achieved through the rational organization of the communicative and practical elements. This applies to the use in educational and professional activities of developing opportunities for business communication within the framework of scientific circles, creative groups, student laboratories" [6, p. 62].

Of course, the pedagogical communication, relationships between teachers and students affect the formation of professional and pedagogical abilities in future pedagogues. Thus, R.Kh. Sakurova, analyzing the methods and forms of individual mentoring (all-inclusive and problem-thematic), considers the business cooperation with an experienced colleague-mentor as a condition for overcoming the difficulties of a novice pedagogue in his professional activity.

It is important that the dynamics of the formation and development of the teacher's relationships with students provide for the consideration of both the student's personal growth, level (stage) of his professional development, and the transformation of the pedagogue's activity goal which is caused by the changes in the student's activity and behavior.

According to Yu.I. Turchaninova, E.N. Husynskyi, in order for pedagogues to master a fundamentally new educational experience, for

the formation of a new professional behavior around the teacher, a special educational environment should be created, saturated with a modern psychological and pedagogical knowledge, ideas, understandings and organized in such a way as to generate and expand in all participants their own experience of a personality-oriented interactions.

Communication in the life of a teacher acts not only as a special way of professional influence, but also as a sphere of his personal development, and as a way of establishing a person in another person (K.O. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya), and as a special way of entering general pedagogical activity [22].

Individual-specific influence is carried out due to the fact that the individual (pedagogue) supposedly transmits his personal characteristics to other people (students) in the form of various samples of his personal activity. They are implemented both in purposeful (professional) activity and in other cases of interaction of a person with other people [22, p. 9].

Undoubtedly, communication and relationships are inextricably linked with each other. "In the process of interaction between people, not only communication skills are produced, but also relationships are formed. Sympathy and antipathy, as a consequence of communication, in turn, determine the circle of persons with whom contact is maintained in the group and through which the assimilation of group norms of behavior and mutual understanding is carried out" [30, p. 162]. "Relationships are the result of communication" [21, p. 64].

G. Kelly, speaking of sociality (sociality corollary), asserted that one person can participate in a social process that concerns another person as he constructs the constructive processes of this person. This consequence underlies G. Kelly's approach to understanding empathy and social relationships. Filling the attitude to other people with content is a matter of understanding how they construct themselves and their world.

The study of socio-contextual, socio-mediated determinants of pedagogical communication in organic unity with the study of the deep mechanisms of psychological interaction at the personal level is consistently provided on the basis of the philosophical concept (M.S. Kahan) of communication as intersubjective interaction in the system of subject-object relationships.

V.M. Miasyshchev wrote: "relationships play an essential role in the nature of the interaction process and, in turn, are the result of interaction. Those experiences that arise in the process of interaction, strengthen,

destroy, reorganize relationships" [25, p. 21]. "The relationships of people are formed in the process of their interaction" [25, p. 166].

Interpersonal relationships do not exist outside the specific context of a particular organization, but they are regulated, in contrast to official relationships, to a greater extent by the personal characteristics of people who communicate and interact. The interrelation here is direct or mediated and is always accompanied by a state of satisfaction-dissatisfaction of subjects with each other [30, p. 161].

G. Homans believes that relationships are the result of interaction. The one with whom we are in closer interaction becomes more attractive to us [21, p. 65]. Empirical data does not always support this thesis, since it relies on the external side of the relationships process between people.

In philosophical literature, the idea of dialogic nature of human relationships as a prerequisite for the formation and existence of human has long been substantiated (L. Feuerbach). The idea was further developed in the works of representatives of such a philosophical trend as dialogism (M. Buber and others). According to M. Buber, relationships between people are based on two internally contradictory initial positions: "I-Thou" and "I-He (It)". The "I-Thou" relationship is an intimate-dialogical, subject-subjective (as opposed to the cognitive-practical, which is "I-He") relationship, which is based on the holistic reflection and acceptance of another person [5].

The model of value exchange as a mechanism of interpersonal interaction in a small social group was tested in the works of R.L. Krychevskyi. Defined [31] the value contribution of the class teacher in the relationship with students: leadership style, instructions regarding senior students and the nature of the relationship between them. In return, the teacher "receives": students' satisfaction with various aspects of their collective life, pedagogue's authority and class self-esteem. It is interesting that the valuable contribution of the class teacher to the life of the student collective "bears a certain imprint of the pedagogue's age and experience. The essence of this influence lies in the fact that in different age periods, the relevance degree of the value contribution of the pedagogue to the psychological and age characteristics of high school students is different".

According to H. Liimets, "the relationship between students in the classroom is also the result of the exchange of values, communication" [21]. It can be assumed that "relationships that satisfy both parties are based, on the one hand, on the recognition of some common values and, on the other hand, on certain personal differences and developmental characteristics of the communicating parties. For example, absolutely identical information

in any area does not provide a basis for communication between these people. If they have different information and are mutually interested in this, then this can be the basis for communication" [21, p. 66].

The study (S.V. Kondratiev, H.F. Mykhalchenko) found that "highly empathic test subjects, as a rule, showed a vivid humanistic orientation, which was expressed in the presence of mindsets towards the positive aspects of a communication partner (student) in a confidential tone of communication, democratic style of relationships, desire to understand the motives of actions" [17, p. 45].

Considering the relationship at the student age, it should be considered that this period accounts for only the 6th stage of human development (according to E. Erikson). As he argues, intimacy versus isolation tends to occur early in adulthood. This is the time of gaining independence from parents and school, period of establishing friendship and close relationships. It is at this stage that a sense of mature responsibility develops.

It is only after we have developed a sense of identity that we are able to develop a close and serious relationship with another person. Only then can we imagine true partnership, heartfelt affection and friendship.

The nature of the relationship between teachers and students, their individual actions and behavior patterns as a whole are governed by various social norms, which are traditionally established in an educational institution of a certain type and are fixed by statutory requirements. Thus, the social distance between pedagogues and students is normatively defined. "It means the difference in social positions, which is due to their rights and obligations in relation to each other" [23]. It also records the differences that "are outlined by the didactic attitude (teaching-learning), age, life and professional experience and, in general, by the socio-cultural potential of one and the other. So, this distance is not only social, but also sociocultural" [2, p. 12].

"A positive primary attitude towards a person (respect, authority, love) creates the preconditions for the return feeling. The pedagogue can cause in children empathy for his ideas, beliefs, attitude to the world only on condition of a positive attitude of students towards him" [2, p. 39]. Therefore, V.O. Sukhomlynskyi urged: "As a teacher, I should not only take into account that the students have some attitude towards me. It's not enough. I need to create a certain necessary for me attitude of the team of students to me as a unity". "The primary relationship determines the mindset of a person to not hinder the emergence of an experience

in himself. However, this is only a prerequisite: for the appearance of a corresponding emotion, an active desire to feel sympathy for a person, his inner world is necessary" [2, p. 39-40].

M.M. Obozov and A.O. Rusalina propose such a system of factors that determine interpersonal attractiveness (attraction, sympathy), compatibility and coherence of people:

1. The degree of relationship between individuals determines the "specific weight" of all other factors' significance.

2. The similarity-contrast of partners in: a) individual (natural) and personal characteristics; b) ideas about oneself ("Self-concept") and about the other (partner).

3. The level of psychological characteristics at which similarity-contrast is sought.

4. The hierarchy of qualities according to the degree of their significance (some are more, others are less significant for a certain type of relationship): a) the objective weight of personal qualities; b) the subjective weight (the difference in the degree of significance of certain qualities for each individual).

5. The time or duration of maintaining connections alters the values of the factors that determine interpersonal relationships. Moreover, a friendly type of connection is primarily determined by the emotional experience of the people who interact.

6. Age characteristics of people and their role in the regulation of interpersonal relationships: a) when they arise; b) their stability and safety; c) the range of age differences, which allows the emergence, stability and preservation of a certain type of interpersonal relationships.

7. Sex differences and the nature of the interaction of interpersonal relationships in same-sex and opposite-sex couples. In each type of couples, different mechanisms of regulation of attraction-repulsion, sympathy-antipathy (man-man, woman-woman, man-woman) can act.

8. Each individual case of interpersonal relationships of specific people has its own individuality, uniqueness. The patterns of the emergence and development of relationships, compatibility have a peculiarity associated with the uniqueness of the life history of each person and each group.

9. Groups of people, and furthermore collectives, do not exist on their own, but enter into complex and diverse relationships with other groups, collectives [30, p. 173-174].

Passion for the common cause of students and teachers is a source of empathy. At the same time, friendly disposition as a general emotional

background of relationships, combined with an interest in science, in a future profession, give rise to a joint creative search. It should be noted that the friendly disposition of teachers and students should develop in a general, pedagogically expedient activity, and not contradict it, turning, for example, into a familiar relationship.

The ethical and psychological foundations of the relationship between a teacher of a higher educational institution and students are being laid gradually. They depend on the experience of students (life, educational, social), traditions that are formed in the structure of the university unit (department, faculty), and finally, on the pedagogical orientation of the personality of the university pedagogue [14, p. 263].

It is worth emphasizing the role of subject activity in the formation of relationships between people, where S.L. Rubinstein wrote: "almost every human action is not only a technological operation in relation to things, but also an action in relation to another person, which expresses an attitude towards it... Relationships between people are realized through the attitude to things, to human subjects" [28, p. 336].

Based on the goal of higher education, 5th centration is the most acceptable. Each teacher of a higher educational institution must constantly analyze his activities, behavior, relationships with colleagues and students, his mindsets from the point of view of how they correspond to the main goals of the university, training of future highly qualified specialists [27].

The study of the essential characteristics of pedagogical communication, mechanisms of its functioning allows us to assert that the effectiveness of its implementation is ensured by a certain system of special skills of the pedagogue: the ability to correlate the structure of pedagogical communication, its beginning, deployment and completion with the content of educational material and to coordinate their position with the position of students as subjects of educational activity; the ability to place a system of semantic questions that stimulate the work of memory, convergent, divergent and evaluative thinking in the content of the topic being studied; skills that stimulate the communicative activity of students and the pedagogue's own communicative activity [18].

In summary, we note that interpersonal relationships in the "student-teacher" system depend on the general psychological climate at the university, organization of an integral pedagogical process in it based on the inclusion of all its subjects in the general educational and professional

activities. At the same time, the mindsets of teachers and students relative to each other are of great importance.

Depending on the features of the manifestation of the socio-perceptual aspect of the teacher's pedagogical activity, the cognitive component of the relationship in the "student-teacher" system can be characterized by three levels: stereotypic level, situational stereotypic (or partially stereotypic) level, creative level. The characteristics of these levels are shown in Table 1.

As it is known, the cognitive component of relationships is most integrated in the degree of mutual understanding of the subjects of interaction. At the same time, "the most essential parameters of mutual understanding are adequacy and identification" [30, p. 169].

References:

1. Azarov Yu. (2003). Tainy pedahohicheskoho masterstva. [Secrets of pedagogical excellence]. SPb.: Piter. 416 p. (In Russian).
2. Allakhverdov V.M., Beliak N.V., Ivanov M.V. (1985). O formirovanii psikhologicheskoi kultury u studentov tekhnicheskikh vuzov. Psikhologicheskoe obespechenie uchebno-vospitatelnogo protsessa v vuze. [On the formation of psychological culture among students of technical universities. Psychological support of the educational process at the university]. L.: Izd-vo LHM. 28-46 pp. (In Russian).
3. Arkhangel'skii S.I. (1980). Uchebnyi protsess v vysshei shkole, ego zakonomernye osnovy i metody. [The educational process in higher school, its legal foundations and methods]. Moskva: Vyssh. shkola. 280 p. (In Russian).
4. Astashova N. (2000). Uchitel. Problema vybora i formirovaniia tsennostei. [The teacher. The problem of choice and formation of values]. Moskva: MPSI. 272 p. (In Russian).
5. Bandurka A.M., Bocharova S.P., Zemlianskaia E.V. (1998). Psikhologhiia upravleniia. [Psychology of management]. Kharkov: OOO «Fortuna-press». 464 p. (In Russian).
6. Berezov N.A., Vasilev H.Kh. (1979). Printsipy nauchnoi orhanizatsii vzaimootnosheniia prepodavatelei i studentov. Sovremennaiia vysshaia shkola. [Principles of scientific organization of the relationship between teachers and students. Modern higher school]. № 1(25). 27-35 pp. (In Russian).
7. Berezov N.A., Kolominskii Ya.L. (1975). Uchitel i detskii kolektiv. [The teacher and the children's collective]. Minsk: Nar. asveta. 145 p. (In Russian).
8. Burns R. (1986). Razvitie «Ia-kontseptsii» i vospitanie: per. s anhl. [Self-concept development and education: translation from English]. Moskva: Prohress. 422 p. (In Russian).
9. Bodalev A.A. (1991). Psikhologicheskii usloviia optimizatsii pedahohicheskoho obshcheniia. Psikhologhiia pedahohicheskoho obshcheniia. [Psychological

- conditions for the optimization of pedagogical communication. Psychology of pedagogical communication]. Sb. nauch. trud. Kirovohrad: Kir. hos. ped. in-t. T.1. 4-14 pp. (In Russian).
10. Reber A. (2000). Bolshoi tolkovyi psikhologicheskii slovar. [The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology]. T.1 (A-O): per. s anhl. Moskva: Veche, AST. 592 p. (In Russian).
 11. Butenko N. (2006). Komunikatyvni protsesy u navchanni. [Communicative processes in education]. Kyiv: KNEU. 384 p. (In Ukrainian).
 12. Vitvitska S.S. (2013). Praktykum z pedahohiky vyshchoi shkoly. Navchalnyi posibnyk za modulno-reitynhovoioiu systemoiu navchannia. [Workshop on higher school pedagogy. A textbook on the modular-rating system of education]. Kyiv: UNL. 396 p. (In Ukrainian).
 13. Vitvitska S.S. (2013). Osnovy pedahohiky vyshchoi shkoly. [Higher School Pedagogy]. K.: UNL. 316 p. (In Ukrainian).
 14. Voitko V.I. (1981). Lichnostno-rolevoi podkhod v uchebno-vospitatelnom protsesse. Voprosy psikhologii. [Personal-role approach in the educational process. Psychology issues]. №3. 69-78 pp. (In Russian).
 15. Voitko L.F. (1983). O psikhologicheskikh faktorakh, povyshaiushchikh aktivnost obucheniia studentov. Psikhologo-pedahohicheskie osnovy sovershenstvovaniia uchebno-vospitatelnogo protsessa v vuze. [On the psychological factors that increase the activity of students' education. Psychological and pedagogical foundations of improving the educational process at the university]. Sb. nauch. trud. Dnepropetrovsk. 76-79 pp. (In Russian).
 16. Volkov I.P. (1970). Sotsiometricheskie metody v sotsialno-psikhologicheskikh issledovaniakh. [Sociometric methods in socio-psychological research]. L.: Izd-vo LHU. 85 p. (In Russian).
 17. Hohol V.N. Ronzin D.V. (1988). Vospitanie professionalnogo ideala u studentov pedvuzov kak uslovie stanovleniia ikh pedahohicheskoi napravlenosti. Psikhologo-pedahohicheskie problemy effektivnoi professionalnoi podgotovki uchitelia v vysshei shkole. [The upbringing of a professional ideal among students of pedagogical universities as a condition for the formation of their pedagogical orientation. Psychological and pedagogical problems of effective professional training of teachers in higher education]. Mezhvuz. sb. nauch. trud. L.: Izd-vo LHU. 25-39 pp. (In Russian).
 18. Hordienko V.I. Kopets L.V. (1986). Individualnye osobennosti sotsialno-pertseptivnykh orientatsii v pedahohicheskom obshchenii. Aktualnye problemy sotsialnoi psikhologii. [Individual characteristics of socio-perceptual orientations in pedagogical communication. Actual problems of social psychology]. Vsesoiuz. simpozium po sots. psikhologii. Kostroma. Ch.2. 38-40 pp. (In Russian).
 19. Hreilikh O.O. (1999). Profesiinyi pedahohichnyi kontakt: Psykhologichnyi samotreninh z rozvytku navychok empatii. [Professional pedagogical contact: Psychological self-training on developing empathy skills]. Kyiv: Znannia. 49 p. (In Ukrainian).

20. Hribov Yu.A. (1987). Ot pedahohiki sotrudnichestva k pedahohike sotvorchestva. Voprosy psikhologii. [From cooperation pedagogy to co-creation pedagogy. Psychology issues]. № 5. 10738 pp. (In Russian).
21. Hritsenko T.S. (1997). Rozvytok kultury pedahohichnoho spilkuvannia v systemi metodychnoi roboty zahalnoosvitnoi shkoly. [Development of a pedagogical communication culture in the system of methodological work of a general education school]. Avtoref. dys. ... kand. ped. nauk. [Abstract of the diss. ... PhD in Pedagogy]. 13.00.01. Kyiv. 18 p. (In Ukrainian).
22. Dihtiar H.O. (2006). Formuvannia refleksyvnoi kultury studentiv pedahohichnykh universytetiv. [Formation of a reflective culture of students of pedagogical universities]. Avtoref. dys. ... kand. ped. nauk. [Abstract of the diss. ... PhD in Pedagogy]. 13.00.01. Kharkiv. 21 p. (In Ukrainian).
23. Dmytrieva S.M. (1996). Psykholohichni osoblyvosti pedahohichnoi spivtvorchosti vykladacha i studentiv. [Psychological features of the pedagogical co-creation of the teacher and students]. Avtoref. dys. ... kand. psykhol. nauk. [Abstract of the diss. ... PhD in Psychology]. 19.00.07. In-t psykholohii im. H.S. Kostiuksa. Kyiv. 20 p. (In Ukrainian).
24. Dontsov A.I., Dubovskaia E.M., Upanovskaia I.M. (1998). Razrabotka kriteriev analiza sovmestnoi deiatelnosti. Voprosy psikhologii. [Development of criteria for the analysis of joint activities. Psychology issues]. № 2. 61-71 pp. (In Russian).
25. Diachenko M.I. Kandybovich L.A. (1981). Psikhologhiia vysshei shkoly. [Psychology of the higher school]. Minsk: Iz-vo BHU. 383 p. (In Russian).
26. Zimniaia I.A. (1970). Psikhologicheskie osobennosti vospriiatia lektsii v auditorii. [Psychological features of the perception of the lecture in the audience]. Moskva: Znanie. 74 p. (In Russian).
27. Kahan M.S. (1988). Mir obshcheniia: Problema mezhsuibektnykh otnoshenii. [The world of communication: The problem of intersubjective relationships]. Moskva: Politizdat. 319 p. (In Russian).
28. Kirichuk O.V. (1993). Problemy psikhologii pedahohichnoi vzaiemodii. [Psychology problems of Pedagogical Interaction]. Psikhologhiia: nauk.-metod. zb. Vyp. 37. Kyiv. 4-11 pp. (In Ukrainian).
29. Kolominskii Ya.L. (1975). Poznanie cheloveka v svete problem mezhlichnostnykh otnoshenii. [Cognition of a person in the light of the problems of interpersonal relations]. Teoreticheskie i prikladnye problemy psikhologii poznaniia liudmi druha druha. [Theoretical and applied problems of the psychology of people's cognition of each other]. Krasnodar. 33-35 pp. (In Russian).
30. Kolominskii Ya.L. (1984). Psikhologhiia detskogo kollektiva: Sistema lichnykh vzaimootnoshenii. [Psychology of the Children's collective: The System of Personal Relationships]. Mn.: Nar. asveta. 239 p. (In Russian).
31. Kondrateva S.V. (1984). Uchitel'-uchenik. [Teacher-student]. Moskva: Prosveshchenie. 96 p. (In Russian).

Authors

Harkusha Inesa Viktorivna
*PhD in Social Communications, Associate Professor,
Alfred Nobel University,
Dnipro, Ukraine*
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2164-7968>
*E-mail: Inessa_garkusha@ukr.net;
inessagarkusha@gmail.com*

Kryzhanovskyi Andrii Yevhenovych
*Assistant of Department prosthetic dentistry, PhD,
State institution «Dnipropetrovsk medical academy of
the Ministry of Health of Ukraine»,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9226-9012>
E-mail: andrei.kr@i.ua*

Abstracts

ІНЕСА ГАРКУША, АНДРІЙ КРИЖАНОВСЬКИЙ. Теоретичний огляд міжособистісних проблем взаємодії викладача та студентів. Статтю присвячено теоретичним проблемам міжособистісної взаємодії викладача та студентів у закладах вищої освіти. Педагогічна комунікація та взаємини в студентській академічній групі розглядаються дослідниками як важлива передумова педагогічного управління навчальним процесом у закладах вищої освіти. Стверджується, що для позначення стосунків між людьми часто застосовується термін «взаємовідносини». Визначено, що педагогічне спілкування – це взаємодія викладача зі студентами і змістом є обмін інформацією. Зазначено, що під взаєминами «викладач-студент» розуміється цілеспрямована взаємодія суб'єктів педагогічного процесу і визначаються загальними соціально-психологічними механізмами, соціально-рольовими функціями партнерів та соціальними нормами закладу вищої освіти. Виокремлено взаємини, які розрізняються на первинні й вторинні, де з'ясовано, що, на відміну від первинних взаємин, вторинні (стосунки «викладач-студент») рідко характеризуються великим емоційним залученням і учасників взаємин можна досить легко замінити. Схарактеризована трьох компонентна модель установки: когнітивна (знання, розуміння пе-

дагогом внутрішнього світу дитини), емоційна (ставлення педагога до вихованця) і поведінкова (вибір засобів та способів впливу). Наголошено на тому, що симпатія та антипатія визначають коло осіб, із якими підтримується контакт у колективі й здійснюється засвоєння групових норм поведінки. Доведено, що захопленість загальною справою студентів і викладачів, дружня прихильність, у поєднанні з інтересом до науки, до майбутньої професії, породжують спільний творчий пошук. Зроблено акцент на тому, що кожен викладач закладу вищої освіти повинен весь час аналізувати свою діяльність, поведінку, взаємини з колегами й студентами.

Ключові слова: міжособистісна взаємодія, ставлення, заклади вищої освіти, викладач, студент, комунікація, педагогічне спілкування.

ИНЕССА ГАРКУША, АНДРЕЙ КРЫЖАНОВСКИЙ. Теоретический обзор межличностных проблем взаимодействия преподавателя и студентов. Статья посвящена теоретическим проблемам межличностного взаимодействия преподавателя и студентов в учреждениях высшего образования. Педагогическая коммуникация и взаимоотношения в студенческой академической группе рассматриваются исследователями как важная предпосылка педагогического управления учебным процессом в учреждениях высшего образования. Утверждается, что для отношений между людьми часто применяется термин «взаимоотношения». Определено, что педагогическое общение – это взаимодействие преподавателя со студентами и содержанием является обмен информацией. Отмечено, что под взаимоотношениями «преподаватель – студент» подразумевается целенаправленное взаимодействие субъектов педагогического процесса и определяются общими социально-психологическими механизмами, социально-ролевыми функциями партнеров и социальными нормами учреждения высшего образования. Выделены отношения, которые различаются на первичные и вторичные, где установлено, что, в отличие от первичных отношений, вторичные (отношения «преподаватель – студент») редко характеризуются большим эмоциональным вовлечением и участников отношений можно достаточно легко заменить. Охарактеризована трех компонентная модель установки: когнитивная (знание, понимание педагогом внутреннего мира ребенка), эмоциональная (отношение педагога к воспитаннику) и поведенческая (выбор средств и способов воздействия). Отмечено, что симпатия и антипатия определяют круг лиц, с которыми поддерживается контакт в коллективе и

осуществляется усвоение групповых норм поведения. Доказано, что увлеченность общим делом студентов и преподавателей, дружеское расположение, в сочетании с интересом к науке, к будущей профессии, порождают совместный творческий поиск. Сделан акцент на том, что каждый преподаватель учреждения высшего образования должен все время анализировать свою деятельность, поведение, взаимоотношения с коллегами и студентами.

Ключевые слова: межличностное взаимодействие, отношения, учреждения высшего образования, преподаватель, студент, коммуникация, педагогическое общение

INESA HARKUSZA, ANDRIJ KRYŻANOWSKYJ. **Teoretyczny przegląd interpersonalnych problemów interakcji pomiędzy nauczycielem i studentami.** Artykuł poświęcony jest teoretycznym problemom interakcji interpersonalnych pomiędzy nauczycielem i studentami w szkołach wyższych. Komunikacja i relacje pedagogiczne w studenckiej grupie akademickiej są uważane przez badaczy za istotną przesłankę pedagogicznego zarządzania procesem kształcenia na uczelniach. Twierdzi się, że termin „wzajemne stosunki” jest często używany w odniesieniu do relacji między ludźmi. Określa się, że komunikacja pedagogiczna jest interakcją nauczyciela ze studentami, a treścią jest wymiana informacjami. Zaznacza się, że relacja „nauczyciel-student” oznacza celową interakcję podmiotów procesu pedagogicznego i jest determinowana przez ogólne mechanizmy społeczno-psychologiczne, funkcje społeczno-rolowe partnerów i normy społeczne szkolnictwa wyższego. Wyodrębniono relacje, które dzielą się na pierwotne i wtórne, gdzie stwierdzono, że w przeciwieństwie do relacji pierwotnych, relacje wtórne (relacje „nauczyciel-student”) rzadko charakteryzują się wysokim zaangażowaniem emocjonalnym, a uczestników relacji można łatwo zastąpić. Został scharakteryzowany trójskładnikowy model postawy: poznawczy (wiedza, rozumienie przez pedagoga wewnętrznego świata dziecka), emocjonalny (stosunek nauczyciela do studenta) i behawioralny (wybór środków i metod oddziaływania). Podkreśla się, że sympatia i antypatia determinują grupę osób, z którymi utrzymywany jest kontakt w zespole oraz przyswajanie grupowych norm zachowania. Udowodniono, że pasja do wspólnej sprawy studentów i nauczycieli, życzliwe zaangażowanie w połączeniu z zainteresowaniem nauką, przyszłym zawodem, generują wspólne poszukiwania twórcze. Nacisk kładzie się na to, że każdy nauczyciel szkolnictwa wyższego musi stale analizować swoje działania, zachowania, relacje z kolegami i studentami.

Słowa kluczowe: interakcja interpersonalna, postawa, placówki szkolnictwa wyższego, nauczyciel, student, komunikacja, komunikacja pedagogiczna.