

## **SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO PEDAGOGICAL INTERACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES**

*The existing literature related with the problem has been scrutinized in the paper. The nature of pedagogical interaction has been clarified. The role of pedagogue-cadet relationships in shaping cadets' and future officers' personality has been brought to the fore and the systematic approach to pedagogical interactions has been delineated. The existing relationships between the communicative approach and other approaches have been identified.*

**Keywords:** *communication; officer identity, communicative approach; formation of officer identity; current situation in problem; pedagogical interaction.*

Cultural-historical approach determines three cultural-historical communication types: cultural-historical type of object communication, cultural-historical type of subject communication, cultural-historical type of moral-ethical communication. Three social unity types can be interpreted from cultural-historical point of view. K.S.Aksakow considers three unity types. The first one is Asian type. Here first of all we encounter human worship, which is typical in Asian type society: this is a tyrannical society. The second type is Western European unity. Here the personality is evaluated on its own merits (in Asia the personality is inevitably revered which ushers in personality cult). The accepted personalities divide the society into different parts. The third one is provaslav cult of russian community (subcommunities within different nations). This type of society embodies the environment of russian nation, as well as slavic tribes. This is a joyful brethren.

Pedagogical interaction has the same spatial and time settings as the overall development factor of the individual. It can be approached in a phenomenal aspect (communication as natural, bioenergetic, creative, evaluative, biographical phenomenon - V.I.Kabrin), in terms of life activity (communicative lifestyle, communicative way of life), in the anthropological aspect (a communicative being, a communicative method), in the gnoseological aspect (communicative consciousness method), axiological aspect (communicative values), and etc.

The nature of pedagogical interaction is systematic, therefore it can not be determined through only a single approach and should be based on multiple approaches (with activity, cultural-historical, personality attitudes, etc.). At the same time, each of these approaches shown in the system dominates and plays a decisive role.

A communicative approach has a systematic role, making it more relevant to other approaches in the system, and incorporating the effects of other approaches. T. Shibutani said it when interpreting the interactive approach. In his opinion, the interactive approach is characterized by the belief that human nature and social structure are communication products. Behavior can not be considered as a response to only environmental stimuli, the expression of inner necessities or

manifestation of cultural templates. The direction of human behavior is analyzed as the outcome of mutual concessions that are consistent with and depend on one another. In addition, human personality is regarded as if it were created in the daily interaction with those who covered it. Finally, the culture of the groups seems to be based on communication rather than on people who have been forced to accept it, and composed of appropriate behavioral models since those people have been strengthened through interacting with their living conditions. If behavioral motivation and identity formation occur in social interaction, and if they enter into contact with each other, the impact should be brought to the mutual exchange between human beings [7, p.26].

Let's try to identify the existing relationships between the communicative approach and other approaches.

*The relationship between the communicative approach and personality approach.* This contact has several features. Above all, let's focus on the impact of the interactive approach on personality attitudes. It should be noted, that this communication implies understanding of identity interactions. It is typical for the representatives of subjective interactions - E. Tolmen, J. Miller, E. Galanter, K. Pribram, and A. Bandur who is the representative of electric biophysics.

Several prominent scientists in this sphere (V.N. Myasishev, A.K. Kovalev, E.V. Ilyenkov and others) emphasize the identification of the personality in the system of relationships. So, E.V. Ilyenkov insisted that the personality like a public education was a collection ("ensemble") of real, distinctive relationships that a person is experiencing with other individuals [2, p.16].

In Q. Sallive's concept, personality is described as "a relatively tolerant example of recurrent interpersonal cases that characterizes human life". For him the personality exists only in the context of relationships with other individuals, and the environment translates into "interpersonal cases". R. Karson interprets the personality as a condition discovered only in interpersonal relationships. An attempt of excitement (Enler, Mangussov, etc.), endeavour for achievements (C. Domino, L. Kronbach, R. Snow), issue about reciprocal relations of leadership styles have been studied in the research of the interaction between personalities.

Personality is construed in the following ways:

- a part of interpersonal space;
- an interpersonal education;
- human's unity with other human beings (L. Feyerbakh);
- human's need for human (V.A. Sukhomlinski);
- human being as interpersonal communication (F. Shleermakher),
- dialogue-wise life (M. Buber),
- personality, as a collection of socially significant relationships (B.G. Ananyev) created in the process of interaction of one person with other people directly and indirectly.

Interpersonal relationships, as an entity, provide three identities:

- personality is relatively stable total of its intrinsic qualities, psycho-features, motives, personality orientation (L. Bojovich), temperament characteristics and capabilities (B.P. Teplev, V.D. Kobilisin, V. Merlin, etc.);
- personality is included in the individual's interpersonal relationships;
- personality is an individual's ideal presentation to other people's activities (A.V. Petrovsky).

Communication can be found in the context of structural elements of personality: motives (communicative motivation - E.I. Passov), thinking (communicative function of thinking, communicative thinking - E.I. Passov); skills (pedagogical communication skills, ability to communicate with trainees - K.D. Radina); preparation (social and psychological preparation - Y.L. Kolominskiy), preparation for communication (H.I. Liymetz); abilities (reflexive abilities - N.V. Kuzmina), ability to commiserate with others (V. Kan-Kalik), organizational-communicative (V.A. Krutskiy); social-perceptive (S.B. Kondratyeva); communicative abilities (A.A. Kidron, A.A. Boldriev and others); personality (communicative qualities of the personality – N.F. Ilyin), reputation (authority), instincts, needs, character, behavior, etc.

At the same time, personality approach can influence the communication character, first of all, by defining its subjectivity: subject communication, subject attitude and so on.

Subject-type unity entails dialogue communication, dialogue attitude (subject-subject relationships of equal rights), altruistic establishments (subordination, voluntary self-sacrifice and self-denial), humanistic attitude, the perception of the subject-type community, interactions (including attempts to “incorporate” the subject communication into the teaching process), dialogue-type teaching, dialogue-type training, education-dialogue, humanistic attitude paradigm, and pedagogue-manipulator. For example, education arrangements sometimes lead to authoritarian or dialogue-type communication

Monologue communication is based on monophonic principle: one voice - one idea; the trainee is instructed to keep silent; The dialogue communication has other bases, which suggests that the trainees can be involved in the discussion of the teaching problem: in the authoritarian communication, the trainer's psychological counseling is “top-down”, asymmetric; in dialogue communication – “in the same equation”, symmetric. The organization of the workshop (communicative space) can also be monologue (monophonic) and dialogue-type (polyphony). Teaching information is a statement that describes the nature of the text to be used. In the authoritarian communication, it usually has no personal character, does not consider the features of the listeners, it refers to the axiomatic content, as well as the personification of the text as it is in dialogue-type communication, the individual features of the students are taken into account, the personal opinion is expressed openly, the discussion nature of the notifications is revealed, and so on [1, p.48 ].

*Relationships between communicative approach and activity approach.* Concepts such as “interaction” and “cooperation” now combine two components in

their names: communication and activities (mutual interaction as mutual activities, activity jointly implemented measures). The same thing can be said about the concept of "cooperation", i.e. working together. However, other communicative notions can be closely interconnected with the activity.

*Communication as an activity.* Human activity is understood to mean the activity directed at achieving certain goals, stimulated by the methods of behavior adopted by the community and stimulated by certain motives. From this point of view, the activity is not only a play, training, production and everyday life, but also people's communication [5, p.26].

As an example of communication-activity, let us introduce the communicative activity proposed by M.I. Lisina. It identifies the following structural components of communicative activity: communication object (partner, other person as a communication subject), need for communication (attempting to recognize and evaluate another person, self-esteem and self-evaluation), communicative motives – these are the reasons to launch a communication (communicative activity unit oriented to another person as its object), communicative assignment (purpose of communication, achievement of different movements), communication means (operations facilitating communication), communication products (derivatives of material and moral nature resulting from the communication).

In fact, the approach to communication, as a project implementation exercise, does not change. N.N.Obozov describes the following parts of communication as an activity: 1) Programming the communication purpose and ways of achieving it (selecting logical influencing means for other communicators, methods of argumentation); 2) negotiation executing the program and other indicative direction; 3) control over individual communicative behavior, its correction; 4) supervision (observation of the communicative actions of others involved in the communication, correction of individual behavior (feedback principle) correction of the program for communicative acts [4, p.98].

Other diversity of communicative activity - this attitude + is object activity. We find out this communicative action model .The third option is interaction + activity.

Communication is regarded as “one of the types of human activity” in various modifications: it is interpreted as a person's specific communication method, distinguished as an object-activity in the universe, is considered as a communication activity, communication means, intragroup communication object, a certain communication method, an object-oriented interaction.

*Unity as an education through internal activities (activity + unity).* When the activity is viewed as complex education, its different types are distinguished. While determining the pedagogical activity of the pedagogue, the following types of pedagogical interaction are used [6, p.541]:

- a) diagnostic;
- b) oriented-prognostic;
- c) constructive-projected, organizer;
- d) informative-explanatory,

- e) communicative-stimulating;
- f) analytical-evaluating;
- g) research-creative.

Communication and culture also have other interconnected relationships: First, communication has its own context in culture as a communicative culture, and secondly, communication plays the role of human being in culture.

*Relationship between the communicative approach and the cultural-historical approach.* The relationship between the communicative approach and the cultural-historical approach can be identified by addressing the problem of unity and sameness. This unity and sameness must be explained in terms of two historical type of theories: First theory reflects the ideology of idolatry, interprets the position of unity and sameness as the subject of the human being, and the subject's dominance over the object. The second theory is armed with Christian culture and its moral and ethical origin is the basis of human existence. K. Lspers described the awakening and dominance of human life as the “axis” of humanity's development.

M. Kagan analyzed the following forms of communication produced by the history of culture: communication with a real partner (true, realistic), communication with the group, authorized communication, communication of cultures; communication with an imaginary partner (with a subjective object), communication with animals, communication with the object, communication with your second “ME”, communication with the mythological or literary image, etc. [3, p.199]. Thus, the idea of unity and sameness reflects human and mental creativity.

**Conclusion.** It is necessary to identify the main system-creating factor in the systematic approach to reciprocal attitudes and relationships (which forms the system of external and internal factors of personal development). In modern times, such a system-creating factor is considered a personality-based approach. For this reason, the basic understanding of the current research is not merely a “mutual attitude”, but personality-based “mutual relationship”, which implies the unification of the individual's developmental factors in a particular system, which serves as a driving force behind the development of personality.

#### LITERATURE

1. Газман О.С. От авторитарного к педагогике свободы // Новые ценности образования. 1995, № 2, 154 с.
2. Ильенков З.В. Что такое личность? С чего начинается личность. М., 2013, 183 с.
3. Каган М.С. Мир общения. М.: Политиздат, 1988, 319 с.
4. Обозов Н.Н. Межличностные отношения. Л., 1979, 163 с.
5. Талызина Н.Ф. Теоретические проблемы усвоения познавательной деятельности человека. М., 1979, 154 с.
6. Харламов И.Ф. Педагогика. М.: Высшая школа, 1990, 576 с.
7. Щумахова Н.Б. Диалог и развитие творческой активности у детей. М., 1991, 81 с.
8. Ağayev M. Pedaqoji fikir tarixində tərbiyə və təhsil. Azərbaycan Müəllimlər İnstitutu, 2011, 178 s.
9. İbrahimov F., Hüseynzadə R. Pedaqogika: 2 cildə. I cild. Bakı: Mütərcim, 2012, 708 s.
10. Davis P., Florian L. Teaching Strategies and Approaches for Pupils with Special Educational Needs: A Scoping Study // Research Report RR516, 2004, 90 p.

11. McAllum R. Reciprocal Teaching: Critical Reflection on Practice // RTLБ, Central West Auckland Kairaranga, Vol. 15, Issue 1, 2014, pp. 26-35.
12. Westbrook J. et.al, Pedagogy, Curriculum, Teaching Practices and Teacher Education in Developing Countries. Final Report. Education Rigorous Literature Review. Department for International Development, 2013, <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk>.

## REFERENCES

1. Gazman O.S. Ot avtoritarnogo k pedagogike svobody // Novye cennosti obrazovanija. 1995, № 2, 154 s. (in Russian).
2. Il'enkov Z.V. Chto takoe lichnost'? S chego nachinaetsja lichnost'. M., 2013, 183 s. (in Russian).
3. Kagan M.S. Mir obshhenija. M.: Politizdat, 1988, 319 s. (in Russian).
4. Obozov N.N. Mezhlchnostnye otnoshenija. L., 1979, 163 s. (in Russian).
5. Talyzina N.F. Teoreticheskie problemy usvoenija poznavatel'noj deja-tel'nosti cheloveka. M., 1979, 154 s. (in Russian).
6. Harlamov I.F. Pedagogika. M.: Vysshaja shkola, 1990, 576 s. (in Russian).
7. Shhumahova N.B. Dialog i razvitie tvorcheskoj aktivnosti u detej. M., 1991, 81 s. (in Russian).
8. Ağayev M. Pedaqoji fikir tarixində tərbiyə və təhsil. Azərbaycan Müəllimlər İnstitutu, 2011, 178 s.
9. İbrahimov F., Hüseyinzadə R. Pedaqogika: 2 cilddə. I cild. Bakı: Mütərcim, 2012, 708 s.
10. Davis P., Florian L. Teaching Strategies and Approaches for Pupils with Special Educational Needs: A Scoping Study // Research Report RR516, 2004, 90 p.
11. McAllum R. Reciprocal Teaching: Critical Reflection on Practice // RTLБ, Central West Auckland Kairaranga, Vol. 15, Issue 1, 2014, pp. 26-35.
12. Westbrook J. et.al, Pedagogy, Curriculum, Teaching Practices and Teacher Education in Developing Countries. Final Report. Education Rigorous Literature Review. Department for International Development, 2013, <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk>.

## АНОТАЦІЯ

**Мурад Гамідов,**  
Військова Академія Збройних Сил  
Азербайджанської Республіки

### Систематичний підхід до педагогічної взаємодії в освітніх військових установах

*Проблема формування особистості офіцера завжди була в центрі уваги протягом сучасного розвитку Збройних Сил. Науково-практичне вирішення цієї проблеми має ключове значення і вимагає чималих зусиль від учасників педагогічного процесу. Досягти певного результату практично неможливо без налагодження порозуміння між педагогом і курсантами в освітніх військових установах. У статті досліджено існуючу літературу стосовно даної проблематики. Під час розгляду теми визначено характер педагогічної взаємодії. В першу чергу досліджено роль педагога у формуванні особистості курсантів як майбутніх офіцерів. Обґрунтовано необхідність системного підходу до організації педагогічної взаємодії. Таким чином, об'єктом дослідження є педагогічний процес в освітніх військових установах. А суб'єктом визначено педагогічну взаємодію між педагогом і курсантами. Розглянуто комунікативну та інші технології впливу для формування партнерських відносин між учасниками педагогічного процесу.*

**Ключові слова:** спілкування; особистість офіцера; комунікативний підхід; формування особистості офіцера; поточна ситуація в пробле; педагогічна взаємодія.

## РЕЗЮМЕ

**Мурад Гамидов,**  
Военная Академия Вооруженных Сил  
Азербайджанской Республики

### **Систематический подход к педагогическому взаимодействию в образовательных военных учреждениях**

*Проблема формирования личности офицера всегда была в центре внимания в процессе развития современных Вооруженных Сил. Научно-практическое решение этой проблемы имеет ключевое значение и требует немалых усилий от участников педагогического процесса. Достичь определенного результата практически невозможно без налаживания взаимопонимания между педагогом и курсантами в образовательных военных учреждениях. В статье исследована существующую литературу по данной проблематике. При рассмотрении темы определен характер педагогического взаимодействия. В первую очередь изучена роль педагога в формировании личности курсантов как будущих офицеров. Обоснована необходимость системного подхода к организации педагогического взаимодействия. Таким образом, объектом исследования является педагогический процесс в образовательных военных учреждениях. А субъектом определено педагогическое взаимодействие между педагогом и курсантами. Автором рассмотрены коммуникативная и другие технологии влияния для формирования партнерских отношений между участниками педагогического процесса.*

**Ключевые слова:** *общение; личность офицера; коммуникативный подход; формирование личности офицера; текущая ситуация в проблеме; педагогическое взаимодействие.*