**Lecture 8 Styles of pedagogical dialogue**

The renowned and outstanding psychologist V.A. Kan-Kalik highlighted five pedagogical styles:

1. *Communication based on high professional prescriptions of the teacher*, his attitude to teaching as a whole.
2. *Communication based on friendly disposition*. It involves dedication to specific work. The teacher acts as a mentor, a senior fellow, and partially as a fellow in co –curricular activities. However, a teacher should avoid familiarity. This is especially true for young teachers who do not want to get into conflicts with elder students.
3. *Distance communication* refers to the most common types of pedagogical communication. In this case, distance is constantly observed in all areas: in education –with reference to the credibility and professionalism and with reference to the experience and age. This style creates relations “teacher-student” as opposition, however this does not mean that students should perceive the teacher only as a tutor and master.
4. *Deterrence method,* the negative form of communication, inhumane and intolerant, shows a pedagogical failure of the teacher, who uses fear and threatens as motivators for students’ activity and work.
5. *Flirting approach* is typical for young teachers seeking popularity. This communication provides false, cheap credibility. [14].

The diagnostic procedure for pedagogical communication styles is based on classification of models of teachers' behavior in communication with students within classes by L. D. Stolyarenko and S. I. Samygin. Conventionally these models can be denoted as follows: dictator model (Mont Blanc); non-contact model (Great Wall of China); model of differentiated attention (Locator); hypo-reflective model (Grouse); hyper- reflective model (Hamlet); model of inflexible response (Robot); authoritarian model (My own self); model of active interaction (Union) [15]. This classification, let us consider it in more details:

**Dictator model (Mont Blanc)** – the teacher is aloof from the students, personal influence is minimum, pedagogical functions are reduced to informative message, which results in the absence of psychological contact, shiftlessness and passivity of the students.

**Non-contact model (Great Wall of China)** – between the teacher and the students there exists weak response due to randomly or unintentionally created communication barrier, the studies are of informative and not of dialogue pattern, which leads to weak interaction with the students and for their part, indifferent attitude to the teacher.

**Model of differentiated attention (Locator)** – based on selective relations with the students, the teacher is oriented not at all group but only at its portion, either at good or, vice versa, at weak students, which leads to violation of integrity of interaction in the system teacher--group, which is substituted with fragmented situational contacts.

**Hypo-reflective model (Grouse)** – the teacher is in his/her shell: the speech is presented mainly with monologues, within joint activity he/she is absorbed with his/her concepts and is emotionally deaf to others, which leads to the absence of communication between the students and the teacher, since the latter is surrounded with the field of psychological vacuum.

**Hyper-reflective model (Hamlet)** – it is opposite to the previous model in terms of psychological characteristic: the teacher is anxious not only with substantial part of interaction, but rather with how he/she is appreciate by the others, he/she always in doubts about efficiency of his/her arguments, reacts vehemently to responses from the students, taking them personally, which leads to strained social-psychological sensitivity of the teacher and non- adequate reactions to the responses and actions of the group.

**Model of inflexible response (Robot)** – interaction between the teacher and the students are arranged according to rigid program, where targets of the studies and teaching procedures are strictly maintained, perfect logics of narration and argumentation of facts takes place, but the teacher does not feel and understand alternating communicative situation, which leads to low efficiency of pedagogical interaction.

**Authoritarian model (My own self)** – educational In addition, the students-philologists demonstrated process is completely focused at the teacher, there is also decreased and low level of neurotization (for more no creative interaction between the teacher and the than 70 % of tested persons), which is characterized with students, any self-action of the students is emotional tolerance and positive background of major suppressed, their cognitive and social activity is feelings (calmness, optimism). Optimism and creativity, reduced to minimum, which leads to shiftlessness, plainness in implementation of desires form sense of loss of creative character of education, distortion of self-respect, social courage, independence, easiness in motivational sphere of cognitive activity. Communication and related with these properties stress

**Model of active interaction (Union)** – the teacher is resistance. In contiguous dialogue with the students, supports group and reacts to them with high flexibility. Tolerance. More than 70 % of students are characterized this model is the most efficient.