

HYPOCRISY OF A TEACHER AS ONE OF THE FACTORS OF PEDAGOGICAL WORK INEFFICIENCY

Aleksandr N. Svirid,
Brest State A.S. Pushkin University,
21, Kosmonavtov Boulevard, 224016 Brest, Belarus
raven_raven@mail.ru

Abstract

The aim of this article is to examine the role of emotional intelligence and hypocrisy in the effectiveness of the pedagogical process and pedagogical mastery. The difference between emotional intelligence and hypocrisy is discussed.

Key words: effective pedagogical process, hypocrisy, emotional intelligence.

The elements of an effective pedagogical process are often similar to the elements of pedagogical mastery. The most difficult issue in this matter is the psychological orientation of the teacher's activity and the pedagogical methods used by him.

Pedagogical work (mastery) cannot be evaluated in individual lessons and classes. A great open lesson may be the only open lesson for a particular teacher. It can only be evaluated in the system of work, and then more in terms of its result than its content.

The one important circumstance should be underlined, but this circumstance is far from always taken into account: for the effectiveness of pedagogical influence, the subject of pedagogical relations must be an authoritative source of information for the object. If the student and (or) his parents do not trust a to the teacher as a specific information resource, then, at best, everything that comes from him will be taken

critically, and if he does not stand up to criticism, then the authority of the source will be reduced further.

This tendency also manifests itself when the teacher is the source of information. Being at least once convicted of a lie or hypocrisy, he dramatically loses his authority.

According to Igor Kon, hypocrisy is “a negative moral quality, consisting in the fact that pseudo-moral meaning, sublime motives and philanthropic goals are attributed to deliberately immoral acts (committed for the sake of selfish interests. Hypocrisy is the opposite of honesty, sincerity, in which awareness and open expression are manifested a man of the meaning of his actions” [1].

The term “hypocrisy” was used in relation to actors who tried on different faces (masks) to play different characters on stage.

Nowadays, hypocrisy is understood as behavior in which words and behavior contradict real human beliefs and feelings.

The teacher represents the state and is forced to act in line with state policy. But do his views always coincide with the state? The teacher is not a civil servant and does not have all the benefits and bonuses that officials have, but he is a provider of public policy. The demand to the teacher is rather more than less. This circumstance transfers the teacher to a zone of “hypocritical risk”.

The hypocrite is a skilled manipulator, he knows (feels) the partner’s in conversation weaknesses and plays on his interests, fears and prejudices. A hypocritical person is usually sensitive, quickly and competently reacts to the mood of others and skillfully plays along with him. But the teacher must take into account the mood and use the situation for skillful pedagogical influence. Therefore, the line where pedagogical work ends and hypocrisy begins is quite thin.

Each person has the ability to adapt to another person and situation. In different situations, behaving differently is normal natural behavior. This is a kind of natural instinct and this line of behavior has allowed a person and a generation to survive. Anyone at least once in his life was two-faced in order to avoid unpleasant and

difficult situations. This is called flexibility and can be an indicator of emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence (EI) is the sum of a person's skills and abilities to recognize emotions, understand other people's intentions, motivation and desires and their own, as well as the ability to control their emotions and emotions of other people in order to solve practical problems [2].

The concept of emotional (social) intelligence appeared as a reaction to the inability of traditional intelligence tests to predict a person's success in his career and in life. It turned out that successful people are capable of effective interaction with other people based on emotional connections and effective modulation of their own emotions, while the concept of intelligence adopted in science did not include these points, and existing intelligence tests were not able to evaluate these abilities.

By the definition of S.J. Stein and Howard Buk, «emotional intelligence», in contrast to the classical concept of «intelligence», “is the ability to correctly interpret the situation and influence it, be able to guess what other people want and need, know their strong and weaknesses, be charming and do not make himself liable to the stress” [2].

It is assumed that it was emotional intelligence that was key for human survival in prehistoric times, since it manifests itself in the ability to adapt to the environment, and find a common language with fellow tribesmen and neighboring tribes [3]. This aspect was touched upon in 1872 by Charles Darwin in his work “Expression of Emotions in People and Animals,” where he wrote about the role of external manifestations of emotions for survival and adaptation [4].

Such a definition, in fact, corresponds to the definition of hypocrisy. Therefore, the question is not so much in quality, but in quantity, which then goes into that quality, allowing us to consider a person a hypocrite.

An attempt to solve this terminological problem was made in 2006 by N.A. Korneeva, who defended her thesis for the degree of candidate of psychological sciences on the topic “Psychological features of the teacher's social hypocrisy as

professionally conditioned deformation” through the concept of “Social hypocrisy” [5]. Korneeva considers social hypocrisy as a deformation of the personality of a teacher in the process of performing pedagogical activity.

Shi writes: “The transition period from one system of socio-economic relations to another put the teacher in a very difficult position. The state pays a beggarly salary, endlessly declaring the importance of education and the problems of youth. The specificity of psychological problems associated with these difficulties puts the teacher in front of the need to master new socio-economic and professional experience. According to N.A. Korneeva, “... at present, teachers are changing their value orientations, disappointment in the economic and social reforms carried out in the field of education leads to the fact that the teacher needs to constantly adapt to the requirements of the administration, parents, students and, finally, to the requirements of society ... This creates a frustrating situation for the teacher, to which he must adapt, that is, a protective mechanism is activated - adaptation to the existing social environment, acquiring the character of a hypocritical behavior. Qualities appear in the teacher’s behavior, which are expressed by the manifestation of insincerity, moralization, stereotypical, ingratiating behavior towards people on whom the opinion of him as a professional depends. All these qualities characteristic of professional deformation are social hypocrisy. On the one hand, the teacher himself should be an example for students, show a high moral and moral level, love his profession, on the other hand, society put the teacher in a very difficult material, psychological and social situation [5, p. 5-7].

The hypothesis of the Korneeva’s study was the assumption:

- Social hypocrisy is determined by the context of pedagogical activity.
- Teacher's social hypocrisy arises as a protective mechanism (adaptation) to socially unfavorable conditions of pedagogical work.
- The mechanism of the development of social hypocrisy is the deformation of the structural components of the personality of the teacher, caused by

the impact of a complex of subjective and objective factors, leading to the need to adapt to various life situations.

- Social hypocrisy develops more often among teachers in the humanitarian sphere [5, p. 7-8].
- Social hypocrisy occurs most often among teachers with low self-esteem, high adaptability and social desirability.
- Social hypocrisy develops more often among humanitarian teachers [5, p. 7-8].

All these assumptions listed above were experimentally confirmed. That is, the problem of the hypocrisy of the teacher objectively exists.

The consequence of the hypocrisy is the inefficiency of pedagogical work. The child sees that the teacher is a hypocrite. The spiritual connection between the teacher and the child is broken in such a situation. Can I learn from those you despise? It is possible if you are an adult, if you have good willpower and a clear understanding of what exactly you should take from this particular person. But children are still not adults, they are ready to learn only from those who are respected. If the child treats the teacher with contempt, considers him a hypocrite, then pedagogical work becomes ineffective [6].

What is the main problem of modern education – the lack of motivation to learn from students? The teacher, trying to raise it, is sometimes forced to hypocrisy. And when he tries to say: “if you want to live well, study,” but it’s obvious to the students what kind of teacher the phone model is in, what kind of suit he walks in, what house or dormitory he lives in, not to mention which car he travels - students inevitably have a dissonance between what they see and what they are trying to depict.

As long as there is a reason for the teacher to say, “if you are so smart, why are you so poor”, the way out of the problem in which modern education finds itself (and inevitably will soon be behind it science, and their production and defense capability) is not visible.

But even in modern schools and universities, you can find teachers, to whom students and children treat with great respect, whom they love and whose words they carefully listen to. The secret of such people is that they have the courage to not lie and hysteria over trifles, not to lose their face and not be afraid to say what you think, and if you don't know something, then admit it directly [6]. But, does it depend only on salary and social status? And does it depend on salary and social status in general?

References

- [1] Kon, I. *Dictionary of Ethics*. Moscow: Politizdat, 1981. 430 p.
- [2] Stein St.J., Book H.E (2007). *The EQ Edge: Emotional Intelligence and Your Success*. Dnepropetrovsk. Balance Business Books. 384 p.
- [3] Goleman, D. (2008). *Emotional Intelligence*. Moscow: AST. 478 p. (in Russian).
- [4] Darwin, Ch. R. (2001). *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. St. Petersburg: Peter. 384 p. (in Russian).
- [5] Korneeva, N.A. (2006). *Psychological Features of the Teacher's Social Hypocrisy as a Professionally Determined Deformation*. The dissertation for the degree of candidate of psychological sciences. Moscow. 169 p. (in Russian).
- [6] Makarenko, O. (2012). *Cowardice and Hypocrisy of Educators*. Available at: <https://olegmakarenko.ru/544334.html>. (Accessed 11, October 2019). (in Russian).