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Abstract—Management and leadership both in small and large groups of people within any social environment and under all psychological conditions are associated with the phenomena of authority and respectability. The main objectives of this study are to investigate the relationship between the teacher's authority and group parameters. In the educational process a teacher's authority most likely affects students' motivation for learning, their diligence, discipline and attention. It also increases students' interest in the subject and then through these intermediate links the teacher's authority affects the learning outcomes. There are three factors in building teachers' authority and respectability: the teacher's personality, the students' value expectations, and the parameters of the social environment. The first two factors are mirror images of each other. The results show that there can also be distinguished some more definite factors such as the professional and psychological qualities involved in interacting with students: subject knowledge, methodological skills, organizational skills, communicative and moral-communicative qualities, empathic personality traits, as well as a number of others. All these qualities are only shown in the teacher-student interaction. The findings support the idea that the structure of students' value expectations is influenced by various micro- and macro-social conditions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Authority is a typical socio-psychological phenomenon that exists only in interaction. In the same way, it can only be demonstrated in interaction and relationships [1]). Therefore, our study is aimed at revealing the essence of the concepts of “authority”, “perception”, “motivation” that are reflected in interaction, in the process of jointly performed activities, and in the value expectations of students from teachers. In addition, the study is focused on identifying teachers who command students’ respect and those who lack it. In both groups psychological characteristics of personalities are studied in order to highlight the factors of teachers’ authority formation.

It is well known that one of the primary issues of formulating any conception is to define the basic notions and establish relationships between them. Therefore, it is important to consider them to avoid confusion and eclecticism. The issue we are studying is not only important from the point of view of theory and practice of education, but also difficult in terminological terms due to their semantic mismatch. One of the famous social psychologists G. Homans explained authority through the concepts of influence and respect. He believed that an authority is a person influencing the group members and commanding the respect of them [2]. There is no doubt that this is a very good definition from the operational point of view.

R. H. Shakurov writes the following, “From the point of view of social psychology authority is the position of a personality in the system of interpersonal relations that determines the possibility of having a moral and psychological influence on other people” [3]. As we can see, this approach connects authority with the concept of status (“position”), i.e. with a special status of the personality in a group. Here the positions of the author are close to the ideas that have become
widespread among foreign specialists. However, there are some peculiarities. In our opinion, it is very important to say that authority is regarded as the possibility of exerting the influence rather than influence itself. This is not a technical possibility, but a fundamental one. The category of possibility can also be considered as recognizing the fact that authority “belongs” to a personality.

Thus, authority is a specific image of a personality in the minds of colleagues, subordinates, students, and others. In our opinion, it can be defined as follows: authority is a form of representing the personality in the minds of group members that makes it possible for this personality to influence their behavior, evaluations, and attitudes without any direct pressure. Like R. H. Shakurov, we use the word “possibility”, meaning that a personality may not seek to exercise authority, may not even think of it. However, the personality influences the other people regardless of the desire. Then there is no direct or indirect pressure. To be more exact, the influence is not realized by any of the parties, and, nevertheless, it is actually felt. Only being a class or academic group teacher, the teacher is likely to affect the socio-psychological atmosphere in academic groups or school classes. The greatest effect of the teacher’s authority should be observed in the educational and upbringing sphere, in the sphere of developing the moral values, social feelings, professional choice, and in some others.

The purpose of this study is to explore the effect of socio-pedagogical environment through the teacher’s personality, the students’ value expectations, and the parameters of the social environment.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The main methods for the research of this problem were:

- theoretical (study and analysis of philosophical, psychological and pedagogical literature on the research problem);
- diagnostic (questionnaire survey, self-assessment method, testing).

We applied the methodology developed by E.I. Rogov for measuring the professional orientation of the teachers’ personalities [4]. The methodology has 5 scales: a) sociability, b) organization, c) focus on the subject, c) intelligence, d) motivation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

It is difficult to say if authority is of rational and cognitive origin, or emotional and sensory one. On the one hand, when establishing any relationship a personality evaluates another one. Everyday experience shows that the attitude to another personality is often assumed on the basis of some individual property, quality, behavior, etc. The perception and evaluation of a particular property is transferred to the personality. As a result, in some cases, many human disadvantages are no longer noticed, and in other cases the advantages are not noticed either. This can hardly be called a rational process, since rationality involves taking into account all significant factors. Emotional and sensory processes play an important role both in developing the authority and in establishing the ordinary relationships [5]. Authority should be considered as a social feeling that every person has a need for and that is personified in some particular individuals. From the genetic aspect authority is most likely a feeling. Like any feeling, it is under a certain rational control [6].

Social psychology traditionally distinguishes between official authority (position authority) and personality authority. Sometimes within the personality authority the personal, or emotional authority and the functional one, based primarily on professional and position competence, are considered separately [7]. Official (or position) authority is completely determined by the formal, and in some cases, informal status of the individual. There are different opinions on the role of the above-mentioned two components: functional and emotional (moral) ones. R. L. Krichevsky, for example, argues that the first one is more important, and its lack has more severe consequences for the staff [8]. Undoubtedly this point of view is quite logically justified, but it is most likely true for production teams, if we keep in mind the objective of their effective functioning. But when dealing with children’s groups at educational institutions, the criteria for effectiveness are ambiguous. Under these conditions any of the teacher’s authority components is equally important.

Another important issue that needs to be analyzed is originating and building the authority. What are the factors that can foster authority? Why does a certain personality, and not any other one, have authority over the group?

First of all, let us focus on the concept “factor”. This is a general scientific concept. Generally, factors can be considered as any conditions, or parameters of surrounding environment that have a direct impact on the phenomenon under study, regardless of the strength of this impact.

It makes sense to divide all possible factors into three groups: 1) the teacher’s personality and activity, 2) various psychological and socio-psychological parameters of students and their groups, 3) the objective environment characteristics of interaction between the teacher and students. It is necessary to note that there are objective parameters in the first two groups too: for example, indicators of age, gender, etc. Y.P. Stepkin believed that value relations between people, the perception through their own values and value orientations comprise the basis of personality authority. It is important to distinguish two aspects: first, the personality that possesses authority has own system of values, and second, those over whom the personality has authority also have their systems of values [7].

It is obvious that gradually the teacher’s life values and priorities demonstrated in interaction with students become clear to them and command the respect of students. There is every reason to assume that the teachers cherishing the values of gaining knowledge, creating, respecting for students have a higher authority. On the contrary, those who are oriented towards their own personal needs (in particular, material) and their satisfaction can exercise a lower authority.
Despite the theoretical disputes, contradictory approaches, and inconsistent results, it is becoming obvious that the value and sensory sphere, being the personality’s essence, affects the personality’s actions and activities. When perceiving each other, people also try to learn and understand the values of the person they interact with. For school and university students, the relationship with a certain teacher and the teacher’s psychological characteristics may not be so important. But, however, they are perceived by the students, and the attitude towards the teacher depends on how the students treat the teacher’s values.

It is advisable to describe the other factors that “come” from the teacher through considering the approaches to the structure of present parameters of the teacher’s personality and activity [9]. In other words, we are talking about the structure of important professional qualities. One of the main groups of such factors is professional competence, which is especially important for building the functional authority. Professional competence includes knowledge of the subject and methodological skills, i.e., the ability to teach, to apply appropriate methods, techniques, and means of training.

The following group of factors includes the teacher’s organizational skills. The group involves the ability to organize and conduct a training session, maintaining discipline using pedagogical methods rather than power; the ability to organize and hold interesting extracurricular activities. This can also include skills related to motivating and stimulating learning and cognitive activities of students, organizing the dyadic interaction between them.

The group including organizational characteristics and qualities is very close to another two groups: the first of them is a communicative and technological group, and the other is moral and communicative personality traits, among which empathy is of significant importance. In fact, the division of communicative qualities into technological and moral ones is rather formal, since such empathic qualities as kindness, patience, and sympathy are inevitably shown in communication activity [10].

The last three groups of factors ensure building the moral authority and respectability of a teacher. However, they do not involve all possible factors. Such particular factors as the range of interests and general erudition of the teacher, honesty and justice when interacting with children and students, pedagogical tact, as well as a number of other psychological qualities should be thoroughly considered. In addition, even the teacher’s appearance and some other very specific factors often become important in teaching activity.

Analyzing the factors “coming” from students, it is worth reminding that it is their values, value expectations, especially those that are completely or at least partially met, that provide the teacher with great opportunities for building their authority and respectability. Thus, identifying and studying these factors can result in determining: a) the principal value expectations of students when interacting with teachers, b) students’ expectations that are rarely met by teachers. A teacher whose personality and activity structure will better meet these expectations has a good chance of having authority over students and being respected by them. Students’ expectations relate to various characteristics of teachers’ personality and activity. In fact, the teacher’s personality characteristics and students’ expectations are two sides of the same coin. We mean the same factors when the “starting point” is either a teacher or students.

Social psychology has long been discussing how different forms of organizing group activity affect various phenomena and processes in a group [11]. If a teacher interacts with a certain class or academic group, i.e., teach them, there are very close relationships between the teacher and the students. The students’ achievements strongly depend on the professionalism of the teacher, and the outcomes of the teacher’s work are assessed depending on the outcomes shown by students. So is it difficult for a teacher to gain respect among those students whom the teacher closely interacts with?

The shared, highly interconnected activity does increase the level of mutual demands in a group. In a sense, it can create difficulties for group interaction [12]. But, at the same time, authority cannot be built without interaction between a teacher and students. Authority turns out to be just the result of the effective activity of students. It can be assumed that one of the important factors of building the teacher’s authority and respectability is the optimal organization of interacting between a teacher and students that reduces their mutual dependence.

The general micro-social background should be also considered as an essential objective factor of external, situational character [13]. Due to it, a certain teacher interacts with certain students. In addition, the teaching staff in general and the teachers interacting with a certain class or group in particular are of great importance. Therefore, it is important to study all aspects of the future teacher’s readiness for professional activities. It is necessary to know the ways and methods of forming professionally significant qualities of students already during the period of study at a higher technical education institution [14]. This will allow to trace the dynamics of the psychology of professional self-identification of students. (The dynamics of psychology students’ professional self-identity) [14]. Finally, there should be carefully considered pedagogical technologies in order to achieve professional maturity of future teachers [16].

Another factor affecting the authority and respectability of a modern teacher is undoubtedly macro-social conditions. As it has already been noted, these conditions lead to the low social prestige of the profession. Another important aspect of macro-social influence is that students’ value orientations change more quickly than those of older people. As a result, the gap between the value systems of teachers and students widens, at least temporarily; it becomes more and more difficult for teachers to meet the “new” expectations of students [17].

The characteristics of professional activity of teachers, as well as the characteristics of any other groups of people, are difficult to separate from the characteristics of the personality. To do this, it is necessary to analyze the communication features that are an integral structural part of pedagogical activity. Some psychological characteristics of the teacher’s personality should be also analyzed. It is necessary to pay
special attention to one of the assumptions: in fact, there is no difference between the teachers who exercise authority and those who do not, or at least there is no significant difference in the parameters of their personality and professional activity [17]. They have approximately the same professional competence, similar levels of development of communication and organizational abilities, and equal indicators of empathy development.

For further details, we will discuss the professional orientation test data. We used the technique of measuring the professional orientation of the teacher’s activity (according to the instructions published by E. I. Rogov) in two groups of teachers: authoritative and non-authoritative. The technique of professional orientation of the teacher’s activity comprises 5 scales: a) sociability, b) organization, c) orientation towards the subject, d) cultural level of behavior (intelligence), and e) approval motivation. It is important to say that it measures the teacher’s orientation towards these attributes, rather than the corresponding skills. For example, it measures the teacher’s focus on the subject, rather than it measures the professional competence; it measures the teacher’s focus on communicating, rather than it measures real communication skills. The last two scales are formally included in the technique. In fact, motivation itself is an orientation, and intelligence is something difficult to be measured. Unfortunately, none of them measures the level of professional qualifications and competence. It would be very interesting to measure the level of knowledge of the subject, didactic skills, etc.
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Fig. 1. Frequencies of orientation types among authoritative and non-authoritative teachers: 1) sociability, 2) organization, 3) orientation towards the subject, 4) intelligence, 5) approval motivation

In both groups of teachers, the predominant orientation is orientation towards intelligence, i.e. about half of the teachers have a fairly strong orientation towards the lifestyle, manners, behavior, and psychological qualities that are traditionally included in the concept of “intelligence”. According to the other scales of the technique (and, accordingly, to the types of orientation), the distribution is that each of them includes less than a quarter of teachers. We have found out the only statistically significant difference between the groups of teachers: authoritative teachers are characterized by a more frequent orientation to communication. The indices frequency distributions checked by using the $\chi^2$ - square criterion show that they differ significantly (at the level of $\alpha<0.05$) in the two groups.

Our findings show that there is only a certain trend. There are no accurate statistical confirmations, but the facts make up a certain picture, and it would be wrong to ignore them. Therefore, there are some mentioned above reasons to argue that the teachers who have authority over students possess some certain features of their personality and activity that distinguish them, and make them more noticeable. Moreover, these features are not the same for all authoritative teachers. The fact is that there is no set of personal qualities that would automatically provide a person with authority.

The teachers whom students have indicated as being respected are essentially very different from each other. This can be seen not only from the test results – even elementary observations and short conversations confirm what was said. It is quite possible that a teacher, authoritative in one educational institution, or in one group of students could be much less respected in others, unable to withstand, for example, comparisons with someone who has the same advantages, but they are more vivid.

We can conclude that the teacher’s authority cannot be built due to any combination of personal characteristics including extraordinary ones. It is obvious that such a combination should be limited but they are numerous and have manifold variations.

### IV. Conclusion

The findings on the problem under study allowed us to come to the following conclusions.

1. The phenomenon of authority closely relates to a number of socio-psychological phenomena characterizing the processes of leading both small groups of people and large social communities. This makes it difficult to study this phenomenon.

2. Unlike a number of other phenomena it is characterized as a specific one. The matter is that there is no such a component as authority in the structure of the personality. The personality authority is represented in the inner psychological lives of other people surrounding the personality [18]. In other words, it is a form of representation that makes it possible to influence others without pressure and force. Thus, the phenomenon under consideration has a typical socio-psychological character.

3. Authority, as a specific form of representation of one personality in the inner life of another personality, is primarily an emotional and sensory construct. It can be called a social feeling [19], [20]. This feeling can lead to distortions when perceiving and evaluating the personality.

4. The students’ value perception of the teacher’s personality and personality features is of crucial importance for building authority. Within the students’ value perception
the greatest importance is attached to perceiving the teacher’s values.

5. The factors of building both the personality authority and the teacher’s personality are grouped into three areas: the teacher’s personality, the students’ value expectations, the parameters of the social environment. The first two groups of factors are peculiar mirror images of each other.

6. Among more specific factors, the groups of professional and psychological qualities can be distinguished: subject knowledge, methodological skills, organizational skills, communicative and moral and communicative qualities, empathic personality traits, as well as a number of others. All these qualities “reveal themselves” only in the process of shared activity.

7. The structure of students’ value expectations, being the basis of the teacher’s authority, is influenced by various micro- and macro-social conditions. As a result, currently there is lower teacher’s authority over students.
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