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ABSTRACT

The present article is dedicated to the problem of the search for the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue. In this regard, the analysis of the pedagogue’s perception is conducted from the aspect of the Russian tradition and the newest Russian history that allows the authors substantiating the dual nature of the characteristics of the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue. In particular the issue of a teacher’s authority who would not suppress the students’ opinions allowing them to make personal decisions and would be in the position of “the younger friend” of a teacher is under consideration. In the study it was determined that a pedagogue is still the central figure of the educational process. However, due to the whole complex of the new functions of this profession, the specter of requirements, professional skills and competences are constantly expanding. Alongside the mass character of the profession, there is set the requirement to meet the high professional demands and also there is saved the expectation that a teacher must have a vocation and feel the readiness to perform this mission self-denying and selflessly. Educational process of modern Russia undergoes the displacement of the priorities from the education of the students to the obtainment of knowledge by them. At the same time a teacher should cultivate the active civil position of the students, because it is impossible to protect a child from the processes, which take place outside the school-in the society and life as a whole. In the article there are defined such components of the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue as the spiritual, social and organizational. Our findings showed that a pedagogue’s ideal is a contradictory concept that is constantly developing adapting oneself under the requirements of the modern society that allows it (an ideal) to be in the relative balance.
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INTRODUCTION

The beginning of the XXI century is a period of the implementation of the Russian education modernization conception in Russia, the most important task of which was the
transformation of the pedagogical consciousness in principally new social-economic conditions. Today the search for the national Russian ideal of a pedagogue is going on in the complex contradictory conditions of diversification of the attitude on the role of school in the social and personal life in Russia. These processes have witnessed a new dramatic impulse in connection with the appeal of the society to the Russian national sources in the axiological area of all life spheres. The present study aimed to review and analyze the problem of the search for the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue. To do so, we will conduct the analysis of the pedagogue’s perception from the aspect of the Russian tradition and the newest Russian history that allows the authors substantiating the dual nature of the characteristics of the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue.

**METHODOLOGY**

The developments of the declared problem and the topic of study are based on the content analysis of the literature on the ground of application of the historic-comparative and historic-genetic methods. The source base of the study was made by two basic blocks of sources. The first includes the modern historic-pedagogical works dedicated to the analysis of the genesis of the Russian ideal of a pedagogue in the retrospective (Astapenko, 2014; Balakhovskaya, 2015; Bushueva, 2016; Dorokhova, 2016; Kolphachev, 2015; Nemova, 2017; Vialikova, 2015) and its characteristics in the historical context. The modern historic-pedagogical works reflect the newest studies in the researched area and are deprived of the ideological coloring of the significant historic-pedagogical literature of the Soviet period and built on the modern methodological bases. The second block of sources includes the modern studies of the newest history in the development of the national ideal of a pedagogue in Russia (Belyaeva, Belinova, Novik, Shabanova & Shlyakhov, 2016; Bulin-Sokolova, Obukhov & Semenov, 2014; Dorokhova, 2016; Gerasimov, 2012; Gridneva, 2014; Sidorova, 2015). The content analysis is the leading method of the study.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Results of the analysis of sources in dichotomic and synchronic profile demonstrated the absence of unambiguity in the perception and description of the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue. On the one part, we can state the formation of the tendency of characteristics accumulation and on the other part, diversification of the requirements to a pedagogue, which in the crucial historical epochs generates radically contradictory expectations of the society from a pedagogue and other representation of pedagogues by them.

Despite the changes in the modern conditions of the functional-substantial character of a pedagogue’s activity and the active enrichment of its functionality due to the tutor’s, facilitator’s and other functions, which shift the accepts of the focus on a student, a pedagogue still determines all key processes in the educational organization. The contradictory character of the Russian society development is reflected in the processes, which determine the education and perception of a pedagogue by the society as the central subject of the educational space.

The social order of the society puts high requirements to a pedagogue. Young pedagogues and those who train them to entering into profession ask the question about the pedagogical talent. Is a talent obligatory for a pedagogue’s successfulness? Can everyone be a teacher? We answer this question differently. Taking into account that this profession requires colossal labor, big working experience, huge patience, love to children, interest to their
profession, not each person can dedicate himself to this mission. However the development of
the pragmatism in the society, understanding of the mass character of this profession promotes to
the distribution of the idea that you can learn this profession.

An educator can give the right to become a teacher only to those, who have the vocation
and professional readiness to perform this important mission. Undoubtedly this is a man who
possesses the required volume of knowledge and professional abilities in the concrete area of
sciences.

There is always dilemma (Ilaltdinova, Shliakhov & Shliakhova, 2015) in the Russian
society, whether a pedagogue might be narrow-profile or multifunctional specialist. Historically
in the Russian consciousness the idea that a pedagogue must be able to do almost everything and
possess knowledge in many professionally meaningful and generally cultural areas rooted.

Complication of the tasks and increase of the requirement to a pedagogue in the modern
conditions in the global scale (Ilaltdinova, Frolova & Lebedeva, 2016) makes a pedagogue to
reevaluation ideals and expectations. Today we see that the narrow specialty of a pedagogue in
the organization of the scientific-research, project activity and work with children with special
needs, which requires the narrow professional skills, becomes more and more demanded.

The Russian national ideal of a pedagogue always included such quality in the list of top
qualities as sacrifice, unselfishness, self-denial and missionary work. In the conditions of the
market relations in Russia such category as “educational service” appeared that as any others has
its price. The type of a teacher-official that formed during almost 25 years still did not enter into
the mass consciousness of either pedagogic or wide Russian society. At that the productive
understanding of a pedagogue’s time value, his personal life, family, meaningfulness of its
professional qualities came.

Historically the Russian pedagogy and education developed in the paradigm of education
differentiation that included formation of the subject competences and cognitive sphere of the
students and upbringing as formation of the moral sphere of personality and social competences.
In the Russian tradition the priority was always given to the tasks of the moral development of
the students. Correspondingly the skills in the sphere of education were demanded from a
pedagogue. On the modern state of education development in Russia, the emphasis is shifting in
the side of the knowledge value that causes the growth of the role of a subject teacher. His
functions as an educator become less demanded on the part of both the parents and school
administration as a result of the number of factors.

The issue of school and policy relations was and still is the most important issue that ever
bothered the minds of the greatest pedagogues. Undoubtedly, a pedagogue, first of all, works
with children and perhaps must be outside the policy. However, such division looks artificial
one, because it is impossible to protect school and child from those processes, which happen in
the society and life. It is especially important for teenager age. Children are the future of state.
They will be live in this society, so they must be ready to the active life position in the adult life.

Each profession requires certain qualities from a person. The peculiarity of a teacher’s
profession is that a pedagogue has to deal with education and teaching of the growing generation
and with characters of children, young boys and girls constantly changing in the process of
development.

The issue of authority is a historically formed dichotomy in a pedagogue’s perception.
The authority of a teacher is a special professional position, which determines the effect on the
students and gives the right to take the decision, express estimation and give advices. On the
other part, the issue about the democratic character of relations between a pedagogue and
students arises. The answer to this contradiction is a display of such notions as “true authority” and “false authority” of a pedagogue. The understanding appears that a pedagogue’s authority does not exclude the democratic character of interrelations, it does not rely on the duties and age privileges, but on the high personal and professional qualities: democratic style of cooperation with the students, ability to the open communication, his aspiration to the constant improvement, erudition, competence, justice and kindness, general culture and etc. The true authority is such relations between the students and a teacher, which impels them always, be the younger friends of a teacher.

In our view, the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue is the self-developing, multilevel, multifactor system, which we simply represent in the dualistic contradictions (Table 1). Appearance of this system was stipulated by the range of the contradictions, existing now, which are determined by the divergence of the historically formed Russian values, appeared on the basis of the Orthodox culture and, on the other part, modern mass axiological constituent of the culture, which formed under the effect of the western values, based on the ideals of pragmatism and individualism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of a pedagogue in the Russian tradition</th>
<th>Perception of a pedagogue in the newest Russian history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pedagogue is a vocation based on talent</td>
<td>pedagogue is a profession, which can be learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedagogue is a polygester, multifunctional specialist</td>
<td>pedagogue is a narrow profile specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedagogue is characterized by the sacrifice and unselfishness</td>
<td>pedagogue is characterized by the pragmatism, he realizes the educational technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedagogue is, first of all, an educator</td>
<td>pedagogue, first of all, forms the system of knowledge, subject-teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedagogue is a socially active, initiative personality</td>
<td>pedagogue is a professional who is outside the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedagogue is an indisputable authority</td>
<td>pedagogue is a friend, mate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our view, it is possible to separate the following interrelated and interdependent components of the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue: spiritual, social and organizational.

We consider the spiritual component of the national ideal of a pedagogue in relation with the history of origin and developments of the Russian state, stages and tendencies of its development. The social component includes the inner social connections, factors and mechanisms. Organizational component includes some general educational foundation, the basis of the pedagogic idea.

We cannot speak about some static character of the national ideal of a pedagogue. However, this phenomenon was acknowledged us as a dynamic and developing one (independently on the way of this development: evolutionary or revolutionary), we can mark the presence of the dynamic mechanism in it, which allows it being in the relative balance. There is very active core-the personal ideal-and the coating of the core-the social ideal. At that the coating of the core is very passive. This contradiction allows a phenomenon of the national ideal of a pedagogue to be in the relative balance.
CONCLUSION

In the historical retrospective and on one modern chronological section we observe the different understanding of a pedagogue’s ideal in the Russian society. It allows us to speak about the absence of the integrate single understanding of the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue. Moreover, it is not merely different, it is contradictory. This is the essence of the Russian national ideal of a pedagogue, who must naturally unite the properties and qualities represented by us in the dualistic dichotomies of the oppositions.
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