**Pedagogical image: an essential tool in the professional and personal development of future teachers**
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**Abstract:** This article provides a scientific and theoretical analysis of the problem of forming a pedagogical image among future teachers. The essence of the concept of pedagogical image, its significance in professional activity, and the specific features of its manifestation in the teacher’s personality are examined. In addition, existing scientific approaches to pedagogical image formation are comparatively analyzed, and their strengths and limitations are identified. The article substantiates effective methods and mechanisms that contribute to the development of pedagogical image in future teachers. The author proposes practical principles and recommendations aimed at the purposeful formation of pedagogical image.

**INTRODUCTION**

The requirements placed on the modern education system necessitate new approaches to the teacher’s personality. In particular, not only the possession of professional knowledge and skills by future teachers, but also the formation of a pedagogical image has become an important factor determining the effectiveness of the educational process. Pedagogical image is interpreted as a complex socio-psychological phenomenon that integrates a teacher’s appearance, speech culture, professional behavior, communicative abilities, and personal values.

At present, the issue of purposeful pedagogical image formation in the process of training future teachers remains among the problems that have not been sufficiently systematized. An analysis of existing research shows that approaches to pedagogical image formation rely on different methodological foundations, and certain difficulties arise in their practical implementation. Therefore, an in-depth scientific analysis of this problem and the identification of effective methods and mechanisms are of particular relevance.

This article provides a scientific and theoretical analysis of certain aspects of pedagogical image formation in future teachers and substantiates effective means and tools for its development.

Under these conditions, the demand for highly qualified pedagogical personnel within the education system is steadily increasing. In particular, it is essential that future teachers are capable of educating a harmoniously developed generation based on universal and national values formed over centuries, and that they possess a deep understanding of fundamental scientific knowledge as well as modern pedagogical and psychological methods. Furthermore, the training of creative teachers who are capable of effectively applying modern pedagogical and information-communication technologies in educational practice remains a pressing task [1, p. 3].

These requirements indicate the necessity of increasing the effectiveness of purposeful preparation of teachers for facilitative activity. Pedagogical facilitation is an important type of professional activity aimed at ensuring effective cooperation between teachers and students in the educational process. Within this process, one of the most relevant issues of pedagogical facilitation is the formation of the teacher’s image, since a teacher’s image determines professional authority, communicative effectiveness, and pedagogical influence.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

In encyclopedic and pedagogical-psychological sources, various approaches and definitions of the concept of “image” exist. In particular, the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language* states that this term originates from the Latin word *image* and expresses the external appearance and socially perceived representation of a person or object. The dictionary notes that the concept of image encompasses meanings such as appearance, figure, representation, look, beauty, prestige, reputation, authority, dignity, and social attractiveness.

These definitions allow image to be interpreted not only as outward appearance, but also as a complex psychological-pedagogical phenomenon that determines how an individual is perceived, evaluated, and positioned within the system of social relations. In this sense, image functions as an integrative concept reflecting an individual’s personal characteristics, professional activity, and social status [2].

Psychological-pedagogical dictionaries interpret “image” as a system of stereotypes, defining it as a stable representation of a particular object formed in mass consciousness. Typically, image is applied to an individual, but it may also be formed in relation to goods, organizations, professions, or social institutions [9].

The study of personal image is of significant scientific importance within social psychology and pedagogy, as it is closely connected with processes of social perception and evaluation of various social groups (national, gender, professional, and others). This demonstrates that the concept of image is actively and systematically studied across multiple scientific fields.

In recent years, as a result of extensive research, the content aspects of the image phenomenon have been comprehensively examined and systematized, and sufficient scientifically grounded information has been accumulated regarding its essence, structure, and functional characteristics. This, in turn, has created the necessary theoretical and methodological foundations for the formation of imagology as an independent scientific field.

Russian researchers E.V. Kondratyev and R.N. Abramov define image as follows: “Image is a more economical way of constructing and identifying complex social reality. Image is a symbolic representation of an object based on the results of information processing. In some cases, our image — the picture others have of us — becomes even more important than our real selves” [3].

Ye.N. Bogdanov and V.G. Zazykin define image as “an emotionally enriched, stereotypical formation in social consciousness” [4].

Researcher V.S. Komarovsky defines image as “a deliberately constructed representation of a person, organization, or phenomenon aimed at exerting emotional and psychological influence on a specific group” [5].

According to Professor A.N. Chumikov, despite the diversity of research devoted to the problem of image, many issues related to this concept remain unresolved. Some people interpret image merely as the ability to look presentable, focusing on clothing, hairstyle, and grooming. For others, image includes not only external appearance, but also voice quality, self-control, public speaking skills, and communication competence [5, p. 318].

A.V. Petrovsky and M.G. Yaroshevsky, in the *Brief Psychological Dictionary*, define image as the creation of a stereotypical representation of a specific object in mass consciousness. The concept of image may be applied not only to individuals, but also to products, organizational structures, fields of activity, and others [6].

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

A teacher’s image is characterized by the emotional-expressive perception of the pedagogical persona by students, colleagues, and the broader social environment. It functions as an important socio-psychological tool that facilitates effective interaction with others. Therefore, regardless of the level of professional competence, a teacher must continuously engage in self-improvement and purposefully form their personal and professional image.

The results of sociological research further emphasize the relevance of this issue. According to research data, only 19% of teachers are fully satisfied with their appearance. This indicates the need for a systematic approach and scientifically grounded recommendations in the formation of pedagogical image.

From this perspective, particular importance is attached to relying on students’ opinions and evaluations in the process of forming a teacher’s image. Questionnaire survey results confirm that teacher image is perceived as a significant factor in the educational process and make it possible to identify its key components. These empirical data demonstrate that pedagogical image is an important socio-pedagogical phenomenon that influences the effectiveness of interaction with students and learning activities.

To the question *“What do you pay attention to first when meeting a teacher?”*, 63% of respondents indicated attitude toward students, 58% communication style with students, 33% character, 21% clothing, 17% hairstyle, 13% age, 8% face, 4% makeup, and 4% answered “everything.”

To the question *“Which teacher qualities do you pay the most attention to?”*, 79% selected the ability to explain learning material clearly, 50% sense of humor, 38% sincerity, 33% communicative openness, 4% firmness of views, and 4% beauty. No respondents selected strictness.

To the question *“Is a teacher’s appearance important to you?”*, 46% stated that appearance is not the main factor, 29% indicated that it is important, 13% stated it does not matter, and 4% emphasized that the main requirement is neatness and cleanliness.

To the question *“Should a teacher dress according to the latest fashion?”*, 50% stated that a teacher should dress modernly but appropriately for the profession, while 50% stated that teachers have the right to dress as they wish. No respondents supported overly youthful or flashy styles.

To the question *“What should a teacher’s appearance not be like?”*, 58% indicated untidiness, 50% wearing short skirts, 46% excessive makeup, 42% revealing clothing, and 13% wearing jeans.

To the question *“Are you interested in a teacher’s personal life?”*, 58% stated that a teacher’s personal life should not concern students, 33% expressed interest in family life, 21% were indifferent, and 8% indicated curiosity about visiting the teacher’s home.

To the question *“Does a teacher’s image influence your attitude toward the subject?”*, 58% responded positively, 38% negatively, and 4% found it difficult to answer.

**ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

Based on the analysis of existing definitions of image, A.A. Kalyuzhny identifies the following main components: teacher’s appearance, verbal and non-verbal communication means, and harmony between personal and professional self-concepts [7].

Appearance helps attract attention, create a positive image, and present oneself as not only a competent but also an aesthetically refined teacher. A teacher’s appearance should serve as a model for both students and adults. It should reflect an inner richness, love for children, and care for them. Children primarily learn appropriate dress from adults, especially teachers. A key principle applies here: a neat appearance demonstrates respect for others. Requirements for external appearance help teachers improve their professional image and achieve success. A true teacher earns respect not through clothing, but through intellect, professional competence, and abilities.

Verbal and non-verbal means are essential components of image. The way we speak, our gestures, facial expressions, posture, and movement all play a crucial role. Research confirms that approximately 35% of information is perceived verbally, while 65% is transmitted through non-verbal channels.

**Table 1.** Characteristics and Techniques for Forming Personal Pedagogical Image in Future Teachers

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Image Direction | Scientific-Psychological Content | Main Techniques and Methods | Practical-Pedagogical Significance |
| Self-analysis and reflection | Awareness of personal and professional qualities, formation of self-concept | Psychodiagnostics, self-assessment, reflective analysis | Conscious image formation, professional growth |
| Self-motivation | Activation of internal motivation | Situational analysis, paper therapy, affirmations | Increased resilience and confidence |
| Attractiveness | Formation of positive external image | Dress culture, color harmony, aesthetics | Creation of authority and trust |
| Personal expressiveness | Emotional influence through facial expression | Face gymnastics, eye aerobics, role play | Improved communication effectiveness |
| Success techniques | Planning professional success | Resume writing, communication training | Professional competitiveness |

Harmony between personal and professional self-concepts is a key component of pedagogical image. Image must align with internal values and character traits. By creating our image, we educate ourselves. This harmony manifests in originality of pedagogical process design, communication style, attitude toward student behavior, and situational judgment.

According to A.A. Kalyuzhny, four methods of image formation can be identified:

1. self-perception and self-presentation;
2. professional image-makers;
3. mass media influence;
4. influence of close social environment [7].

E.P. Kostenko proposes an acmeological algorithm of image development, consisting of reflection, image design and implementation, and corrective self-development through specialized programs and technologies [8].

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the formation of personal and professional pedagogical image is an integral component of a teacher’s professional competence. Conscious selection of self-presentation strategies enhances both pedagogical activity and communication effectiveness. Educational psychologists should provide systematic and individualized guidance to teachers, considering modern pedagogical trends and empirical research findings. Such an approach promotes professional growth, strengthens pedagogical identity, and contributes to high educational effectiveness.
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