# Didactic communication as a form derived from communicative action
Oprea, Oana Miruna

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

# Didactic communication as a form derived from communicative action

## OPREA Oana-Miruna

Al. I. Cuza of Iassy, Romania

E-mail address: oana.miruna.oprea@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper we will approach the issue of didactic communication in terms of communicative action. Thus, we will bring up for discussion the idea that communication and understanding are aspects of the didactic process, whereas the teacher's main role is to transmit knowledge, to generate understanding and communication skills and also to create life skills for the individual's social integration.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Etymologically, the verb to communicate is closely related to the French language which is, according to Evelina Graur [4], our good brother; however, along with the transformations determined by the transition from Vulgar Latin to Proto-Romanian, the Latin word communication was inherited under the form of cumineca, which meant to commune (in the sense of the Christian ritual). When we need to define communication, we refer to information, bringing into notice or letting somebody know about something [4]. We believe that communication is the process through which we express thoughts or feelings or we transmit knowledge. Although we communicate about something every day, it is difficult to provide a definition for this term. For example, we are told that it will rain; we are obviously transmitted information by means of language, which is why we will take the umbrella with us. Since we have brought this example up for discussion, we must have in mind the fact that the individual does not communicate by himself, whereas the communication process involves the transmitter, the channel, the information and the receiver [4]. In general, but especially where education is concerned, communication has the following meanings:

- Communication with the meaning of understanding;
- Communication with the meaning of community;
- Communication with the meaning of participation and co-participation;
- Communication with the meaning of organization;
- Communication with the meaning of misunderstanding [8].

C. Rus believes that communication with the meaning of understanding is the ability of the human beings to transfer the reality to each other, as well as their experiences and knowledge; understanding requires a common database with a common language [8]. Communication with the meaning of community refers to the fact that the individual is not alone, whereas he is considered to be a social being. For this reason, the groups that are formed through affiliation are characterized by the emergence of group dynamics, which includes formal and informal structures, created on the basis of the communication process [8]. The fact that groups exist leads us to bring into question the coagulation of its members, given that the participation of the group members in various structures of action is based on the communication process, determined by the achievement of certain common goals [8]. Communication with the meaning of organization involves the combination of the elements in order to achieve a certain goal in a short period of time, at minimal costs [8]. Regarding communication with the meaning of misunderstanding, C. Rus believes that the entities do not always reach a consensus, and those who communicate do not always understand each other; For this reason, it is considered that there are situations where the group unit is destroyed because of this misunderstanding [8].

## 2.  DIDACTIC COMMUNICATION AS A FORM OF ACTION

Communication is considered to be an inter-human relationship and a framework for action, a sui generis instrument of knowing, transmitting, discovering and training the student's personality [1].There are a variety of methods through which the student can communicate with the teacher or mentor. The communication process is a grounded form of the activity of teaching and learning the specific contents; the teacher-student relationship has adaptive-formative value. Didactic communication determines the relationships of action and interaction between those who participate in the discussion; from this point of view, we believe that the purpose of the didactic communication process is to achieve positive results, and to generate fundamental changes regarding the student's behaviours, attitudes and mentality [3]. Interaction is meant to meet certain needs, but the criterion regarding participation is also particularly important.

The quality of didactic communication depends on several factors:
- The transmitter's qualities;
- Environmental factors;
- The physical context;
- The context where communication takes place [6].

Cosmina Lungoci believes that there are several factors that influence the didactic communication process in a positive way:
- The conceptions the transmitter and receiver have of themselves;
- The transmitter and receiver's knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, values, proposals and experiences;
- The roles the transmitter and receiver hold within the group;
- The transmitter and receiver's motivations;
- The context of the communication situation [6].

Communication is not possible without the communication acts; Habermas identified four classes:

- The first class – the communicative class – refers to discerning expressions;

- The second is the observational class; it refers to the meaning of the sentences' cognitive question;

- The third is the representative class, and its main essential feature is given by the function of a speaker's self-representation in front of a listener;

- The last class is the regulative one and it refers to the norms accepted by the interlocutors, which can be observed or intercalated [5].

Hristache, M. believes that within communication one can make a distinction between communicative action - understood as interaction - and discourse, whereas the communicative action can be achieved through speech games established by legislation. Presenting communication as action requires bringing into question the idea that the defining feature of the communicative act - participation - involves educommunication [5].

We must explain the fact that J. Habermas provides the concept of communicative action with a sociological interpretation, which is somehow derived from a symbolically established inter-subjective relationship, while communicability requires reflecting upon the semantic-pragmatic bases of knowledge [11]. According to Vidam, the interlocutory condition of the act of speech regards the metaphysical self; it does not regard directly the object to be known; it places us in an open context, where the logic space of the interlocution, the secret place of creating statements, closes in order to open, at the same time [11],.

It is more than well-known that the actions are correlated with the individuals' behaviours, which is why the answer to the stimuli raises two issues:

On the one hand, there are the spontaneous behaviours, which should be excluded, whereas they appeal to common sense

- On the other hand, the fact that the same common sense determines us to qualify those behaviours which are not observable as actions.

We believe that within the didactic process intercomprehension can be achieved through the semantic-pragmatic dimension, whereas the language is the integrant element of the acts of thinking, since people come to agree [11], to understand certain aspects by means of language - especially when it comes to didactic communication. Since didactic communication involves dialogue, we believe that communicability is based on the interlocutory relationship and it cannot remain a language game, as Wittgenstein believes [11].

Regarding didactic communication, we must say that the discourse is an essential element of the learning process. In Habermas's work, the discourse is different from the communicative action, whereas it concerns the validity claims. Laura Ciubotărașu Pricop believes that in the case of the discourse the validity claims arise from the information exchange that occurs within the communicative action, whereas the role of the discourse is to establish a consensus that could be found within the communicative action [2]. Laura Ciubotărașu Pricop believes that, according to Habermas, achieving a consensus involves overcoming a situation that occurs when systemizing the validity claims naively assumed within the communicative action [2]. For this reason, we believe that within the didactic communication one must take these aspects into consideration, as well as the fact that understanding at school level must be achieved gradually, based on understanding consensus, which can be achieved only if the teacher can catch the student's attention and perceptivity.

## 3. COMMUNICATION ETHICS

When we communicate, especially within school units, we must take into account the aspects related to ethics and morality. I believe it is appropriate to bring up for discussion the idea of communication ethics within didactic communication because it is an essential element, which should not be left aside. Discourse ethics was developed by Otto Apel, who tried to reformulate the Kantian ethics by substituting the Kantian paradigm of subjectivity with that of communication [7]. We believe that ethics is an extremely important aspect, especially when it comes to the relationship established within the communication process; however, we must not forget that the introduction of ethics as a subject would help the students achieve a better position in relation to the Romanian education system [9].

We must also mention the fact that the ethical decision is essential within the process of education, whereas at the moment it is an indispensable element, especially regarding the marketing actions taken by the educational institutions. We believe it is also appropriate to take account of the fact that the decisions taken by the teacher during the communication with the students should be based on morality and rationality; and that they should guide the teacher's behaviour both inside and outside the educational institution, whereas he sets up behavioural patterns for the beneficiaries of the education system [10].

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have brought up for discussion didactic communication as a form of action derived from the communicative action. We believe that the importance of this study lies in the fact that didactic communication is not always performed in the best conditions, and for this reason ethics communication and rationality play an extremely important role. We believe that the didactic communication process can be viewed as communicative action, and also as discourse - with the necessary distinctions - and that its applicability is possible in the context of understanding and communicative consensus.

---

**References**

[1] Bradea, L.O., (2007), Comunicarea – mijloc și scop în educație (Communication – means and purpose in education), The Proceedings of the European Integration - Between Tradition and Modernity Congress, Editura Universității Petru Maior University, Volume 2, pp. 265-272, available                                                                                          at: http://www.upm.ro/facultati_departamente/stiinte_litere/conferinte/situl_integrare_europeana/Lucrari2/Bradea%20Livia.pdf

[2] Ciubotărașu Pricop, L., (2013), Ethical Assumption of Deliberative Communication, Literature Conference, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue, Section of Communication and Public Relations, available at: http://www.upm.ro/ldmd/LDMD/01/cPR/cPR%2001%2062.pdf

[3] Duhicher, O., Macovei, D., (2012), Influența comunicării asupra climatului educațional (The influence of communication upon the school climate), The Scientific Journal of the State University of Moldavia, no. 4(54), pp. 132-135, available at:

[4] Graur, E., (2001), Tehnici de comunicare, Editura Mediamira, Cluj Napoca

[5] Hristache, M., (2012), Specificul comunicării instructiv-educative la elevii din ciclul primar Editura Emma, disponibil pe: http://edituraemma.ro/wp-content/uploaads/2012/08/specificul-comunicarii.pdf

[6] Lungoci, C., (2014), Aspecte privind eficientizarea comunicării didactice, available at: https://www.moodle.ro/preparandia/index.php/universitar7/item/478-aspecte-privind-eficientizarea-comunicarii-didactice

[7] Nișp, B.F., (2010), Etica discursului sau cum citim pragmatic, Time Journal, Nr 136, available at:http://www.romanian-philosophy.ro/newsletter/pages/10_05_mai/[Recenzie]Nita_Timpul_Nr.136.pdf;

[8] Rus, C., (2012), Forme și teorii ale comunicării, Cluj Napoca, available at: http://fspac.ubbcluj.ro/comunicare/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Teorii-ale-comunicarii.pdf

[9] Terec-Vlad, L., Trifu, A:, (2014), Ethics – A Compulsory Discipline in Pre-University Education in Romania, Anuarul Universității ”Petre Andrei” Iași – Fascicula Drept, Științe Economice, Științe Politice, nr 13, Editura Lumen, Iași

[10] Terec-Vlad, L., Trifu, A., Terec-Vlad, D., (2015), The Decisional Moment and Ethics, Ecoforun Journal, Volume 4, Nr. 1, available at: http://ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/view/95

[11 Vidam, T., (2010), Întemeierea eticii comunicării: Francisc Jaques în și față de K.Otto și J. Habermas Annals of G. Barițiu of Cluj Napoca Institute of History, Humanistica Series, Tome VIII, pp. 383-392, available at: http://www.history-cluj.ro/SU/anuare/2010/Continut/art26Vidam.pdf