

COMMUNICATIVE AND INSTRUMENTAL MODELS OF EDUCATIONAL PROCESS IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

В статье представлен анализ основных принципов инструментальной и коммуникативной парадигм образовательного процесса, изучаемых в современной философии и социологии образования; рассмотрены противоречивая и конъюнктивная модели соотношения инструментализма и коммуникативности в образовательном контексте.

Ключевые понятия: коммуникативный поворот, коммуникативное действие, инструментальное действие, образование, модели обучения.

У статті проаналізовано основні принципи інструментальної й комунікативної парадигм освітнього процесу, що вивчаються в сучасній філософії та соціології освіти; розглянуто противорічну й кон'юнктивну моделі співвідношення інструменталізму й комунікативності в освітньому контексті.

Ключові поняття: комунікативний поворот, комунікативна дія, інструментальна дія, освіта, моделі навчання.

The paper analyzes main principles of instrumental and communicative paradigms of educational process studied in modern philosophy and sociology of education; contradictory and conjunctive models of correlation between instrumentalism and communicativity in the educational context are considered.

Keywords: communicative turn, communicative action, instrumental action, education, models of teaching process.

In the modern system of higher education, there is a kind of «communicative turn», which comprises, firstly, the special attention of modern theorists to the problems of improving communicative programs in higher schools, and secondly, practical efforts of social actors to implement communicative strategies in educational process. The communicative turn can be proved by a large number of scientific publications on the subject of communicativization in educational process of modern universities made by N. Bekus-Goncharova, V. Gerasimova, E. Ivakhnenko, E. Karpievich, E. Kozhemyakin, A. Korbut, A. Polonnikov, A. Polyakov, E. Slepovich, T. Tyagunova and, etc. At the same time, many theorists believe that in the modern educational system the communicative principle has not fully established itself yet and it is perceived only as a problem for the future, as a topic for reflection, but not as a fact of everyday educational activities in higher schools. In actual practice of teaching in universities, the principle of instrumentalism still dominates displacing and distorting the task of communicativization of educational process [2, p. 44]. Let us consider the main problems accompanying the communicative turn in the modern educational system and pre-identify the main principles of communicative and instrumental strategies.

Instrumental and communicative educational paradigms have the same conceptual

origins – the theory of communicative action by J. Habermas and the concept of instrumental reason by M. Horkheimer. If in the communicative sphere the social actors are oriented on achieving mutual understanding and consensus with interest to the interaction process rather than its results, in instrumental context the actors aim at achieving their own success and egocentric dominance, demonstrating only visibility of the interest to positions of other participants of interaction while remaining indifferent to their speech acts in their minds. Habermas writes that «we call an action oriented to success *instrumental* when we consider it under the aspect of following rules of rational choice and assess the efficiency of influencing the decisions of a rational opponent» [5, p. 285]. By contrast, «in communicative action participants are not primarily oriented on their own individual successes; they pursue their individual goals under the condition that they can harmonize their plans of action on the basis of common situation definitions» [5, p. 286]. In communicative interactions, «the participants coordinate their plans consensually, with the agreements reached at any point being evaluated in terms of the intersubjective recognition of validity claims» [6, p. 58].

Focusing on the basic concepts by J. Habermas, let us identify paradigmatic differences between instrumental and communicative models of higher education as well as their functional and disfunctional practical effects. The basic principle of communicative teaching model is the special interest to the process of intellectual interaction between a tutor and students at lectures and seminars aimed at achieving understanding of a problem under discussion and mutual understanding between all participants of interaction. As suggested by J. Habermas, the phenomenon of understanding can be explained by means of the concept of «agreement» – the processes of understanding are intended on reaching a consensus that depends on rationally motivated approval of some statement contents. Consensus cannot be imposed on opponents by manipulating them [6]. False interpreting of consensus implies the absence of any objection from a student audience, any criticism of some theoretical theses offered by teachers or students. This total (or better – totalitarian) consensus can be considered as a sign of instrumentalism rather than communicativism. On the contrary, the true interpretation of consensus does not exclude, but presupposes a discussion to ascertain the truth and clarify questionable theses. Another important principle of the communicative model of learning is to encourage intellectual non-conformism of all participants of educational interaction, to develop skills of producing, translating and defending their own understanding of some problem. A teacher should not evoke obedience from students, but initiate (and sometimes provoke) debates in order to model polar assessments of a considered thesis. The ability to evaluate specific problems in a different way, to identify disputed points in specific concepts form critical thinking of students which is an indicator of intellectual maturity of social actors.

One can mark another (structural and organizational) principle of communicative teaching model which can be roughly noted as de-hierarchization and de-authoritarianism of educational process. We are talking about impossibility of using the authoritarian style in teacher's behavior referring to students (and, conversely, about inadmissibility of «dictation» practices from students' side that should be done by a teacher). Egalitarian principles of the communicative process in the student audience have in its origin an idea of authority (and not dictatorship) of a teacher who should create an atmosphere of mutual

respect rather than fear and depression. Communication always has a procedural nature: it is happening here and now, *in situ*, its results and outcomes are unpredictable – they are born in the context of interactions. One can consider very successful metaphor of generation, which is used by Belarusian theorists (M. Gusakovsky, M. Golubeva, T. Tyagunova, A. Polonnikov, A. Korbut, etc.) [3] to refer to the procedural aspects of new communicative situation in education, demonstrating the formation of non-classical paradigm in universities. Knowledge is generated (rather than translated by a teacher) in intelligent interaction of all participants of educational process. «The classical university assimilating certain cultural objects should be replaced by a non-classical University generating cultural forms. Its task becomes to develop forms of human existence in unstable situations. For university education, this means changing the basic metaphor of «assimilation» to the metaphor of «generating» [3]. B. Readings in his outstanding work «The University in Ruins» also stressed the importance of creating intellectual space of dialogue and questioning in universities instead of technical process of transmission and assessment of knowledge that can be completed by either scoring or awarding a degree [8].

What can contribute to or, conversely, prevent the approval of the communicative model of learning the system level in higher education? Since free communication and discussion on problematic issues is, to a greater extent, the prerogative of social and humanistic disciplines (natural technical sciences focus more on the use and applications of knowledge rather than relativization of problems), universities should pay considerable attention to the sector of humanities. Reduction of humanities volume in modern universities has been treated by well-known American scholar M. Nussbaum as «cancerous tumor» [8], which can cause catastrophic consequences. In her opinion, it is humanities that contribute to developing the skills of dialectical thinking and, more globally, form practices of truly democratic behavior because communicativism, critical thinking, freedom and respect to freedom of other people, intention for internal consensus with the others can be considered to be the quintessence of true democracy [8]. Similarly T. Fleming emphasizes the connection between communicativization of education and democratization of society. «What might such a communicative university system look like? There would be less emphasis on hierarchical authority and more on participatory decision-making; more dialogue than dictat... Above all, education would be redefined as an exercise in democracy, teaching democracy...» [7, p. 123]. Other theorists also pay attention to the importance of general humanitarian training to develop students' communication skills. For example, the authors of the book «The University as a center of culture-generating education» believe that in today's universities there is a need to carry out transformation of mono-polar educational scheme (cultivating exclusively scientific-theoretic rationality) and create a multipolar educational space where many forms of human cognitive activity – moral, artistic, mystical, scientific and theoretical – will co-present [3].

A somewhat different «recipe» of communicative principles has been proposed by B. Readings, according to which the idea of the University is failing because historically it was related to «external» ideas that university had to implement. These are the Kantian idea of Reason, Humboldt's idea of culture and techno-bureaucratic idea of Perfection [9, p. 30]. Accordingly, the modern (or, more exactly, post-modern) university, according to B. Readings, has to get rid of this referentiality and focus on «external» principles to establish

self-value of institution of the Mind. B. Readings says that «...the university is where thought takes place beside thought, where thinking is a shared process without identity or unity – thought beside itself perhaps. Its ruins offer us an institution in which the incomplete and interminable nature of the pedagogic relation can remind us that «thinking together» is a dissensual process, belonging to dialogism rather than dialogue» [9, p. 192]. As one can see, B. Readings compares two concepts – dialogism and dialogue, giving preference to the first. If the dialogue is a specific situation of communication between co-present individuals, the dialogism is a broader concept, which means the principle of comparison of different concepts and opinions that can be carried everywhere and at every moment, as in his/her own mind and in situations of actual meetings.

So, can we say that the communicative teaching principles can not be combined with the traditional style of teaching and a type of a «traditional teacher» whose task is to perform the following functions: «a) to investigate the subject of scientific knowledge that attracts him/her; b) to be the main source of educational information, its main manager; c) to transfer this knowledge and professional knowledge and skills to students; g) to check the degree of accepting and understanding the knowledge and skills passed to students as well as functions such as enlightenment, popularization of scientific knowledge, consulting, expertise and others» [1, p. 5–6]. Are communicativism and classical learning model really in contradiction? Yes and no. Depending on what meaning to put in the concept of traditional teaching, we can offer different assessments of this phenomenon. If by «traditional» style of training one keeps in mind «dictatorial» intentions of a teacher that broadcast to students a specific set of fixed theses and demands to be remembered with later playback of this information at the exam, if by «traditional» style one means monologue style of presenting typical/typological knowledge without problem-discussion context, if one considers «traditional» teacher's indifference to spontaneous discursive practices of students (or, even worse, banning these practices), then we conclude that the «traditional» teaching is incompatible with communicative teaching model.

However, it is possible to describe some other modus of «traditional» style of learning that is able to be combined with innovative educational practices and, moreover, that in reality is always accompanied by problem-oriented education. So, every teacher, before creating a discussion space in real or virtual classroom, offers students a scientific «view of the world», indicates problem areas and questions not solved yet, presents a variety of (subjective and objective) interpretations of existing theories within a certain discipline. In this case, such a teacher also «broadcasts» certain information, gives its original interpretation, systematizing and critically evaluating it. The teacher offers students his/her scientific experience, his/her vision of scientific problems, so that students can then join the discussion and become able to navigate in the sea of scientific information. On the contrary, if we exclude the phase of «translation» of scientific experience of the teacher, if immediately jump to the level of «problem-oriented» discussion, it is highly probable that instead of discussion one can get superficial fantasy without scientific foundation. With some degree of conditionality, one can talk about two-phase training rhythm in higher school: presentation of the scientific picture of the world (broadcasting teacher's scientific experience) is replaced by the exploration and discussion of problems in the process of free communications in practice lessons. The teacher in this context is positioned not as a

«possessor of the truth», but rather as a guide/navigator that helps students to gain a perspective view of the scientific landscape and not to be entangled in problems that have already lost their importance.

Let us identify the basic principles of instrumental learning models in higher education institutions, which are in inverse relationship to the principles of communicativism. Firstly, instrumentalism presumes focusing not so much on the process of learning but on how to get final grades or degrees, on visible success, on getting functional skills which later can be mechanically applied at a particular place of work with becoming a Perfect Functioner. Secondly, instrumental learning is connected with hierarchism and authoritarianism principles in relationship between the subjects of the educational process by idealizing the situation of unquestioning obedience, servility and conformism that do not exclude the use of other people as a tool for reaching their own utilitarian goals. Thirdly, instrumentalism does not exclude repressing some opinions of the educational process subjects, which may be stigmatized as inadequate, incorrect, too original, or, conversely, too banal.

One of the central principles of instrumental education paradigm is the belief in necessity and possibility of modifying the subjects of educational process in accordance with a certain «correct model», the correctness of which is justified according to subjective preferences of educational program author. The totalitarian character of such practices is obvious, especially if we consider that in such a situation a student turns into a passive object that is initially deprived of opportunities for free «self-constitution» (Z. Bauman) and self-determination (the teachers themselves decide who or what he/she must be by managing the educational process with using positive/negative evaluation of correct/incorrect speech acts). Using metaphors of I. Illich, in this situation the teacher turns into «custodian, preacher and therapist» [4, p. 37–38], diagnosing «defects of character/thinking» of students and devising means of correcting them. In instrumental learning model, a student turns into a non-free, inexperienced being that is doomed to accept intellectual food that is prepared by the teacher-priest for him/her. In contrast, in the communicative model, freedom space is reserved for all participants of educational interaction; a student has a right to freely choose intellectual trajectories that he/she is able to learn «here and now»; he/she may re-design or re-establish their perception of the world, but only as a result of free awareness of the necessity of such a «self-assembly» (Z. Bauman). According to the authors of the monograph «The University as a center of culture-generating education», just attitude on self-transformation of an individual (rather than modifying him/her from the outside) should be the basis of modern higher education reform [3].

The outstanding Brazilian theorist P. Freire in «Pedagogy of the Oppressed» has called the instrumental learning model as «banking» since teachers in it appear as active investors who invest prearranged stock of knowledge in the students' heads: «Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiques and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat» [10, p. 72]. The negative effect of such a «banking system of education» becomes the atrophy of critical thinking skills of students who start getting used «to absorbing and digesting» information provided to them by hierarchically dominating Depositor being not able to generate their

own knowledge. According to P. Freire, it is possible to change such a situation with the help of egalitarization of educational space that has as its outcome the deconstruction of classical educational positions (Teacher teaches – Student perceives information). In the new communication space, turning and replacing of Teacher and Student positions should take place: «through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teaches» [10, p. 80].

To conclude, two models of communicative relation principles and instrumentalism can be described. Firstly, it is a contradiction model (instrumentalism *versus* communicativism), which includes two subspecies: 1) instrumentalism displaces communicativity (exactly this variation has become a sad reality of universities in industrialism era) and 2) communicativity replaces instrumentalism (this option may be considered as the purpose of strategic changes in universities of post-industrialism era). Secondly, there is a conjunctive model (communicativity *and* instrumentalism), in which these two principles complement each other. Thus, communicativity becomes a strategic task implemented in a variety of interactions between social actors of university system, and the principle of instrumentalism becomes the tactic method of application of knowledge learned. The importance of such complementarity of considerable principles is stressed by E. Ivakhnenko, according to whom «one should not consider communicative principle as true/acceptable and the purpose-rational principle as false/inadmissible, or vice versa. The main item is relevance and applicability of their combination. The dominance of instrumental settings remains effective within the boundaries of particular techniques» [2, p. 41]. As one can see, in the considered context, the concept of instrumentalism is somewhat changing while its negative features meant by Habermas disappear. If we accept such a «refined» interpretation of the concept of instrumentalism in which only applicative aspects of cognitive practices are accented, it will be possible to accept that conjunctive model in the best manner that fits postmodern intentions on pluralization and diversification of educational strategies.

References:

1. Бакиров В. Трансформация университета, функций и статуса университетского преподавателя // Кадровый потенциал современных образовательных систем: состояние и перспективы : материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф., Харьков, 18 февр. 2016 г. – Харьков : Изд-во НУА, 2016. – С. 3–12.
2. Ивахненко Е. Новации вузовского обучения в оптике инструментальных и коммуникативных установок / Е. Н. Ивахненко // Высшее образование в России, 2011. – № 10. – С. 39–46.
3. Университет как центр культуропорождающего образования. Изменение форм коммуникации в учебном процессе [Электронный ресурс] / [под ред. М. А. Гусаковского]. – Минск : БГУ, 2004. – 279 с. – Режим доступа : <http://charko.narod.ru/index38.html>. – Заголовок з екрану.
4. *Illich I.* Deschooling Society / I. *Illich*. – Harmondsworth, UK : Ringwood, Australia : Penguin Education, 1974. – 117 p.
5. *Habermas J.* The theory of communicative action. – Vol. 1, Reason and the rationalization of society / J. Habermas. – Boston, MA : Beacon Press, 1984. – 512 p.
6. *Habermas J.* Moral consciousness and communicative action / J. Habermas. – Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 1990.

7. Habermas, critical theory and education [edited by Mark Murphy and Ted Fleming]. – New York : Routledge, 2009. – 216 p.

8. *Nussbaum M.* Not for profit: why democracy needs the humanities/ M. Nussbaum. – Princeton, N.J : Princeton University Press, 2010. – 184 pp.

9. *Readings B.* The University in Ruins / B. Readings. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996. – 256 pp.

10. *Freire P.* Pedagogy of the Oppressed / P. Freire [Transl. by Myra Bergman Ramos]. – New York – London : Continuum, 2006. – 183 p.

Надійшла до редакції 12.09.2016. Розглянута на редколегії 19.09.2016

Рецензенти:

Доктор філософських наук, професор, завідувач кафедри філософії Харківського національного університету будівництва та архітектури Проценко О.П.

Доктор філософських наук, професор ХАІ, професор кафедри філософії Національного аерокосмічного університету ім. М.Є. Жуковського «ХАІ» Кузнецов А.Ю.