Universidad de Guantánamo

Comunicación docente, un desafío epistemológico para el autoaprendizaje
Teaching and communicating. An epistemological challenge for self- learning

Máximo Gómez Castells
Jorge Washington Valarezo Castro
Alex Rodrigo Rivera Ríos
Universidad Técnica de Machala, Ecuador
Correo electrónico:
maximogc@gmail.com
jorgevalarezoc@gmail.com
alexrodrigo@gmail.com

Resumen: El presente artículo tiene como objetivo analizar los problemas de la comunicación en la docencia cuando no son empleados los fundamentos epistemológicos que conduzcan a una postura crítica por parte de los estudiantes, de manera que conviertan la interacción social en un mecanismo constructor de sujetos del desarrollo sostenible. Para lograr ese resultado fue utilizada la revisión bibliográfica y el análisis de contenido como manera de construir una visión de la trascendencia teórica y práctica de la comunicación en el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje.

Palabras clave: Comunicación educativa; Aprendizaje autónomo; Pensamiento crítico; Democratización comunicativa y emancipadora

Abstract: This paper aims at analyzing the problems related to communication while teaching, which occur when the epistemological grounds to favor criticism in students are misused. Ideally, the social interaction becomes a mechanism to train subjects for a sustainable development. To achieve the aims of the research a bibliographic analysis and an analysis of the content as means of training critical perspectives regarding the theoretical and practical relevance of communication in the teaching and learning process were carried out.

Keywords: Educative communication; Autonomous learning; Critical thinking; Democratic and emancipating communication

Introduction

Communication is a field of science very developed nowadays; it highlights all social spaces and therefore also teaching. This reason argues the need to study the orientation that takes place in the teaching process, resulting from the teacher and student dialogue in which diverse conflicts manifest, which requires their epistemological and practical solution as one of the ways to achieve educational results. In this regard, Lomov (1989) states: "the educational activity is communicative by excellence, in which all the functions inherent to the latter are manifested:

informative, affective and regulating behavior" (p.14). The allusion to functions refers to various structures that are created during teaching and learning.

One of the most complex structures is learning, because it operates under the guidance of the teacher, but is a translation that makes the student to their advantage. The pedagogy, in its development, has deployed arguments that support the vision of active learning, but constantly emerging new challenges such as competency learning; as a trend in construction it is revealed one of the challenges that teachers face in the field of education: autonomous learning, which implies the student to take personal control of the learning process (Pérez, 2013). A posture that synthesizes psychological, sociological and pedagogical aspects, among others, because it is a matter of reaching a possible consciousness, a conception in which the socio-psychology emphasizes that the receiver in the class must be thought from the perspective of knowing not what he thinks, but what changes are likely to occur in his consciousness, without any modification in the essential nature of the group (Goldman, 1980). This idea poses the risks and challenges when the reception is viewed as a capacity to obtain knowledge with methods and means to create, and where a distant knowledge of reproduction is not constructed as essential for a category or concept.

This intentionality leads to the action that teachers must play in their messages, especially since they must reconfigure the traditional way of teaching communication. The first requirement refers to the facts that take place in the links that arise when talking with students and they react differently. In this situation, there are frequent conflicts related to the students' understanding of the questions and actions indicated by the teachers, an opportunity that should be used to enrich the orientation towards learning that leaves behind a simplifying look; this leads us to arrive at what Habermas calls the culture of science and its meaning, because "it is not the informative content of theories but the formation of a reflexive and enlightened habit in the theorists themselves which produces, in the end, a scientific culture "(Habermas, 1986, p.2).

That is, the interaction of the poles that represent the teacher and the student requires a behavior of the questioning teacher, in search of the productive and away from mere memorization. This production through the exchange of information that is constantly carried out by the teacher, and

to which the student incorporates his translations, will be investments of the student in personal development as an actor of the scientific culture that requires dominating.

This communicative autonomy contains a high dose of affectivity in the interactive relations since it configures an environment of feelings that tint the behaviors assumed by the subjects that they exchange. Precisely, in the assumption that all dialogue is a transfer of knowledge, the concerns that this article tries to address are located, since there is a tendency to consider that information *per se* is instructed, when such a position demands to evaluate that the formation of a pondering habit is not based exclusively on information content.

The paper aims at analyzing the problems of communication in teaching when the epistemological foundations that lead the critical posture in the students are not used, so that they convert social interaction into a constructive mechanism of subjects of sustainable development.

This purpose will make it easier to propose methodologies for communication in the educational field, mediated by the instructive and pedagogical methods, which transform teaching into a tool according to the urgencies of this 21st century society. In order to achieve this result, bibliographical review and content analysis were used as a way of determining a vision of the theoretical and practical importance of communication in the teaching-learning process.

Development

Cultural attributes are the qualities acquired in the course of life as a product of the appropriation of knowledge, and which operate in communication and often stipulate its viability. A fact that is largely determined by the way the teacher addresses the symbolic universe of the student and can facilitate or hinder their role in learning. The reasons that explain the role of communication in the teaching situation emerge from the consideration that communication is the basis of social interaction because it builds interrelations among people. It is also a mutually influential process and results in a reference to things and objects from interpretations and symbols (García, 2013).

The social fact produced responds to a network of elements that configure a communicative situation based on verbal and nonverbal signs that are expressed by physical and cultural objects decoded in the communicative act. A theoretical point of view of semiotics has defined this act as a grammar of production and grammar of recognition, formed by rules that regulate both fields

and delimit them (Verón, 1998), both are mechanisms that the subject uses to make more dynamic the reading of the text and for generating ideas on purpose.

Within the production grammar are located the roles that within the orientation role are configured by teachers. Martínez (2007) notes:

> The roles of the teacher are: to have a communicative and interactive vocation; invite the interaction for his clear and concise speech; be a facilitator; create pedagogical situations that simulate real life, so as to foster cooperation and interaction; inform students about the roles as a teacher so that students understand their own role and assume responsibility for it. (p.31)

What this author designates as roles are actually roles assumed by the teacher to configure a horizon with which to carry out their social obligation to teach. The first of them places a dimension that establishes a method of action: the dialogue thought like reaction, something that forces to choose the words with which to motivate behaviors. Precision and clarity, however, do little to contribute to an invitation to intervene, since it is a question of placing bold discursive constructions in what their contrast produces the possibility of reaching the sense that is being proposed.

The pedagogical situations allude to the placement of cultural objects that must be installed in the student's consciousness in order to be activated in the manner of an epistemological vigilance and to question the teaching proposals. There are professors who fear such attitudes when they are the basis of an autonomous student; Williams (1992) has pointed out the skills that a defenseless attitude in teacher communication entails:

> ... we must always distinguish between two types of consciousness: the alert, open, and often conflicting recognition of specificity and complexity which, in thousands of cases, is always challenging working hypotheses and generalizations (p.107)

This author bets on the advantages that critical communication provides because it contrasts with an educational system aimed at inducing an eternally conscious defenselessness, of which it will be very difficult to extract the student. In these cases, there are frequent teaching practices with a poor intentionality in the proposal of orientation, which makes the professorial discourse a banal message where the use of words with a precise semantic category is not required. It is about

establishing a more assertive communication while interacting (Barona, 2014) that puts the receiver in the position to demonstrate the affirmations.

These demonstrations occur within a group structure and significantly favor self-directed learning, as it forces the student to seek reasons. It is a group collaborative work modality, which purpose is for the student to achieve the desired development through interaction and communication (Paz, 2014). The above is a relationship that functions at a structural level and provides a lot of independence to students.

Critical positions in communication adopt forms and order structures through the production of ideas, the intentionality of messages, and critical exercise; which can constitute stages for autonomous learning achieved from an attention to the configuration of teacher communication. The conjugation of productive attitudes in reception highlights the importance of the cultural function that activates the attributes and resizes them in an internal process of symbolic efficiency. Efficiency that is synthesized in a communication model that works with the oppositions between the unidirectional and bidirectional constitution in the practices of consumption of cultural goods (Gómez, 2016). To achieve this it becomes necessary to develop a new mode of teacher communication.

Landivar (2013) defines educational communication as the area of theoretical-instrumental knowledge, whose object of study are the processes of interaction characteristic of all human relationship, where they transmit and recreate meanings; to this, he adds that in the practice of educational communication, at least one of the actors pursues an educational purpose, from which it has appropriated knowledge and techniques for action and has organized it minimally. This dimension tries to contextualize the communicative process, an intention that expresses an authoritarian origin that is the cause of the difficulties to exercise a democratic teaching role.

Apart from this complexity, it should be pointed out that the models of educational communication have been polarized by their political and pedagogical intentions, which correspond to the practices deployed in or outside the classroom and are differentiated by the constitution of the receivers, which can be a diverse structural community or a sociopolitical and homogeneous group community in the pedagogical context. The constitutive qualities presented

in the previous paragraph determine the communication relations that are established in the educational field, and the nature and functions of the actions.

These communicative practices, often contradictory to each other, play an important role in the education of learners and in the relationships established between the protagonists of the teaching process. These relationships are to be analyzed in a model of communicative process with a process approach, according to its use and study with a centrality to the teaching-learning process. For Ojalvo (2002), cited by Perdomo (2010), this conception appreciates educational communication, and constitutes an ecosystem based on the subject-medium interaction.

In this approach the possible relationships refer to the teacher's interactions, and students, subjects and message, of the subjects with their cultural matrix, and the subjects within the process of interaction.

In them we will find inherent contradictions and tensions, because they are the source of productive thought. So, it is appropriate to install critical thinking that contributes to the deployment of an active method where roles are flexible with a horizontal orientation, that is, where the questioning is not considered a contentious or irreverent attitude. To think critically is a condition in the context of knowledge because that is where the possibilities of development that Ramírez (2008) see as:

> ... a broad range of cognitive skills necessary to identify, analyze and evaluate (effectively) real arguments and conclusions to discover and overcome personal prejudices and biases, to formulate and present compelling reasons for a conclusion, thesis or position, and to make reasoned decisions about what to believe and what to do (p.103).

The type of thinking described is expressed through the languages of the teacher and the student, in what is required to make corresponding horizontal relationships dismantling the traditional way of dialogue in which the teacher is who controls the communication in the classroom, determines the subject, the aspects to be debated, questions, etc., establishes the rules of the students' linguistic behavior, establishes the limits and possibilities of the dialogue. Through all this creates the pattern of relationships with their students (Ojalvo, 2008).

One way to counteract these effects is to use modes of exercising critical thinking in the different modalities of teacher-student interaction. In this regard, it is possible to cite the bibliographic

criticism based on locating questionable elements as it is visible in the concept of critical thinking that gives Ramírez. There it limits that the evaluation must be efficient, with which he suggests that there are some that are not and that questions the character of evaluation. Other forms are the counterargument or antithesis, propositions by diagrams, or arguments like fallacies (Urquijo, 2008), this practice forms students and teachers in a communicative democratizing model.

Theoretical model of democratizing educational communication

When a model of educational democratizing communication was announced in the previous paragraph, the possibility of creating an instrument that enabled the agreements and needs of teachers and students to express the learning achieved was being instilled.

This tool has an established foundation between the functional model of the teacher and the active receiver model of the student. Its principle would be the emission-reception of a text as an interaction that, when democratizing itself, becomes creative. The elements that operate it are the emitter, the receiver and the mediations of the curriculum, the communicative relations, the methodologies and the language determined by the context where it is used. Their relationships would be triangular, inspired by the terciary model and would allow to think of the exercise of teaching from different angles, a possibility that would accustom to a diversified practice of teaching that would greatly influence in the resizing of the reflective judgment and the creative capacity of the student and of the teacher. We will identify the protagonist of the speech and at the same time recognize the rules of communication protocol. This model also has the advantage that it is not exclusive to a curriculum. The following chart shows the behavior dynamics of teachers and students.

Gráfico 1- **Democratic** -**communicative model**

Source: The author

Student-teacher relationships are developed through partnership and community. All this emphasizes social relations insofar as the attitude in social action is inspired by a compensation of interests and rational motives, while a community establishes relationships based affectively and traditionally. These points of view were considered in the construction of this model that aims to generate agreements that integrate the educational association with the community of which it is part to achieve an active formation, which indicates that the educational institution is positioned for its effectiveness in the teaching and learning. Methodologically, it is inspired by phases that go from activating knowledge in the mode of inter-subjectivity, attribution of orientation, towards learning where it is generated:

• A communicative environment that enables the meanings arranged in the orientation.
• The progressive design of the curriculum based on levels of complexity, which vision is ample, and where the teacher centralizes communication in order to direct the attention in the sense of reflective thinking.

It is clear that the role of the students will be exercised from the conviction of the meanings oriented and the possibility of controversy. These student attitudes will constitute discursive strategies for appropriation, communicative behaviors to interpret texts as behavioral reactions. The scientific logic will allow us to refer to the known and unknown in the *continuum*, formed by poles such as arguments and counterarguments, diagrams and texts, fallacies and truths as a semantic structuring of discourse.

Conclusions

Teaching communication is neither a monologue nor an essential transmission of knowledge; it is a complex process of negotiation and contradictions from which emerges an active receiver whose production is the real state of learning. In this communicative model the diversity of channels is a condition for the truth of communication seen as rational agreements.

The role of the teacher in training an autonomous learner should not lead to a conscious defenselessness formed by the simple reproduction of knowledge, and requires a translation in the linguistic behavior that stimulates critical thinking.

Educational communication in the contemporary world is the field of critical thinking that requires establishing horizontal relationships and flexible roles that build a horizon of roles that are appreciated as democratic.

To operate a democratizing communicative model is to give the student the ability to activate collective memory, to enable his critical awareness and to develop his dialogical capacity by demanding communicative resources to act in a scenario that challenges him. For the teacher is to penetrate with legitimacy and positioning in a form of teaching in which the student is a protagonist, because the teacher constructs the situations and the student ponders about them not to memorize, but to apply the perceptions produced. It means to empower learning for the student´s own realization.

_____

Bibliographic references

Barona Balanta, J. R. (2014). *Aprendizaje autodirigido de una lengua extranjera*. Universidad de San Buenaventura: Educación, Santiago de Cali, Colombia.

García Hornazábal, R. (2013). *Estudio del impacto del comportamiento comunicativo verbal y no verbal en profesorado en el aula. La percepción de docentes y estudiantes de enseñanza secundaria*. Universidad de Extremadura, España. (Tesis doctoral).

Goldmang, L. (1980). La importancia del concepto de conciencia posible para la comunicación. En *La creación cultural en la sociedad moderna*, (27-37). Barcelona: Fontamara.

Gómez Castells, M. (2014). *Eficacia simbólica*. Asturias, España: Ediciones Trea S. L.

Habermas, J. (1986). *Ciencia y técnica como ideología*. Madrid: Editorial Tecnos.

Landivar, T.E. (2013). Comunicación educativa. Reflexiones para su construcción. *Revista Alternativas,* (4), 8.

Lomov, B.F. (1989). *El problema de la comunicación en la psicología*. La Habana: Ciencias Sociales.

Martínez, M. (2007). *El nuevo papel del profesor universitario de lenguas extranjeras en el proceso de convergencia europea y su relación con la interacción, la tutoría y el aprendizaje autónomo*. Porta Linguarum. Departamento de Filosofía Inglesa. Alicante.

Ojalvo Mitrany, V. (1999) *¿Cómo hacer más efectiva la comunicación?* En: Colectivo de autores del CEPES (Ed.). Universidad de la Habana. CEPES.

Ojalvo Mitrany, V. (2002). *Comunicación educativa*. En: Colectivo de autores del CEPES (Ed.). Universidad de la Habana. CEPES.

Paz Penagos, H. (2014). Aprendizaje autónomo y estilo cognitivo: diseño didáctico, metodología y evaluación. Bogotá: Escuela Colombiana de Ingeniería. *Revista Educación en ingeniería*, *9*(17), 63.

Perdomo, A. (2010). Presencia de la dimensión ética en la formación de estudiantes. *Panorama Cuba y Salud*, 24-32.

Pérez Cabrera, L. B. (2013). El rol del docente en el aprendizaje autónomo: la perspectiva del estudiante y la relación con su rendimiento académico. *El Salvador*, 7(11). 45-62. doi: http://www.redicces.org.sv/jspui/bitstream/10972/2090/1/3.

Ramírez Mazón, Á. (2008). El conocimiento y el pensamiento crítico. En Ramírez, A. *Formación en el pensamiento crítico.* Estado de México: Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Campus Estado de México.

Urquijo Lago, A. (2008). Los argumentos. En Colectivo de autores (Ed.), *Formación en el pensamiento crítico.* Estado de México: Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Campus Estado de México.

Verón, E. (1998). *La semiosis social*. Barcelona, España: Gedisa.

Williams, R. (1992). *Sociología de la cultura*, Barcelona, España: Paidos.