

---

## COMMUNICATION MODELS' CONTRIBUTION TO STABILITY, REPRODUCTION AND CHANGE OF SOCIAL VALUES\*

ANNA ALEKSANYAN

In the modern era of fast-developing society the role of the information and communication is getting more and more important. Nowadays it is hard to imagine any aspect of science and education without the fastly-updated information and communication means. In order to catch up with these innovations in information and communication and the information and ensure the smooth integration into all these an educational system should be customized to meet all the requirements of 21st century. In the 21st century many national and local education systems are considering how best to meet the changing needs and demands they face.

The educational system is one of the centralized formes of collective life where a person obtains basic knowledge, information and experience that guide him throughout whole life. Together with the experience a person assimilates values specific to that group, cultural stereotype, behavioral forms and, of course, the culture of memory. All this can be obtained directly or indirectly in the process of communication with them collectve members.

There are various theories and approaches (functionalism - assuming that education, as a social institute within society, is made up of interdepend parts all working together, contributing some necessary activity to the functioning of the whole society [E. Durkheim]; conflict theories - explaining the influences of educational system on the specific institutions [K. Marx, M. Weber, R. Collins]; interactions and interpretive theories - on small-scale and small group interactions [G. H. Mead, C. H. Cooley]; recent teories - observing the role of education within the events and situations around us and react to them as we do [B. Bernstein, P. Bourdieu]; differentiation theories and theories about social change [A. C. Jeffrey, P. Colomy, F. J. Lechner, G. Rhoades, R. Münch]; approaches of N. Luhman about evaluation of society and about socialization, theories of communicative behavior [J. Habermass, H. Lasswel], theories on education policy and education research [A. Bryman, J. Anyon, B. S. Cooper, B. Lingard, W. Helsper, J. Böhme, W. Leuterbach, R. Backer], as well as Armenian scientist's approaches [Sh. Perperyan]) that describe the importance and the essential role of the education into microlevel and macrolevels of society by the use of communications. These theories consist the theoretical and metohodological bases for this research and analyses.

---

\* Paper presented at the International conference on "Social Construction of Reality: Chances and Risks for Human Communications", Yerevan State University, Faculty of Sociology, Yerevan, September 25-27, Armenia.

Thus E. Durkheim wrote: “Education is the influence exercised by adult generations on those that are not yet ready for social life. Its object is to arouse and to develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and the special milieu (or setting) for which he is specifically destined”<sup>1</sup>. Durkheim observed that education takes different forms at different times and places and revealed that we cannot separate the educational system from the society for they reflect each other. *Any change in society reflects a change in education and vice versa*. In fact, education is an active part of the process of change in the society. That’s why, E. Durkheim offered to analyze the classrooms as “small societies”, or agents of socialization to understand direction of social change. Durkheim outlined certain areas that he believed were important for sociologists as researchers to address, including the relationships of education to societal change, just the social system of the school and classroom<sup>2</sup>. From this viewpoint, to understand the changes and directions of the societal transformations in Armenia, the study of the education system and particularly the study of school has a crucial role.

In order to be able to face the present day challenges the school should meet modern demands by means of passing knowledge and values. This is the reason for which the German researcher K. Mayer states: “Education is the most difficult social and political problem of the 21st century to be solved”<sup>3</sup>.

The current transformations in Armenia have relevant role and impact on educational reforms. The social change itself is determined by modern educational reforms. The education system makes this possible through the societal values, as educational system mostly (among the social institutions) has the following functions: creating, transferring and spreading out of values in society. That is why, if we do not face any change of values and reforms in education system, then there can not be any transition in society at all.

Nevertheless, in the current times Armenian education system was not enough flexible to the contemporary transformation processes in society. There are social values that are stable, and these stable values contain the risks for the transition, because they were creating in the soviet time, but are transferring and spreading out till our days. From another side there are societal values in education system, which are not new but have new interpretations, which are national values. From this viewpoint Armenian education system has no chances to spread new societal values, which promote the creation of new civil cultural atmosphere. There is a necessity for a new type of active citizen for new civil society (as a result of modern education system), who can actively participate in all processes in society. This is a new actual challenge for the entire Armenian education system as a social institution.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Durkheim, E.** Education and Sociology. (trans. Sherwood D. Fox) Glancoe, III.: Free Press, 1956, p.28.

<sup>2</sup> **Brookover, W. B. and Ericson E. L.** Sociology of education. Homewood, III.: Dorsey Press, 1975, p.4-5.

<sup>3</sup> **Mayer, K. U.** Arbeit und Wissen. Die Zukunft von Bildung und Beruf. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2000, p. 383-410.

The group of researchers, intending to examine the change of values, is going to use the concept of “creative actualization”<sup>4</sup>. This concept comes from the current time Axiological theories and considered to the value as “the ground of change and improvements of the World” (Hugh P. McDonald). This concept explains the change of the world in connection with the actualization of the values.

How goes this “creative actualization” processes from micro to the macro level of society, and how can the values reflect on the mind and behaviour of people and on the social consciousness is indicated by Robert Neville, by Robert Hartman, by Ludwig Grünberg, Rem Edwards and etc.

Nevertheless, if we consider the theories of reforms in education, we can see that there is also a more recent concept, which we can name “actualization in education”. This concept is considered to the reforms of education from soviet to the contemporary education system, which is corresponding to the requirements of the 21st century. In that concept are explained the processes of actualization of education in current transition period (Slastenin B. A. & Chizhakova G. I.)<sup>5</sup>. This concept comes to complete the concept of “policy design in transforming higher education” (Kogan M., Bauer M., Henkel M.)<sup>6</sup>. This concept argues the need in “rational actor model” and states that “we need a theoretically integrated perspective in order to understand higher education policy change and overall reforms in education.... For a detailed presentation of reforms we need the national accounts<sup>7</sup>. Hence, Bob Lingard states that “Education is a deliberate activity directed at the achievement of a range of ends which could potentially include the development of knowledgeable individuals who are able to think rationally, the formation of sustainable community, and the realization of economic goals benefiting both individuals and their communities...Thinking about education thus necessarily involves considerations of values”<sup>8</sup>.

Armenian researchers also have specific explanation of the educational reforms and change of values. Specific stand of point has Shahen Perperyan<sup>9</sup>, who has shaped the “tree of values”, “which are being used as an indicator during the lifetime. He state that the values are not stable and unchangeable, but some still condition our behaviour and frame our activities”. He separates the “validation process” of the change of values. Validations can be “Legal validation; Friend/kin and kit validation; Natural validation; Will validation; Religious validation”. And Perperyan states that “Here the most important component is not the action itself, but the intentions of policy makers”. In our case that is education policy. For that validation there are some rules: Rule of value categorizing; Rule of Parallel; Rule of Value interrelation, fulfilment; Rule of Value Interpretation. From our

---

<sup>4</sup> **Hugh P. McDonald.** Creative Actualization: a Meliorist Theory of Values. NY: VIBS 224, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> **Slastenin B. A. and Chizhakova G. I.,** Pedagogical Axiology, Moscow: Academy Press, 2003.

<sup>6</sup> **Kogan M., Bauer M., Henkel M.** Transforming Higher Education: Comparative Study, Higher Education Dynamics, London, Springer, 2006.

<sup>7</sup> **Kogan M., Bauer M., Henkel M.** Transforming Higher Education: Comparative Study, Higher Education Dynamics, London, Springer, 2006, p.41.

<sup>8</sup> **Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B.** Globalizing education policy. NY: Routledge, 2209, p.71.

<sup>9</sup> **Perperyan, S. R.** Axiology or Valuelogy, Kilikyo katoghikosutyán dprevanq (in Armenian), 1976, 160 p.

view point, there are two things that are common for all: the subject of the change and the model through what values is being developed by education system.

From this aspect the interpersonal communication model<sup>10</sup> and especially teacher-learner relations have a highest importance because as extensive research shows the teacher-learner communication model has an important role in the personal formation and in developing group relationship at school age. As the psychologist N. Efimova shows the relations “child-teacher” later develop into “person-society” relations i.e. a child identifies his communicational model with the relation model of the whole society.

The communication model “teacher-learner” includes teacher’s teaching strategy, the specifications of the means of presenting information or knowledge or the communication style. The communication model also includes the nature of the reflexive impulse from the class, the nature of the pupils’ communicative activeness and the specifications of the developed communicative relations which is in accordance with the communicative influence of the teacher.

That is why, to find out the peculiarities of the communicational model in Armenian education system and the transformation process from Soviet to European and the influence of different factors on it, particularly the communicative influence of the teacher and communicative activeness of pupils, an researches has been implemented in Armenian schools.

The research has been implemented in the three public schools of Yerevan: No 21, No 60, No 78. The research was conducted with the participation of 20 teachers and 524 pupils.

The peculiarities of the communicative influences of the teachers were observed with the Condrateva’s and Rean’s methodology. According to that theory the teachers can have three types of communicative influences: organizational, disciplinary, evaluating. These types of communicative influences are shaped by the styles of teacher’s communication: Democratic, Authoritarian and Liberal.

And the peculiarities of pupils’ communicative activeness were observed with the Bodalev’s methodology, which separates two types of the pupils’ communicative activeness: Creative, Reproductive.

The analyses of the research results are shown that the pupils’ communicative activeness is due to the nature of the communicative influences of the teachers. Hence in the case of organizational influences the pupils have Creative communicative activeness; disciplinary influences – Reproductive communicative activeness, and during the research we mentioned that pupils have one more communicative activeness, which during the analyses we called *Breaking*.

---

<sup>10</sup> The **communication model** expresses the interconnection between a learner communicative activeness and teacher pedagogical influences. Communication model includes the communication component parts, communication subjects, their role, relations and influences towards each other, specific functions. The model is necessary for a researcher to better and more precisely express his thoughts on research object essential features. Model content can be conditioned by several factors : as per researcher’s conception as well as according to the science challenges within which the research is being implemented. Researchers use the modeling method to find out the exact system essence and to make explicit the studied communicative system. **Modeling method** is the object characterization through another object.

	<b>Creative</b>	<b>Reproductive</b>	<b>Braking</b>
<b>estimating/evaluating</b>	9.5%	42.5%	48%
<b>disciplinary/ administrative</b>	20.5%	48.5%	31%
<b>organizational</b>	52%	38.3%	10.7%

The results of the research allow us to conclude the followings: if in the educational system generally we have **estimating/evaluating** influence by teachers, the pupils have **Braking** activeness in 48%, **Reproductive** activeness - 42.5%, and **Creative** activeness - 9.5%. If in the educational system generally we have **disciplinary/ administrative** influence by teachers, the pupils have **Braking** activeness in 31%, **Reproductive** activeness - 48.5%, and **Creative** activeness - 20.5%. If in the educational system generally we have **organizational** influence by teachers, the pupils have **Braking** activeness in 10.7%, **Reproductive** activeness - 38.3%, and **Creative** activeness - 52%.

In those societies, in which educational systems is dominate estimating/evaluating influence, in that case generally the pupils have Braking activeness, and educational systems transfer stable social values without any change. In this case, there are dominating stable national values and mostly in the conservative societies. If in the educational systems is dominate disciplinary/ administrative influence by teachers and Reproductive activeness of pupils, in that case in the society there is reproduction of the social values by rethinking. In this situation the reproducing old social values has new interpretations (mostly in the post-soviet societies). And only, if in the educational systems is dominate organizational influence by teachers and Creative activeness of pupils, in the society there are possibility create new social values and keeping the old national values to change the values accordingly to the requirements of the new society.

Thus, conducted researches have shown that the Armenian educational system has not yet refused the administrative communicational model i.e. the Soviet times model still works in our schools. As the national report on educational reforms in Armenia also states “The Armenian education system was not flexible enough to reflect to the new events. As a result, educational institutions keep implementing the goals of the non-existing Soviet system”. The approach of giving students ready knowledge prevails over making them participant in constructing knowledge”<sup>11</sup>. I am concordant with Afonin’s opinion on this issue who states “It is easier to say that the problem is in people in management sphere, they are poorly prepared on the professional basis, do not possess sufficient management knowledge and, finally, do not adequately do their official duties. It is suffice to teach them to better control and the

---

<sup>11</sup> **Education reforms in Armenia. Human development, national report 2006.** Program National Systemizer N. Sahakyan, Yerevan, 2007, p.21.

management will be optimum”<sup>12</sup>. However, everything is much more difficult and problematic. From another standpoint, we realize the resistant necessity to transfer to the European system and a policy to integrate into European Cohesion Educational Area which brings about some education system reforms. Most likely the problem is not in lack of management knowledge but rather in their content, not in poorly trained administrative personnel and not in the absence of management as such, but its targeting, organization and implementation technologies. There are such stereotypes, mechanisms, consciousness layers, customs, traditions, and mentality, collective symbols that are passed from generation to generation and which do not allow or interfere to the communicative model development at school and in all education system. Thus, A. Mkrtichyan states that “The independent School education system ... promotes to the recreation of the of the old world outlook through Soviet time political stereotype intercommunicate”<sup>13</sup>.

This means that the culture of memory interferes to the formation of the new culture and new values, to the import of communication new symbol and finally, to the application of communication new model in education system through its various manifestation inter-relation from generation to generation.

And from another standpoint Armenia is intended to form a new national thinking as a post Soviet country and much attention is paid to the reestablishment of the national values and their preservation in the future. The system “De-sovietization” attempts are focused on its ethnization and not oriented towards the active civic position of the current growing generation required in the conditions of independent governance. Hence, Armenian educational system is in the case that we can name *indeterminate*.

Thus, institutionalization of the Soviet time educational system which stemmed from culture of memory reinforcement and group symbols, inter-relation and reproduction through cultural stereotypes and others, interferes the education system transformation to a new model and consequently the European communicational model effectiveness. If we will be able to work up new communicational model which arise from advanced experiences we can promote the change from Soviet to European education cohesion area and efficiency of transformation processes in Armenia.

Armenian educational system has been under the influence of the Soviet Union ideology for decades, moreover, it has been one of the frames of its extension and reinforcing. Of course, the school education undergoes political, economic, mass media and other influences. It completely reflects the events taking place in the society that is why the research of that system enables to reveal all the issues characteristic to the society. In the 21st century Armenia has the issue of integrating Europe, a part of which is connected with integrating into spreading out a joint European educational cohesion area. Whereas S. Kara-

---

<sup>12</sup> Afonin, Y.A., Jabin, A.P., Pankratov, A.S. Social Management, handbook: M.: Pub. MSU, 2004, p. 36.

<sup>13</sup> Mkrtichyan, A. Chaos as a system formation mechanism of self organization of society. Yerevan.: Pub. YSU, 2008, p. 156.

Moorza noticed “School is one of the most stable and conservative social institutions, the “genetic matrix” of the culture. Coming generations are shaped in accordance with that matrix. That is why the formation of a person with new characteristics presupposes changes in school education basis”<sup>14</sup> i.e. a total change is necessary in the communicational model (on the base of the national experience and keeping the positive components of the old model).

From this viewpoint, in the conditions of the Armenian transformational society arouses the actual problem which is the issue of development of a communicational model in school (as a “social system of the education”) which is common for all societies. Moreover, as Kara-Moorza puts it “the formation of a society... mostly depends on the school model”<sup>15</sup>.

Since Armenia is intended to integrate into Europe and European cohesion area, it seems obvious what a direction of the changes is, where these transformations move – the Europaization. As A.E. Mkrtichyan noticed, a country’s integration into Europe means not only the regulation of the legal norms or laws but presupposes the implementation of that procedure for all citizens - i.e. it is necessary to create a common cultural atmosphere. According to A.E. Mkrtichyan “This challenge can be solved through school education as the culture is formed in knowledge (information) and value (common social expectations) results passed through study and upbringing from generation to generation”<sup>16</sup>.

Hence, we can see, there is an actual problem of connections within education and value system in society, and there are various theories and concepts stating that only the change in education can reflect to the change in societal values. However, there are no theories which present the logical and schematic model for the processing of the change of values and explain the mechanisms for the functioning of that processes in education and Vs.

We explain the change of value as the process which can be leading by the education strategy and education policy makers. The education strategy is the only instrument for the actualization of new values in society due to its functionality of creating, transferring and spreading out of values. In this case the change of value we define as a “Search of Identity”, the result of which is the formation of the model “New Man for New Society”. If we transfer the idea into current terms it will be an “Active Citizen for Civil Society”. Thus it’s crucial to outline whether the presence of current basic value and identity characteristics tend to slow down the development of an Active Citizen for Civil Society.

**ԱՆՆԱ ԱԼԵՔՍԱՆՅԱՆ – Հաղորդակցական մոդելների ազդեցությունը սոցիալական արժեքների կայունության, վերարտադրության և փոփոխման գործում –** Հոդվածում ներկայացվում է կրթության համա-

---

<sup>14</sup> Kara-Moorza, S. Conscious Manipulation. M.: Exmo, 2004, p. 247.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 246.

<sup>16</sup> Mkrtichyan, A. Chaos as a system formation mechanism of self organization of society. Yerevan.: YSU Pub., 2008, p. 156.

կարգում սովորողների կողմից կիրառվող հաղորդակցման մոդելների փոխառնչությունը սոցիալական արժեքների փոփոխման և կայունության հետ: Տրվում են կրթության համակարգում ուսուցչի և աշակերտի միջև հաղորդակցման մոդելների առանձնահատկությունների բացահայտմանն ուղղված ուսումնասիրության արդյունքները: Պարզվում է, որ ՀՀ կրթության համակարգում սովորողների ակտիվությունը հաղորդակցման ընթացքում իր բնույթով ոչ միայն ստեղծագործական և վերարտադրողական է, այլև, ինչպես հողվածի հեղինակն անվանում է, արգելակվող. նման վարք հանդիպում է հաղորդակցման այնպիսի մոդելի դեպքում, երբ ուսուցիչը հիմնականում գնահատող ազդեցություն է ունենում աշակերտի վրա: Պարզվել է նաև, որ ուսուցչի կարգապահական ազդեցությունների դեպքում սովորողներն ունենում են վերարտադրողական, իսկ կազմակերպական ներգործությունների դեպքում՝ ստեղծագործական հաղորդակցական ակտիվություն: Հետազոտողը, հիմնվելով սոցիոլոգիական և մանկավարժական արտելոգիական հայեցակարգի վրա և ցույց տալով կրթության համակարգում հաղորդակցման մոդելի ու հասարակական արժեքների փոխառնչությունները, հանգում է եզրակացության, որ այն հասարակություններում, որտեղ գերիշխում է սովորողների ստեղծագործական ակտիվությունը հաղորդակցման մեջ, և համապատասխանաբար գերակա է կազմակերպական ներգործություն – ստեղծագործական ակտիվություն մոդելը, տեղի է ունենում արժեքների հարաշարժ փոփոխություն, և միայն այդ հասարակությունն է ի վիճակի ապահովելու նոր ակտիվ քաղաքացու ձևավորումը քաղաքացիավարական հասարակության պայմաններում:

**АННА АЛЕКСАНИЯ – Влияние коммуникационных моделей на стабильность, воспроизводство и изменчивость социальных ценностей.** – Коммуникативные модели, используемые в школьном обучении, по-разному влияют на ценностную ориентацию учащихся, в том числе на стабильность и изменчивость тех или иных ценностных ориентиров. Поведенческие модели школьников имеют не только творческую и воспроизводящую направленность, но и тормозящую функцию, особенно когда учитель воздействует на них только посредством оценок. Дисциплинарное влияния учителя делает поведение школьников в значительной степени воспроизводящим, тогда как его организационное воздействие стимулирует у них творческое поведение. В обществах, где учитель выступает именно организатором, выявляющим творческий потенциал учащихся, социальные ценности воспроизводятся стабильно и в высокой степени соответствуют гражданскому обществу.