

## SEMIOTIC BASIS OF PEDAGOGICAL COMMUNICATION

**Veska Guviyska, & Mirela Kyuchukova**

*Department of "Social Pedagogy", Southwest University "Neofit Rilski" (Bulgaria)*

### Abstract

The study examines pedagogical communication as a semiotic and postmodernist category. Its essence is the concepts "text and discourse", as well as "discourse analysis" as their application. Their basis is the power in and the ways of its use in a social institution like the school. The scientific text has a primarily conceptual character, in the direction of power practices in school realized through language and its social connotations. The purpose of the study is to understand the post-modernist modifications of school texts and speech practices, as well as the possibility of manipulation they bring to the teacher-student relationship.

**Keywords:** *Text, discourse, discourse analysis, pedagogical communication, postmodernism.*

---

### 1. Introduction

Pedagogical communication at school in the 21st century undergoes changes related to the knowledge and use of concepts such as "text and discourse". The latter are semiotic categories as sign systems that can be interpreted in different ways, but always in the direction of the power they contain. Power carries within itself certain rules encoded in the contexts of use of the texts in school and modifies them.

The subject of the study in this case are the semiotic categories and concepts "discourse and text" as the basis of pedagogical communication. The aim of the study is to understand the post-modernist modifications of school texts and speech practices, as well as the possibility of manipulation they bring to the teacher-student relationship. The future of pedagogical communication is in accordance with the social uses of language related to new messages for the pedagogical community in school, which must be understood as a scientific phenomenon and process.

Overview Pedagogical communication as a semiotic category is a type of discursive practice. The latter is related to the creation, production, transformation and interpretation of texts. In this sense, the main semiotic relation in pedagogical communication is the relation: "text and discourse". Both categories are post-modern, insofar as they are mostly tied to the problem of power, which changes the meaning of "pedagogical communication" itself, its message as a message, and the positions of the teacher and the student as addressee and addressee in this process.

### 2. Discourse

The concept of "discourse" is a concept with excessive volume, which in recent years has taken over the scientific community, becoming a leading cognitive category. The history of the term "discourse" is evidence of the updating of ancient concepts through a new context of use. Discourse goes a long way from its generic essence of "word", "speech" borrowed from Latin and French sources (*discursus argumentum*), to a modification of any kind and order, burdened with ideological, political and economic characteristics. Today, discourse is shedding its original verbal character to give way to a social one. The discourse reflects a certain speech behavior of social participants who reshape it in their own image and likeness. Discourse is evidence not only of the power of speech, but also of its weakness to be manipulative, dictating norms and rules of behavior. Each professional community creates its own discourses through which it legitimizes itself in the public space. The pedagogical community is no exception.

For the American linguist Zellig S. Harris (1952), discourse is comparable to the phrase and, in contrast, consists of several utterances. Émile Benveniste (1973) draws attention to the explicit position of the speaker in the utterance. Van Dijk, T. A. (1977) defines discourse as a "communicative event" between a speaker and a listener that takes place in a specific time and space with verbal and non-verbal means.

John Austin in the 60's of the 20th century with the theory of "performatives" and John Searle's "typing" of the speech act are also credited with identifying it as a scientific category. Postmodern readings of discourse primarily associate it with power in the works of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu. For Foucault, discourse is included in a political and economic mode of use, given the New Age's edifying institutions and subjugation of the human body as politically docile and economically expedient. For Bourdieu, discourse is: a "practical logic", where the body itself carries its social history.

Discourse is a typically semiotic category that is subject to multiple interpretations, but its main characteristic of being a sign system is preserved. The "text and discourse" relationship is joined by the "context" category, inasmuch as the innovative moment in any discourse is the ways of its use in different situations, so that at some point the context becomes more important than the text itself.

Pedagogical discourse, in turn, has specific characteristics that express its uniqueness:

- Status-role characteristics of the participants, such as students and teachers;
- Communicative goal related to the socialization of the learner, which predetermines it;
- Prototypical place of communication as a heterogeneous type of school,
- A key concept such as training and education;
- Values of a moral, aesthetic and any other nature accompanying the mastery of knowledge and skills at school (Karasik, 2002).

Pedagogical discourse also acquires new postmodern characteristics that contradict the traditional vision created up to that point. The roles of teacher and students, or at least the positions of the teacher, change. The school becomes a quintessentially social institution, burdened and burdened by power in its desire to solve the problem of human difference. Training ceases to be the main concept and is replaced by "education", where the most important point is certificates and grades. Values and especially norms become extremely subjective and are of a different order in the minds of teachers and students. It is difficult to predict the changes that will redefine the very concept of pedagogical discourse, insofar as it is part of the social and cultural one in society. However, the most decisive change is in the pedagogical texts and their interpretation. Without the knowledge of these texts and the "communicative situation" that sets them, it is difficult to talk about pedagogical communication of the future.

### 3. Text

Text is a basic means of communication, implemented as a link between linguistic signs in written or spoken form. (lat. *textum* - connection) Its distinguishing feature is the relation "part and whole", insofar as the whole organizes and subordinates the parts to express a certain meaning. A basic concept in text theory is "text structure" (from the Latin *structura* - interrelationship). The most famous approach to the structure of the text is the "linguistic" one, which belongs to Van Dijk from 1997. The author defines a "general structure" of the text and relates it to the functional components such as introduction, exposition and conclusion. (Van Dijk, 1997) The structure of the text also has several main characteristics: "connectedness, systematicity, modality and hierarchy". As a "linguistic category," the text is interpreted differently according to the authors and schools they represent. The text for structuralists - Ferdinand de Saussure, Louis Hjelmslev, René Girard can be thought of as a system where the number of meaning plans is limited and the text itself is a closed system. In the analytical concept of the text - Jackie Derrida, Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan, Julia Kristeva, the text is a process of production and continuous production of meanings and their number is unlimited. As an open system, the text corresponds continuously with other texts, and this process is known as "polyphonism" (M. Bakhtin) or "intertextuality" (J. Kristeva). One of the most interesting ideas is about the intersections of "symbolism and textuality" of the Moscow-Tartu Semiotic School. The school considers "the text as a collection of signs and the text as a sign; the text as a constituent of culture and culture as a text; the text as already produced meaning and the text as a process of continuous meaning-building" (Dacheva, 2001).

The entire effort of postmodernism is directed at the "text" itself.

The postmodern reading of texts leads us to semiotic or structuralist ideas rather than purely literary ones. They deal above all with the context, with cultural and ideological meanings of the text and analyze its readability from the point of view of the codes and conventions that construct it.

Iser's phenomenological approach to reading allows us to think the birth of fiction in the act of reading, where it reproduces itself with its ways of use.. ie. "why the same literary text can mean different things to different people and different times" (Iser, 2004).

The concept of "intertextuality", introduced in 1967 by Julia Krasteva, changed the attitude towards literature, insofar as it expresses the postmodern age as a way of thinking. Krasteva's idea corresponds to the ideas of Jacques Derrida, for whom "everything is a text - society, culture, literature". For Culler, there is a model that includes five ways in which a text can enter into a relationship with other texts (Culler, 2003).

- Text actually taken from life and reality;
- The general cultural text that complements the first text;
- Conventions of the genre ie cultural plausibility;
- A natural attitude towards the artificial, so that the text can protect its own authority;
- Complex intertextuality.

For M. Bakhtin, the dialogue between texts is a meeting of personalities who express themselves through them. "The text as a kind of monad reflects in itself all the texts within the limits of a given meaning sphere..." Relations between the texts and within the text are dialogic. Their character is non-linguistic. (Bakhtin, 1986).

The focus on language as a phenomenon will also change pedagogical knowledge, regardless of whether it uses literary or non-literary texts. The pedagogical community will have to comply with the discursive practices of Postmodernism if it wants to be timely in its messages. His achievement is the statement that the way we speak is not only the way we think, but also the way we live. The teaching community will need to be attentive to all texts in school and the culture they carry within them.

#### **4. The text-discourse relationship. Discourse analysis**

"Discourse analysis" (discursive) is "a set of methods and techniques for the interpretation of heterogeneous texts or statements as products of speech activity, carried out in specific socio-political and cultural-historical conditions" (Pedagogic Speech, 1998). It is associated with the study of features of language communities based on the spoken speech and written texts they produce. Discourse analysis uses the transcription of oral speech, including certain features that are not available in written texts, and conceptual analysis as the main methods. The latter relies on decoding the meaning of words, phrases, texts and works. "Discursive analysis" received a boost in its development with the creation of "linguistic pragmatics" as a science in the 70s of the 20th century. She sets herself the task of answering the questions: "Who is speaking, to whom and why?"

The importance of discursive analysis is in the pragmatization of texts, the relationship between speech and language, as well as the role of participants in speech production and activity.

Various variants of discourse analysis are successfully used in the scientific space. In 1970, Michael Holliday brought out the relationship between the grammatical system and the social connotations of language. The most popular is critical discourse analysis, developed by Norman Fairclough (1995), who focuses his research effort on the intertextuality of discourse and its possibility to correspond with many others. In this way, discourse itself comes to be seen as a type of social practice. In Fairclough's three-part model, there is a text, the discursive practice that uses it as a text, and the social practice related to its primary purpose and potential to change society. Fairclough develops the conceptual apparatus of "critical discourse analysis", including intertextuality, interdiscursiveness, hegemony, ideology, etc. related to the primary purpose of discourse to be a form of social struggle. (Jorgenson & Phillips, 2008). In his books, Ten Van Dyck talks primarily about the possibility for those in power to set the strategies of the discourse and determine the conditions of its occurrence. This social motive again directs the discourse and discourse analysis to the social practice and its modification. Among the theories, the Viennese school of "discursive sociolinguistics" of R. Wodak (1989) stands out, which examines institutional communication and its barriers, including at school. For the famous Russian semiotician Yu. Stepanov, discourse is a "language within a language" or rather "an alternative world", which has its own grammar, its own lexicon and is necessarily connected to social circumstances. (Stepanov, 1979).

For pedagogy, discourse analysis can have several manifestations:

- Study of pedagogical discourse as self-identical, i.e. "conversational" as pedagogical based on participants and topics of discussion;
- Study of the pedagogical discourse as part of the discourses of society, where its multifaceted intercultural nature is manifested;
- Research of power relations of the pedagogical discourse in the context of the school as an institution and the possibility of using this discourse as a social practice.

#### **5. Conclusion**

Discourse, text and discursive analysis as their application are new semiotic and postmodernist categories. The educational community will have to turn its attention to their knowledge and use insofar as they directly or indirectly influence language and speech practices in school. They are also evidence of the entry of power into the professional language of the pedagogical community, which dictates its rules and requirements about when and how a teacher and a student should talk at school. The government also

creates conditions for the manipulation of language practices in school, similar to the media, where suggestions are more important than the truth. It is the task of teachers to mobilize their efforts and professional conscience in order not to be officials or servants of the authorities, but to perform their services for humane causes that do not change in pedagogy.

### *References*

- Bakhtin, M. M. *The problem of the text in linguistics, philology and other humanitarian sciences. Experience of philosophical analysis.* /M.M. Bakhtin //Literary-critical articles. M., Fiction, 1986.
- Culler, J. (2003). *Deconstruction: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*, vol.3. ISBN 041524709. Routledge.
- Dacheva, G. (2001). *Semistylistics*. Sofia: IC SEMA RS.
- Iser, V. (2004). *The Scope of Interpretation*, Sofia: 41T. ISBN 9549148524.
- Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Language circle: personality, concept, discourse*. Volgograd, Peremena.
- Orlova, T.G. (1998). *Pedagogical speech*. Dictionary-reference /under order. TA Ladyzhenskoi and AK Mikhalskoi. M.: Flinta, Nauka.
- Phillips, L. & M. W. Jorgensen. (2004). *Discourse analysis: theory and method* / trans. With English / under ed. A. A. Kiselevoi. Kharkiv: Izdvo Humanitarian Center.
- Stepanov, Yu., (1979). *Semiotics*, Translator Encho Gerganov, Sofia,
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London: Sage.