

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION AS A COMMUNICATIVE PROCESS, ACTIVITY AND ATTITUDE OF SUBJECTS EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

A.T.Nurmanov

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10909138>

Abstract. *In this article overview of comparative characteristics of the concepts of "communication-communication", "communication- activities", sets out the author's position ratios listed concepts in aspect of training students for effective communication, communicative levels effective communication.*

Keywords: *effective communication, technology and techniques of effective communication, communicative culture, communicative levels effective communication.*

INTRODUCTION

Issues of training specialists for effective communication are of interest to sociologists, philosophers, linguists, psychologists, educators today. This problem is particularly relevant in the field of pedagogical education, where communicative activity is the main means of solving the "problem of information support, symbolic design, textual organization of pedagogical interaction" [15, p.4].

The communicative activity of a modern teacher is characterized by the effectiveness of his partnership and pedagogical interaction with all subjects of the educational process: with state and public social institutions, with educational institutions, with students and their parents, with colleagues, etc., where communication in the broadest sense of the word is the main means of achieving success. At the same time, the versatility of the sides of the concept of communication, leading to different approaches to its definition, greatly complicates the adequate interpretation of the essence of this key term in pedagogical practice. The purpose of this article is to try to give a more or less clear idea of this concept, to summarize its main definitions that exist today in its relation to such concepts as communication, attitude, activity.

LITERATURE ANALYSIS

Classical and modern definitions of the concept of communication in the works of famous Russian specialists characterize it: as a communicative process of transmitting an information message from a subject to another using various communicative means and mechanisms in order to exchange information between people and establish mutual understanding between them [1]; as a process of interaction, and the transfer of information only a necessary condition for communication. The meaning of human communication is in establishing mutual understanding, in making mutual contacts, in uniting people within a certain society [6]; as one of the types of human activity [4]; as a kind of social relations [7]; as a specific form of interaction of subjects [12]; "both as a process of interaction of individuals, and as the information process, and how people relate to each other, and as a process of their mutual empathy and mutual understanding of each other" [22, p.178]; the combination of three components: process, activity, attitude [10, p.5].

According to Webster's dictionary, (Merriam-Webster, Inc, 2005) communication is an act of using words, sounds, signs, or behavior to express or replace information, or it can be to express

ideas, thoughts, feelings and many other things to other people. It is clear that is more than just words. It is a process of sending ideas from the source of the informant to the recipient with the aim of changing his behavior. Beside that it is the transfer of knowledge from one person to another to achieve certain goals and that communication is the act of making contact between the sender and the receiver with the help of the message, and is received and interpreted by the receiver.

Communication skills need to be developed and trained continuously so that they become good communicators. Communicator the sender may not express what s/he wants to say clearly; or the room may be noisy; or the receiver may not understand the words the sender is using. To be effective, they have to try to minimize these barriers to communication (Prozesky, 2000).

Hasbullah et al (2018) stated that communication is the process of sending messages from one party to another through certain contexts such as intrapersonal communication, interpersonal or interpersonal communication, group communication or organizational communication and mass communication. When communication takes place in the context of group communication or organizational communication, it will have its own communication network or pattern.

Meanwhile according to Aminullah (2019) communication is a symbolic behavior that cannot be separated in human life. Communication also has existed since humans existed, so in this case communication becomes a necessity in his life. In addition, communication is also referred to as social interaction, because humans are social beings.

Samsuddin and Ananda (2019) stated that communication is a process where individuals in their relationships with other individuals, in groups, in organizations, and in society to provide information.

In modern research, "Communication" and "communication" are considered as words close in meaning, which state that communication, like communication, is invariably active, dialogical in nature [11,16,17].

There is also a point of view according to which "communication is a broader concept than communication" [23].

Representatives of the separate interpretation of the concepts of "communication" and "communication" give the following arguments to prove their arguments: a) communication has both a practical and spiritual character, whereas communication is a purely informational process; b) communication is an intersubjective interaction, and its structure is dialogical, while communication is the information connection of a subject with a particular object [13].

M.S.Kagan and his followers argue that "genuine communication is beyond the establishment of interpersonal (interpersonal) relationships are impossible" [14,15].

The researchers' conclusions that the concepts of "communication" and "communication" have both common and distinctive features can be considered generally accepted. In their opinion, their correlation with the processes of information exchange and transmission and their connection with language as a means of information transmission are common. Communication is mainly characterized by interpersonal interaction, and communication has an additional meaning: information exchange in society.

As a comparative analysis of definitions shows, communication is perceived in a human sense richer than a simple communication and information connection. Communication necessarily involves communication (directional transmission of information) as one of the elements, but is not limited to it. Communication is a two-way process, necessarily involves feedback and is much richer in content than just receiving and transmitting information. It is a

complex system of interaction between two or more people. The act of communication takes place when a person who comes into contact with another person sees him as his own kind and equal and counts on active feedback.

The concept of communication as information communication is actively developed by V.D. Shirshov [30, pp. 78-88]. His research concludes that interpersonal communication is acquiring a qualitatively new state in the information world. It takes the form of specially organized pedagogical activity, thanks to which the process of social inheritance and socio-cultural reproduction of a person becomes expedient. On the relationship between communication and communication, the researcher argues that communication is a type of communication mediated by language, and pedagogical activity is an organized form of interpersonal communication. Communication itself means information communication, which turns into an information relationship aimed at understanding. Therefore, the problem of understanding has fundamental importance for the characterization of pedagogical activity as a communicative process.

Following G.G.Gorodilova, we consider communication as a communicative process, as an activity and as an attitude in their totality. From these positions, we will analyze the concept of "effective communication", consider its place in communication, its connection with the activities and attitudes of the subjects of the educational process to each other.

In our study, we consider communication in the process of communication as a semantic contact, which is preceded by psychological and social contact. In our opinion, communication is the highest form of communication. The effectiveness of communication can be judged only when mutual understanding, semantic contact is achieved.

Thus, at the first level of communication, the subjects of communication are included in the communicative process aimed at establishing psychological contact. The establishment of psychological contact promotes interaction, leading to social contact (I began to listen and understand the purpose of the interlocutor), and influence (I began to look at the message through the eyes of the interlocutor), and then to effective communication (interaction, semantic contact, which is developed on the basis of personal meanings).

Therefore, communication has different levels of implementation. Mutual understanding, that is, the achievement of semantic contact, is its highest level, otherwise than effective communication. Communication in scientific sources is considered in the context of activity. However, the nature of the relationship between communication and activity is understood in different ways. Firstly, they indicate important aspects of a person's social existence, his way of life [20, p.130]. Secondly, communication is characterized by involvement in any activity as its integral element, and activity is considered as a condition of communication [16]. Communication is characterized by a number of researchers as a communicative activity [2,17,26,27].

We find an interesting approach to this issue in L.P. Bueva, who believes that activity and communication are interrelated, relatively independent, but not equivalent sides of a single (individual and social) process of life [7]. She writes: "... communication is a directly observable and experienced reality and the concretization of social relations, their personification, personal form" [7, pp.116-117].

In this definition, we find the answer to the question of the relationship between the concepts of "social relations" and "communication", and that the first is the content of the process, and the second is its individual form of manifestation. So, according to philosophical definitions, communication is considered directly in human relationships. It is understood inseparably from

activity: the content of activity determines the forms of its communication, in which various social relations find expression. A completely opposite point of view is expressed by some modern psychologists, who consider communication as a specific form of human interaction with other people, not reducible to activity [12].

In their opinion, the main difference between the concepts of "activity" and "communication" is that activity is schematically represented by the formula "subject - object", and communication is "subject - subject". The so-called "manipulative" communication, in essence, is based on an activity-based scheme and as such is not communication. "In communication, none of the partners can be considered as an object, since each of them is an active subject of this process, determining its dynamics and content..." [24].

Thus, modern psychological science considers communication as: a) a means of organizing activities, b) satisfying a person's need for another person, in live contact [25].

We believe that in order to understand the essence of communication itself as a special psychological phenomenon, an activity-based approach is necessary, i.e. communication is considered by us in this regard as a specific type of human activity, as a subject-object relationship. And for pedagogical purposes, in order to prepare students for effective communication, it is considered as a specific form of interaction of subjects, consisting of "subject-subject" relations. It seems to us that in the process of education and upbringing, the communicative nature of communication becomes more important than the activity nature. The communicative nature of pedagogical interaction in interpersonal relationships in the systems "Teacher - student", "Student - teacher", "Teacher - students", "Student - student", "Student - students") is characterized primarily by an increasing degree of agreement leading to mutual understanding. "Understanding means communication aimed at valid consent" [29, p.58].

DISCUSSION

Communication is manifested in taking into account the individuality of each student. After all, people differ from each other by their unique natural properties, their characteristics as individuals. Communicative learning involves taking into account all these characteristics of students, because only in this way can conditions for effective communication be created: communicative motivation is caused, purposefulness of speaking is ensured, relationships are formed, etc.

Communication is determined by the speech orientation of pedagogical interaction, which consists in the fact that the way to effective communication lies through the very practical mastery of technologies and techniques of effective communication.

Communication is expressed in the functionality of learning. The functional approach in the process of preparing students for technologies and techniques of effective communication is manifested primarily in methodological strategies of organization, assimilation of educational and didactic material, taking into account the personal characteristics of the subjects of interaction, the communication situation, context, extralinguistic factors, etc. in their unity. Communication is realized in the situational organization of the process of preparing students for effective communication, in situational exercises.

Thus, effective communication as the highest level of social relations in the education system is achieved when the subjects of the educational process observe democratic, truly humane relationships based on the "subject-subject" paradigm, which is dialogical in nature. It is in dialogue that "an individual receives not only rational information, forms ways of thinking, but

also assimilates human emotions, feelings, and behaviors through imitation and borrowing, empathy and identification" [28, p.448].

The upbringing of a spiritually mature and harmoniously developed personality with independent thinking, developed intellectual potential, deep knowledge and a modern worldview is possible in dialogue. According to M.M. Bakhtin, the truth is not born and is not in the head of an individual, it is born between people who jointly discover the truth in the process of their dialogical communication [3].

The above is most directly related to pedagogical communication. "A genuine – teaching, developing, educating pedagogical dialogue is possible only if the teacher himself is an active and creative, rhetorically educated person" [8, p.44]. Rhetorical education, that is, rhetorical competence, being the highest level of communicative competence, means, first of all, the linguistic and speech culture of the individual, includes knowledge of the theory and history of rhetoric, the connection between language and culture, the spiritual world of the individual and the genre-stylistic features of texts as products of speech activity. Rhetorical culture is based on deep universal values, on equal, humane and fair relationships with students, and on dialogue.

The formation and development of rhetorical competence of future teachers is carried out in the process of preparing them for effective communication. In extracurricular classes, students gradually master rhetorical skills related to the invention of thought (to determine the topic, purpose, tasks of speech, formulate theses, develop arguments, select illustrative material, choose a genre and the appropriate type of speech for effective communication, determine the characteristics of the addressee, communicate with him, etc.), with the location of thought (arrange facts, arguments according to the chosen type of speech, logical harmony, consistency presentation of the material, etc.), with the expression of thought (the ability to determine the appropriateness of the use of linguistic units in accordance with the communication situation, the ability to vary rhetorical techniques), with speech (to highlight keywords with a voice, convey the modality of the text, etc.).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be said that the rhetorical training of future teachers, their purposeful preparation for effective universal, and on its basis for pedagogical communication, is carried out on the basis of the development of advanced pedagogical technologies that take into account the dialogical and personality-oriented nature of pedagogical interaction. The development of scientific, theoretical and practical understanding of pedagogical communicative activity on the basis of universal and national values, the heritage of the great enlightenment scientists of the East, taking into account modern realities, the introduction of rhetorical courses into curricula for all levels of continuing education of the republic, the development of standards, educational and methodological literature, etc. – topical issues of pedagogical science.

REFERENCES

1. Андреева Г.М. Психология социального познания: Учеб. пособие для студентов высш. учеб. заведений. 2-е изд. / Г.М. Андреева. М.: Аспект-Пресс, 2000. - 288 с.
2. Андреева Г.М. Принципы деятельности и исследование общения // Общение и деятельность. - Прага, 1988. - С. 56-58.

3. Бахтин, М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества [Текст] / М.М. Бахтин. – М., 1986. – 256 с.
4. Берн Э. Игры, в которые играют люди: Психология человеческих взаимоотношений. Люди, которые играют в игры: Психология человеческой судьбы / Пер. с англ. – Санкт Петербург; Москва: Университетская книга, 1998. - 398 с.
5. Бендюков М.А. Социально-психологическая теория Б.Д. Парыгина и вызовы XXI века (к 80-летию ученого) // Методология и история психологии. 2010. №2. С.152–157.
6. Бодалев А.А. Психология общения. – М.: Педагогика М., 1996. – 301 с.
7. Буева Л.П. Человек, деятельность и общение. -М.:Мысль, 1978.-216 с.
8. Вострикова Т.И. Профессионально-педагогический диалог как риторическое произведение//Материалы XIV Международной научной конференции «Риторика и культура речи: наука, образование, практика» 1-3 февраля 2010 года. / Под. ред. Г.Г. Глинина. - Астрахань: Издательский дом «Астраханский университет», 2010.
9. Выготский Л.С. Педагогическая психология /Под ред. В.В.Давыдова. – М.: Педагогика, 1991. – 479 с.
10. Городилова Г.Г. Методика обучения профессиональному речевому общению в подготовке учителя русского языка для национальной школы. /Под ред. проф. Г.Г.Городиловой. – Тошкент, Укитувчи, 1992.
11. Зимняя И.А. Педагогическая психология. - Р-н-Д, 1997. - 480 с.
12. Ильин Е.П. Психология общения и межличностных отношений. — СПб.: Питер, 2009. — 576 с.: — (Серия «Мастера психологии»).
13. Каган М.С. Мир общения: Проблема межсубъектных отношений. — М.: Полит.издат, 1988.— 319 с — (Над чем работают, о чем спорят философы).
14. Каган М.С. Философия культуры. СПб., 1996. С.295-296.
15. Колесникова И.А. Коммуникативная деятельность педагога: учеб. пособие для студентов высших педагог. учеб. заведений /И.А.Колесникова; под ред. В.А. Слостёнина. - Москва, Издательский центр «Академия», 2007.
16. Леонтьев А.А. Психология общения. - 3-е изд. - М.: Смысл, 1999. – 340 с.
17. Лисина М.И. Проблемы онтогенеза общения. — М.: Педагогика, 1986. — 144 с.
18. Ломов Б. Ф. Проблема общения в психологии // Ломов Б. Ф. Методологические и теоретические проблемы психологии. М.: Наука, 1984. С. 242-288.
19. Ломов Б.Ф. Методологические и теоретические проблемы психологии. – М.: Наука, 1984. - 444 с.
20. Ломов Б.Ф. Общение и социальная регуляция поведения индивида: Психологические проблемы социальной регуляции поведения. - М., 1976. - С. 130.
21. Макшанцева Н.В. Диалоговые технологии как средство формирования профессиональной языковой личности //Вестник Университета Российской Академии Образования. 2010, №5 (53), с.31-35.
22. Основы социально-психологической теории / Парыгин Б.Д.-М.: Мысль, 1971.- 351 с.
23. Педагогика и психология высшей школы / Под ред. С.И. Самыгина. Р-н-Д, 1998. - 544 с.
24. Реан А.А. Анализ вербального взаимодействия как метод исследования педагогической деятельности // Проблемы диагностики факторов продуктивной деятельности педагогического коллектива. - Л., 1988.

25. Реан А.А., Коломинский Я.Л. Социальная педагогическая психология. СПб., 2006. – 297 с.
26. Рыданова И.И. Основы педагогики общения. - Минск: Беларуская наука, 1998. -319 с.
27. Руденский Е.В. Социальная психология. - М., 1998. -224 с.
28. Философский энциклопедический словарь [Текст] / гл. редакция: Л. Ф. Ильичев, П.Н. Федосеев, С. М. Ковалев, В. Г. Панов. – М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1983. – С.448.
29. Хабермас Ю. Теория коммуникативного действия // Вест. МГУ. – Серия 7. – Философия. 1993. – № 4.
30. Ширшов В.Д. Сущность и структура понятия «педагогическая коммуникация» // Понятийный аппарат педагогики и образования. Вып.1. – Екатеринбург, 1995.
31. Mărginean, C.O., Meliț, L.E., Chinceșan, M., Mureșan, S., Georgescu, A.M., Suci, N., Pop, A., Azamfirei, L., 2017.
32. Merriam-Webster, Inc (Ed.), 2005. The Merriam-Webster dictionary. Merriam-Webster, Springfield, Mass.
33. Prozesky, D.R., 2000. Communication and effective teaching. Community Eye Health 13, 44–45.
34. Катарина Баптиста А. и Родригес С. (2023). Перспективная глава: Коммуникация как важная стратегия успеха процесса преподавания-обучения. Интех Опен. doi: 10.5772/intechopen.109308
35. Hasbullah, et al. (2018). Communication Pattern of Wilayatul Hisbah, Lhokseumawe City in Implementing Amar Makruf Nahi Mungkar. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal), P. 194-205.
36. Aminullah, M. (2019). Human Interaction with Creators and Fellow Creatures (Study of Communication Relations of XYZ in Alamin Theory). Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal), P.85-98.
37. Astrid S. Susanto. (1988). Komunikasi Dalam Teori Dan Praktek. Bandung: Bina Cipta.
38. Samsuddin and Ananda, R. (2019). Communication of School Heads in Improving Education Performance in SMA Plus Private Vocational School, Al-Azhar Medan. Britain International of Linguistics, Arts and Education Sciences (BIO LAE) Journal, P. 8-15.