

Aleksandar Stojanovic¹

Teacher Training Faculty – Belgrade

Pre-School Teacher Training College “Mihailov Palov” – Vrsac

=====

CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNICATION IN SCHOOL AND FAMILY UPBRINGING

Abstract: Starting from the fact that the problem issue of communication in upbringing, i.e. educational process is rather significant, a research has been undertaken with an aim to establish communication characteristics in the conditions of school and family upbringing. The research sample has included 619 pupils, their parents (476) and teachers (405). The responses of pupils and their teachers regarding communication characteristics in school upbringing and education have shown that two-way communication is more present than one-way communication. The responses of children and their parents lead to the general conclusion about the characteristics of communication in family upbringing that two-way communication is almost twice as present as one-way communication. In other words, even though one-way communication is represented to some extent, it is not dominant either in family or in school upbringing. Two-way communication is represented to significantly higher degree, guiding the educated into subject position and enabling their emancipation – liberation from dependence, pressures, bans, as well as authoritative demands of parents and teachers.

Key words: communication in upbringing process, educational actions, upbringing in school and family.

Introduction –

Unlike traditional pedagogical theories considering the relation an educator – an educated as interpersonal relationship, according to more recent theoretical considerations education is pronouncedly seen transcendently-philosophically as “communication”, i.e. equality or “interaction” between children and educators. In accordance to this, as well as to the need for intensifying the interactive relationship of the educated with the environment, contemporary pedagogical movements – communicative, interactive and emancipatory pedagogy have developed.

¹ vsvaskatedrapp@hemo.net

Numerous authors have for some time now emphasized that education, i.e. upbringing is a form of interpersonal communication, i.e. communicational process in which subjects interact. Educational action in interpersonal relations cannot occur if there is not interaction between actors, which is usually established through communication (Bratanić, 1990: 75). Originally, communication means to mutually counsel, inform, acknowledge, cooperate, talk, discuss, etc, pointing to informative feature of communication. Another characteristic of communication arises out of social aspects of communication – it means to involve someone into social community in order to participate in mutual work, cooperation, interaction. In other words, structural elements of communication are information and interaction.

In educational, i.e. upbringing process communication is defined as a process of creation of meaning between two or more person, i.e. as a process of reciprocal exchange of meaning. In a relation of communication there are persons who send messages, i.e. pieces of information and persons who receive the information and everyone can at the same time be both a sender and a receiver of a message. Messages are understood as ideas or system of ideas – ranging from the simplest claims and statements to the most complex cognitive constructions. If a message transfer is one-directional, it can be called informing, and if a message goes in both directions, we are talking about communication.

Analysing the process of communication, H. Haste (1995: 83) notices two traditions of view on language and thinking lasting for centuries hand in hand. The first tradition is considered a heritage of Descartes and Bacon, apprehending learning as a process of control and mastering, achieved through development of a subject and an object. The process of communication is seen as a monologue, while language is the means of representation of a content of a mind, so that it, through logic, could get to another mind. The way to the truth and understanding leads through logical analysis occurring in the head of an individual.

The second tradition stated by H. Haste has reached modern thinking through humanism, and the social psychologist Billig has traced it back to Protagoras. According to it, knowledge is the most important communication so that both language and communication are understood as dialogical and rhetorical. Communication is a process or argumentation, i.e. interaction in which both sides make efforts at altering the view of

another side in order to be more successful in communication and persuasion.

The analysis of modern pedagogical tendencies has shown that the scientific postulates of communicative pedagogy are symbolic interactionism and emancipation as educational aim (Bandjur, Radovanovic, 2000: 19). Symbolic interactionism, introduced in 1934 by G. H. Mead and developed by Habermas, Mollenhauer and others, is grounded on a standpoint that people construe their own and identities of others through everyday encounters and other social interactions.

Habermas' influence on Kohlberg's shift from monologue to dialogue is essential for educational practice (Popovic, 1995: 42). Habermas developed his theory according to the theory of discourse or/and communicative competence. B. Popovic points out that "Kant's heritage" was in psychology of morality characterised as monologic, while since the time his follower Kohlberg accepted Habermas' assumptions, dialogue has been increasingly more emphasized. His view on communicative action, which, according to I. Graorac (1995) should overcome the particularity of instrumental feature, Habermas organizes around the renewal of subjectivity, i.e. construing the theory of the subject. Various insights and educational practice have changed through history, leading towards all the more deepen knowledge on the needs and abilities of a child – a subject, along with all the more convincing confirmation of the importance of equal participation of children in the life of adults. As a consequence, numerous criticisms in pedagogical theory, expressed from various standpoints and within different orientations, have implied what is nowadays called non-repressive communication, partner, equal relations between an educator and children, i.e. education and upbringing as communicative action.

Communicative pedagogy implies upbringing and education as a transformation of an individual into a personality, all the way to reaching the point of a free man, not through the influence of the variety of heteronomous factors, but rather in the process of communication in which each participant is one's own ultimate creator. Open communication means that a choice has been made between open and close awareness in favour of the former, thus making a selection of a method: the advantage is given to conversation over to speech (Susnjic, 1997: 231).

A variety of arguments in favour of the importance of conversation, discussion and dialogue can be found in literature. It has been underlined

that dialogue implies mutual empathic communication and represents the highest level of interactive connectedness in communication. During dialogue alternate and reciprocal role taking occurs, as well as mutual empathizing with the positions of others, mutual respect of attitudes and opinions of others, as well as taking a view of the problem through somebody else's eyes, rather than solely one's own; this further means that at this stage persons communicating are able to empathically listen to one another, put oneself in the position of others and consider a problem from addressee's perspective. In this way the ideal of human communication is reached.

Consequently, there is no dialogue in communication without mutual empathic communicating. Only at the level of interactive connectedness in communication can interdependence of influence be expected, as well as successful educational action. In other words, as it has been claimed by majority of authors, established dialogue is a guaranty of successful upbringing and education.

Our standpoint is that the problem area of communication in upbringing and educational process is very important and in accordance to it a research has been carried out. It is incited by the findings of S. L. Tubbs and S. Moss (according to Bratanić, 1990) referring to the consequences of successful communication in education:

- understanding (referring to correct transfer of information, contents, messages; understanding is primarily connected with the cognitive field of the persons communicating, but emotions also have a significant role to play);
- content (referring to what persons feel, i.e. what they emotionally experience during communication; feelings determine affective polarization of attitudes, leading to the occurrence of inclinations, antipathy, love, hatred, etc);
- influence on attitudes and beliefs (it can be achieved if there are positive feelings and mutual inclinations; thus an educator has to be positively sympathetically engaged – from simple inclination to admiration, avoiding indifference, ill-disposition, antipathy, etc);
- enculturation of relations (also achieved if there is mutual inclination, satisfaction, positive feelings of various intensity; a possibility opens up for an educated to develop his/her personality and improve his/her relationships with all, not only the educator);

- activity provoking (the most difficult and the most important task in communication in education; apart from understanding of contents and the influence on the educated to agree with the message, it is most complicated to provoke them act in accordance to it; it is necessary for the educated not to understand their activity as imposed obligation, but as something arising out of their intrinsic motives and wishes);

Methodological framework –

The aim of the undertaken research is to confirm the characteristics of communication in the conditions of school and family upbringing and education.

It has been assumed that children (within a family) and pupils (in school) are primarily in a passive position in the process of upbringing and education and that the communication between the educated (children, pupils) and educators (parents, teachers) is mostly initiated by educators. Communicational features of a pedagogue refer to their ability to communicate, to appropriately approach children depending on individual situation; they are closely related to pedagogic tact of educators implying the sense of suitability in application of certain educational procedures. Our assumption, i.e. hypothesis is that in family and school upbringing and education the dominant role of an educator (teacher, parent) still prevails, that the possibilities for an educated to get involved into independent activities and initiatives are still small and that the educated (children, pupils) do not have the sufficient extent of freedom to express their opinions and feeling through open communication.

The research was carried out at the territory of Vojvodina, in the municipalities of Vrsac, Zrenjanin, Kovin, Bela Crkva, Alibunar, Plandiste and Banatski Karlovac. The subjects were the following: 619 pupils and their parents (476 filled and sent the instruments back) and teachers (405); out of the stated number of children 208 were 4th primary school grade, 209 were 8th primary school grade and 202 attended the 4th secondary school grade in the mentioned places.

Systematic non-experimental observation was undertaken within the research, as well as scaling technique, using the following instruments designed for the need of the research: the evaluation scale for children, their parents and teachers. The evaluation scales include educational and upbringing actions and a five-level scale according to which the subjects

estimated the level of using of educational and upbringing actions in family, i.e. school.

Metrical characteristics of the instruments were tested according to the methods within the software package for statistical data processing (SPSS 7.5 for Windows) – validity was confirmed according to factor analysis: reliability coefficient (alpha) at the evaluation scales filled by pupils is 0,895 and parents 0,807; efforts were made to ensure objectivity through providing same instructions to all the subjects.

In order to investigate the stated hypothesis the responses of pupils, their parents and teachers (class teachers) were analysed according to the instruments SPU-1, SPU-2, SPR-1 and SPN-1 (the evaluation scales of upbringing, i.e. educational actions in family and school).

In order to get an insight into the extent of application of one-directional and two-directional communication in family and school upbringing and education, adding up of the variables in the instruments SPU-1, SPU-2, SPR-1 and SPN-1 was undertaken in the following way: 20 educational actions that had been explicated in more details (thus pointing to the differences between them and the variants of certain actions) were classified into two groups, each consisting of ten actions – the criterion according to which they were classified referred to the characteristics of one-directional and two-directional communication in educational work. Two-directional communication implies: conversation, as a basic form of interpersonal communication (Brajsa, 1994: 47), actively participated by both sides, expressing mutual trust and respect, honesty and true wish for communication, active listening and encouragement of the addressee to communicate further, motivation of the educated through positive support to their behaviour, development of democratic cooperative relations, etc. It provides sufficient space for the freedom of expression of the educated and open manifestation of their diversity. Upbringing and educational process characterized by two-directional communication is an adequate social setting for the development of moral autonomy of the educated.

Unlike two-directional, one-directional communication is characteristic for imposing of ideas and opinions by an educator, “moralizing”, “instilling certain belief”, criticizing, imposing repetition of what an educator presents, focusing on certain contents, authorities and values, not allowing the educated to express their opinions, feelings and standpoints,

strict often ambiguous demands, generalized messages or rewards, not being interested in closer communication, etc.

As a consequence, the group of actions describing *one-way communication* encompassed the following upbringing, i.e. educational actions (their formulations, i.e. interpretations will be stated, as they appear in the instruments):

- when they want to draw your attention to desirable behaviour parents (in SPU-1) or class teachers (in SPU-2) do that through lecturing etc;
- parents (class teachers) ask you to follow their example through strict demands;
- parents (class teachers) punish you if you do not obey their demand;
- when they advise you, parents (class teachers) call your attention to appropriate behaviour, not allowing you to express your own standpoints, feelings and opinions;
- when they have remark on your behaviour, parents (class teachers) “tease” you, or comment your misbehaviour in front of others, etc;
- remarks of your parents (class teachers) involve encouragement to be persistent in finding a way to solve a problem;
- parents (class teachers) advise you on the ways you can change your behaviour, pointing to future difficulties, because of the reactions of others to your actions, etc.
- when parents (class teachers) want to inform you on how they would like you to behave, they point to the act and actions you should follow;
- conversations with your parents (class teachers) referring to desirable behaviour involve facts, data and arguments;
- parents (class teachers) act as role models and show you how you should behave.

Educational, i.e. upbringing actions classified within a group characterized by *two-way communication* are the following ones:

- when they want to point to the way they would like you to behave, parents (class teachers) try to encourage you to think about it and choose what you think is right;
- parents (class teachers) talk with you about a story, a book, a film or a TV show and in such a way point to the rules of desirable behaviour;

- parents (class teachers) accept your attitudes, feelings and opinions and encourage you to solve problems independently;
- parents (class teachers) suggest various possibilities of how to act, and it is up to you to make up your mind what is most appropriate in a given situation;
- parents (class teachers) engage you in various situations so that you could through experience and your own behaviour acquire desirable values and personality features;
- parents (class teachers) try to make you control your own behaviour by yourself;
- when your parents (class teachers) are assuring you that some type of behaviour is acceptable and desirable, you feel their sincerity and honesty;
- when leading a conversation with you, your parents (class teachers) consider you an equal addressee – you can say what you think even if it is contrary to their view;
- parents let you be completely responsible for making certain decisions;

It can be easily noticed that within both groups certain actions more pronouncedly represent the features of one-way, i.e. two-way communication, while other formulations of the characteristics of educational actions seem to be classified within either one or another group. Nevertheless, we consider that educational actions classified in such a way can be analysed in order to check our hypothesis.

Research results –

Characteristics of communication in family education, i.e. upbringing – children responses

First of all, the adding up of the variables from the instrument SPU-1 (The evaluation scale of educational actions in a family) filled by pupils was carried out, in order to establish the level of application of one-directional, i.e. two-directional communication in *family upbringing*.

A t-test was used to establish statistical significance of differences of arithmetic middles of newly formed variables (one-way and two-way communication) at the level 0,000 for the appropriate number of degrees of freedom (df = 618). Furthermore, the correlation between the variables “one-way communication” and “two-way communication” is 0,308 at the significance level 0,000. The established correlation points to the fact that

there is a tendency of parents to use both one-way and two-way communication actions, i.e. their combination. The data are in accordance with already gathered data on current actions in family upbringing and education.

The next step was *factor analysis* in order to identify smaller number of components, i.e. factors, assuming that the stated variables can be reduced to a smaller number of latent structures uniting and giving sense to them. First of all, 20 factors (as many as variables) were extracted from the matrix of variable inter-correlation according to the method of principal components. According to the latent factor roots whose value was higher than one, the first four factors were identified. They were then rotated according to the “varimax” rotation and the following values were found:

| Factor | Total | % variance | cumulative % |
|--------|-------|------------|--------------|
| 1 | 2.711 | 13.554 | 13.554 |
| 2 | 2.433 | 12.165 | 25.719 |
| 3 | 2.215 | 11.073 | 36.792 |
| 4 | 1.685 | 8.425 | 45.217 |

The total extracted variance for the four identified factors is 9,044 or 45,22% out of the maximally possible variance whose value is 20,00 (100%).

Those saturations whose value was higher than 0,350 were considered significant. According to this criterion we have created the following matrix of rotated components identifying the following factors:

| Upbringing actions | F a c t o r s | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | | 0.411 | | |
| 2 | | 0.531 | | |
| 3 | 0.643 | | | |
| 4 | | 0.673 | | |
| 5 | | 0.427 | | |
| 6 | | 0.628 | | |
| 7 | 0.674 | | | |
| 8 | 0.710 | | | |
| 9 | 0.435 | 0.394 | | |
| 10 | 0.686 | | | |
| 11 | | | 0.623 | |
| 12 | | | 0.481 | |
| 13 | | | | 0.372 |
| 14 | | 0.620 | | |
| 15 | | | 0.658 | |
| 16 | 0.571 | | | |
| 17 | | | | 0.547 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|-------|-------|
| 18 | | | | 0.714 |
| 19 | | | 0.366 | 0.480 |
| 20 | | | 0.674 | |

It can be easily seen that *the first factor* is constituted by the formulations including: reproaches, strict demands, punishment, not allowing the expression of one's own attitudes, feelings and opinions, as well as "teasing", and commenting misbehaviour in front of others. It could be said that the first factor consists of the variables reflecting one-way communication (or, if the old Levin's terminology is used – the authoritative relation between parents and children). The highest levels of saturation are characteristic for: parents' punishment if children do not obey their demand (0.710), pointing to the ways of behaviour without allowing possibility of expressing one's own attitudes, opinions and feelings (0.686), strict demands of parents for children to follow their examples (0.643), when they have remarks on children's behaviour, parents "tease" them or criticize their misbehaviour in front of others (0.571). According to such saturations of educational and upbringing actions, this factor was called *restrictiveness*.

The second factor is constituted by the following variables: pointing to desirable rules of behaviour through conversations parents lead with their children referring to a story, a book, a film, a TV show, etc. (the highest saturation on a factor: 0.673); role-modelling, i.e. showing according to your own example how children should behave (0.628); engaging children in various situations so that they could through their own behaviour acquire desirable values and personality features (0.620), encouraging children to think about their behaviour themselves and choose what they think is right (0.531), referring to facts, data and arguments when talking about desirable behaviour (0.427), when parents want to introduce children into rules of behaviour, they point out to the acts and actions they should follow (0.411), etc. According to these data we could say that the second factor is to highest extent constituted by the variables of two-way communication, or, according to Lavin's typology, democratic relation in upbringing can be noticed. We will call this factor *pointing out*.

As a significant finding, we would emphasise that parents patiently persuading children to comply with their demands regarding behaviour has almost the same saturations in the case of both factors (slightly higher in the case of the first factor), indicating that pointing out can have characteristics of both one-way and two-way communication – depending on the way it is applied it can have restrictive character (in the sense of moralizing), but it can also be used, in harmony with communicative pedagogy, for guidance of the educated into positive direction. In

contemporary education the method of persuasion does not imply only one-directional form of communication (from the educator to the educated), but two-directional (as well as inter-directional) communication. This also involves such educational situations in which children are to acquire their life beliefs, values and attitudes through their own experience.

The third factor includes: letting children be completely responsible for their decision making (saturation 0.674), behaviour control by children (0.658), acceptance (understanding) of attitudes, feelings and opinions of children along with the encouragement to independent problem solving (0.623), suggesting various ways of action by parents, with a possibility open up for children do decide themselves what is in a given situation best solution (0.481) and equal conversation of children and parents – children can say what they think although it is opposite to their parents' opinion (0.366). This factor is characterized by children's responsibility, self-control, respect for their needs, self-decision making, freedom in expression of thoughts and feelings; consequently, relying on constructivistic views on education and upbringing, it is called *emancipation*. This is, beyond any doubt, a two-way communication.

The fourth factor is determined by the following variables: honesty of parents in their relation with children while convincing them into the appropriateness of an action (0.714), the remarks made by parents involve encouragement for a child to endure in finding a solution to a problem (0.547), equal conversation of children and parents – children can say what they think even though it is contrary to the standpoints of their parents (0.480), and, while advising their children on the ways they can alter their behaviour, parents point out to possible difficulties or reactions of others to misbehaviour (0.372). Basic characteristics are: honest, open, equal conversation, as well as giving support to children to endure in overcoming difficulties; in other words, the factor relies on two-way communication. It seems that this factor could be called *equality in a dialogue*.

We can see that the identified factors in family upbringing classified in such a way explicate 45,22% of variance. Individually, the first factor has the highest percentage of participation in the variance as a whole (13,55%), which has already been noticed according to the cluster analysis. More restrictive character, as it has been shown by the research result, is typical for upbringing of the children of younger age (restrictive actions are most frequently used in the 4th grade of primary school). The second factor, i.e.

pointing out, participates in the total variance with 12,17%, meaning that parents rather frequently “guide” their children, pointing out to desirable rules of behaviour in various ways (through conversation and encouragement to think about one’s behaviour, giving their children positive examples, introducing them into various situations, referring to arguments, etc). The third factor, i.e. emancipation, is from the angle of contemporary pedagogic theories most desirable and explicates 11,07% of the total variance. Parents let their children be responsible for their own actions, they try to understand their needs, allow them to make their own decisions, control their own behaviour – most often when children reach a certain level of maturity (4th grade of secondary school). The fourth factor, equality in a dialogue, explains 8.46% of the variance. Parents at all ages (4th and 8th primary school grade, as well as 4th secondary school grade) mostly show honesty in their relation to their children, encouraging them to endure in finding solutions and considering them equal addressees.

So, having analysed communication in family upbringing according to children’s responses, we can conclude the following: the first factor is characterised by one-way communication, while the second, the third and the fourth are characterised by two-way communication. In spite of the fact that, considering individual factors, the first one has the greatest extent of participation in the variance as a whole (13,55%), the second, third and fourth factors together have 31,66% share in the variance and it can be concluded that two-way communication is significantly represented in family upbringing. At the same time, it should be noticed that there are differences between ages – one-way communication prevails in the 4th grade of primary school, both one-way and two-way communication are used in the 8th grade of primary school, while two-way communication is used to greater extent in the 4th grade of secondary school.

Characteristics of communication in family upbringing – parents’ responses

Our intention was to support or challenge the findings referring to communication in family upbringing acquired through children (pupils’) responses according to the analysis of their parents’ responses. Factors analysis of the variables from the instrument SPR-1 was used to identify six factors whose latent roots have value higher than one; after the rotation undertaken according to “varimax” rotation, the following values were established:

| Factor | Total | % variance | cumulative % |
|--------|-------|------------|--------------|
|--------|-------|------------|--------------|

| | | | |
|---|-------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 2.311 | 11.557 | 11.557 |
| 2 | 2.123 | 10.617 | 22.174 |
| 3 | 2.051 | 10.257 | 32.431 |
| 4 | 1.881 | 9.403 | 41.834 |
| 5 | 1.750 | 8.751 | 50.585 |
| 6 | 1.427 | 7.134 | 57.719 |

The total extracted variance for the six identified factors is 22,543 or 57,72% out of the maximally possible variance whose value is 20,00 (100%).

The saturations higher than 0,50 were analysed resulting in the matrix of rotated components, according to which the following factors could be identified:

| Educational actions | F a c t o r s | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | | | | 0.755 | | |
| 2 | | | | 0.643 | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | 0.700 | | | |
| 7 | | | 0.616 | | 0.511 | |
| 8 | | | 0.558 | | | |
| 9 | | | 0.752 | | | |
| 10 | | | | | 0.600 | |
| 11 | 0.744 | | | | | |
| 12 | 0.539 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | 0.608 |
| 14 | | | | | | 0.808 |
| 15 | 0.739 | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | 0.800 | |
| 17 | | 0.651 | | | | |
| 18 | | 0.721 | | | | |
| 19 | | 0.626 | | | | |
| 20 | 0.719 | | | | | |

The first factor includes the following variables: acceptance (understanding) of standpoints, feelings and opinions of children and encouragement to independent problem solving (highest saturation 0.744); children themselves controlling their own behaviour (0.739); parents suggesting various ways of action, with a possibility open up for children to make up their mind what is the best in a given situation (0.539). According to this, the factor is characterized by self-control, understanding of their needs by parents and independent decision-making. Therefore it could be defined *emancipation*.

The *second factor* is determined according to the following variables: honesty of parents in their relation with children while convincing them into the appropriateness of an action (0.721), the remarks made by parents involve encouragement for a child to endure in finding a solution to a problem (0.651), conversation of children and parents on equal grounds – children can say what they think even though it is contrary to the standpoints of their parents (0.626). Basic characteristics are: honest, open, equal conversation, as well as giving support to children to endure in overcoming difficulties; in other words, the factor relies on two-way communication. It seems that this factor could be called *equality in a dialogue*.

In the case of the *third factor* the following factors have the highest level of saturation: parents patiently convincing their children to follow their demands when behaviour is in question (0.752); parents as role models, showing their children how they should behave according to their own example (0.700); strict demands of parents that children should follow their example (0.616); parents punishing children if they do not respect their demands (0.558). It is easily noticed that this factor involves actions permeated by *imposing of a role model* by parents and it was called so.

The *fourth factor* consists of the following variables: pointing to desirable rules of behaviour through conversation parents lead with their children referring to a story, a book, a film, a TV show, etc. (factor saturation: 0.755); when parents want their children to get familiar with the rules of desirable behaviour, they refer to deeds and actions that should be followed (0.643). According to these data it could be said that *pointing out* is typical for the fourth factor.

When the *fifth factor* is in question, the following variables have the highest level of saturation: when they disapprove with their children's behaviour, parents "tease: them" or comment their misbehaviour in front of others (0.800); parents pointing to the ways of acting without possibility for children to express their own attitudes, opinions and feelings (0.600); strict demands of parents imposing their example to children (0.511). According to the stated saturations of upbringing actions, it is considered that this factor could be called *restrictiveness*.

The *sixth factor* is characterised by the following actions: parents put their children into various situations so that they could acquire desirable values and personality features through their own experience and behaviour (saturation 0.808); and, parents advise children on the ways they could

improve their behaviour, pointing to possible difficulties, due to potential reactions of others to such actions, etc (0.608). This factor was called *situational influence*.

According to what has been stated above, six factors explicating 57,7% of the total variance are identified when parents' responses are in question. Considering each individual factor, the first, second, fourth and sixth involve upbringing actions characterised by two-way communication (together they explain 38,71% of the variance); the third and the fifth factor are permeated by the factors featured as one-way communication (together explaining 19,01% of the total variance).

Reaching a general conclusion on the characteristics of communication in family upbringing according to the responses of pupils, i.e. children and their parents, we could say that two-way communication is twice as much present as one-way communication. In other words, both are present, but two-way communication significantly more.

Characteristics of communication in school education and upbringing – pupils' responses

Having analysed the upbringing actions in family setting, the adding up of the variables from the instrument SPU-2 (Evaluation scale of upbringing and educational actions in school) filled by pupils was carried out in order to establish the extent of the presence of one-way, i.e. two-way communication in *school upbringing and education*. We could thus with greater certainty judge the change in the general pedagogical paradigm already noticed in family upbringing. We could get a piece of information showing what is today's pedagogical style like, i.e. what is our pedagogical reality like, having in mind that the social context has significantly changed. It has already been confirmed that the pedagogical style of our families has become different from the so called civic style that used to dominate before or in the period immediately after the Second World War.

According to the t-test statistical significance of differences of arithmetic middles of newly formed variables (one-way and two-way communication) at the level 0,000 for the appropriate number of degree of freedom (df = 618) was established. Furthermore, the correlation between the variables "one-way communication" and "two way communication" is 0,364 at the significance level 0,000. The established correlation points to the fact that in the school setting as well, both one-way and two-way communication actions occur, i.e. their combination. The data are in accordance with

already gathered data on current actions in school upbringing and education.

Then *factor analysis* was carried out in order to identify smaller number of components, i.e. factors. First of all, 20 factors were extracted from the matrix of variable inter-correlation according to the method of principal components. In the next step, according to the latent factor roots whose value was higher than one, the first four factors are identified. They were then rotated according to the “varimax” rotation and the following values were found:

| Factor | Total | % variance | cumulative % |
|--------|-------|------------|--------------|
| 1 | 3.332 | 16.660 | 16.660 |
| 2 | 2.546 | 12.731 | 29.391 |
| 3 | 2.326 | 11.630 | 41.021 |
| 4 | 1.836 | 9.181 | 50.202 |

The total extracted variance for the four identified factors is 10,040 or 50,20% out of the maximally possible variance whose value is 20,00 (100%).

Those saturations whose value was higher than 0,350 were considered significant. Using this criterion the matrix of rotated components was established, according to which the following factors could be identified:

| Educational actions | F a c t o r s | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 0.677 | | | |
| 2 | 0.559 | | | |
| 3 | | | 0.731 | |
| 4 | 0.578 | | | |
| 5 | 0.573 | | 0.326 | |
| 6 | 0.419 | | | 0.602 |
| 7 | | | 0.415 | 0.739 |
| 8 | | | 0.621 | 0.468 |
| 9 | 0.436 | | | 0.590 |
| 10 | | | 0.583 | |
| 11 | | 0.568 | | |
| 12 | 0.420 | 0.435 | | |
| 13 | 0.631 | | | |
| 14 | 0.560 | | | |
| 15 | | 0.655 | | |
| 16 | | | 0.730 | |
| 17 | 0.515 | 0.414 | | |
| 18 | 0.440 | 0.414 | | |
| 19 | | 0.697 | | |
| 20 | | 0.760 | | |

The first factor is mostly constituted by the following variables: when teachers want to introduce the rules of behaviour, they point to the acts and actions that should be followed (0.677); while advising children on the ways they could modify their behaviour, teachers point to possible difficulties or other people's reactions to their misbehaviour (0.631); pointing out to the rules of desirable behaviour through a conversation of a teacher and pupils on a story, book, film, TV show, etc (0.578); referring to facts, data and arguments when talking about desirable behaviour (0.573); putting children into various situations so that they could acquire desirable values and personality features through experience and their own behaviour (0.560); encouraging pupils to think about their behaviour and choose themselves what they think is right (0.559); remarks of teachers are permeated by incites encouraging pupils to be persistent in finding a solution to a problem (0.515), etc. It is considered that according to these indicators this factor could be called *pointing out*.

The second factor consists of the following variables: pupils alone are responsible for their decision making (the highest saturation 0.760); conversation between teachers and pupils in which pupils are treated as equals – they can say what they think even if it is contrary to the standpoint of a teacher (0.697); control of behaviour by pupils (0.655); acceptance (understanding) of attitudes, feelings and opinions of pupils and encouraging them to solve problems on their own (0.568); suggesting various ways of taking action by teachers, with a possibility open up for pupils to decide themselves what is in a certain situation the best (0.435), etc. According to this, this factor is characterised by the self-responsibility of pupils, self-control, understanding of their needs, independent decision-making, freedom to express one's thoughts and feelings; consequently, relying on constructivistic views on upbringing and education, the factor is called *emancipation*.

It can be noticed that the third factor is constituted by the formulations in which criticism, "teasing", comments of misbehaviour in front of others, punishment, not allowing expression of one's attitudes, feelings and opinions prevail. The highest levels of saturation refer to the following: teacher's lecturing when drawing pupils' attention to desirable behaviour (0.731); when they have remarks on pupil's behaviour, teachers "tease" them or comment their misbehaviour in front of others (0.730); punishment by teachers if pupils do not respect their demands (0.621); teachers pointing out to the ways of conduct without a possibility for pupils to express their own standpoints, opinions and feelings (0.583); strict demands of teachers for pupils to follow their example (0.415). The

characteristics of the factor are easily noticeable – it is called *restrictiveness*.

In the case of the *fourth factor*, highest saturations are typical for the following variables: strict demands of teachers imposed on children to follow their example (0.739), as a role model, the teachers show pupils how they should behave (0.602), teachers patiently convince pupils to conform to their behaviour requests and expectations (0.590), punishment by teachers if pupils do not comply with their request (0.468). It is easily noticed that this factor is comprised of the actions directed to *role-model imposition* by teachers.

When the first and the second factor are in question, upbringing, i.e. educational actions are mostly characterized by two-way communication and their total participation in the total variance is 29,39%; what is typical for the third and the fourth factor is restrictiveness and imposition of rules, i.e. one-way communication and their total participation in the variance is 20,81%. In other words, according to these results we could say that in the relation a teacher – a pupil, two-way communication is more present than one-way communication in the schools in Serbia, which is contrary to our hypothesis.

Characteristics of communication in school education and upbringing – teachers' responses

Our intention was to support or challenge the findings referring to communication in school upbringing and education acquired through pupils' responses according to the analysis of their teachers' responses. Factors analysis of the variables from the instrument SPN-1 was used to identify five factors whose latent roots have value higher than one; after the rotation undertaken according to "varimax" rotation, the following values were established:

| Factor | Total | variance % | cumulative % |
|--------|-------|------------|--------------|
| 1 | 2.638 | 13.190 | 13.190 |
| 2 | 1.984 | 9.920 | 23.111 |
| 3 | 1.843 | 9.214 | 32.325 |
| 4 | 1.838 | 9.189 | 41.514 |
| 5 | 1.708 | 8.538 | 50.052 |

The total extracted variance for these five identified factors is 10,011 or 50,05% out of the maximally possible variance whose value is 20,00 (100%).

The saturations higher than 0,50 were analysed resulting in the matrix of rotated components, according to which the following factors could be identified:

| Educational actions | F a c t o r s | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | 0,514 |
| 3 | | | | 0,605 | |
| 4 | | 0,591 | | | |
| 5 | | 0,558 | | | |
| 6 | | | | | 0,764 |
| 7 | | | 0,745 | | |
| 8 | | | 0,782 | | |
| 9 | | | 0,650 | | |
| 10 | | | | 0,551 | |
| 11 | 0,635 | | | | |
| 12 | 0,574 | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | 0,691 | | | |
| 15 | 0,699 | | | | |
| 16 | | | | 0,788 | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | 0,658 | | | | |
| 20 | 0,629 | | | | |

The first factor is characterised by the following actions: teachers' control of pupils (0.699); pupils talking with teachers on equal terms – pupils can say what they think even though it is contrary to the standpoint of their teachers (0.658); acceptance (understanding) of attitude, feelings and opinions of the pupils and encouragement to independent problem solving (0.635); pupils assuming all the responsibility for their decision making (highest saturation – 0.629); teachers suggesting various ways of action, with a possibility of pupils to decide on their own that is in the given situation the best (0.574), etc. Consequently, what is typical for this factor is self-control, self-responsibility of pupils, understanding of their needs, self-decision making, freedom of expression of thoughts and feelings and it is thus called *emancipation*.

The second factor is mostly comprised of the following variables: putting pupils into various situations so that they could acquire desirable values and personality features through direct experience and behaviour (0.691); teacher pointing to desirable behaviour in conversation about a story, a book, a film, a TV show, etc (0.591); stating facts, data and arguments when talking about desirable behaviour (0.558), etc. According to these indicators, we think that this factor can be called *pointing out*.

In the case of the *third factor*, the highest level of saturation refer to the following upbringing actions: punishment by teachers if pupils do not obey their demands (0.782); strict demands by teachers for pupils to follow their examples (0.745); teachers patiently convincing their pupils to keep to the rules and follow their requests regarding behaviour (0.650). It is perceivable that the factor includes the actions characterised by teachers' *role-model imposition* and this is how it is called.

The *fourth factor* is constituted by the formulations out of which the following have the highest level of saturation: when they have remarks on pupils' behaviour, teachers "tease" them or comment their misbehaviour in front of others (0.788); teachers lecturing when drawing pupils' attention to desirable behaviour (0.605); teachers pointing to the ways of action without possibility for pupils to express their attitudes, opinions and feelings (0.551). Having in mind these saturations when the fourth factor is in question, it is called *restrictiveness*.

The *fifth factor* is comprised of the following upbringing, i.e. educational actions: as role-models, teachers show pupils how they should behave (0.764); when they want to show pupils how to behave, teachers try to encourage them to think about it and choose what they think is right (0.514). It seems that this factor can be called *subsidiarity*. Subsidiarity implies help of teachers not taking away pupils' initiative and not making them free from individual creative effort (Szczesny, 2001: 33).

Once again, according to the responses offered by teachers, five factors have been identified, interpreting 50,05% of the total variance. Considering individual factors, the first, second and fifth factor are comprised of the actions characterised by two-way communication (together interpreting 31,65% of the variance), while the third and the fourth factor involve the actions permeated by one-way communication (together interpreting 18,40% of the total variance).

The general conclusion on the characteristics of communication in school upbringing and education, made according to the responses of pupils and their teachers, would be that two-way communication is more present than one-way communication.

Conclusion –

It has turned out that our hypothesis was wrong. Even though present to certain extent, one-way communication is not dominant, either in family or in school upbringing and education. Two-way communication is more represented in these settings, putting the educated into subject position and providing conditions for their emancipation – liberation from dependence, pressures, bans, authoritative demands of parents and teachers. It can be concluded that both parents and teachers acknowledge social and pedagogic reality indicating that children have to have “free space” for their own development, and cannot be mere objects to which the established system of values, knowledge, skills, habits, etc is transferred. This is how we explain the greater presence of two-way communication in upbringing. The presence of one-way communication and the correlation of the actions of both types of communication is interpreted according to the fact that parents and teachers seem to be aware that giving freedom to children does have limits; in other words, the boundary of the freedom of choice (of values, standpoints, attitudes, behaviour) depends on the extent educated bear responsibility for their own decision making, implying consequences of one’s decision. We consider this is why there are differences between certain ages – in the 4th grade of primary school, one-way communication prevails, in the 8th grade of primary school both one-way and two-way communication are present, while in the 4th grade of secondary school, two-way communication is present to greater extent.

References:

- Bandur, V. & Radovanović, I. (2000). Pedagoško-vrednosna obeležja emancipatorske nastave. *Pedagogija*, 1, Beograd.
- Brajša, P. (1994). *Pedagoška komunikologija*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bratanić, M. (1990). *Mikropedagogija – interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Đermanov, J., Kostović, S., Kosanović, M. (1998). Komunikacija – aktuelni problemi proučavanja u društvenohumanističkim naukama. *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta*, XXVI, Novi Sad.
- Đorđević, J. (1985). Diskusija kao metod u moralnom vaspitanju. *Pedagoška stvarnost*, 1-2-3, Novi Sad.
- Đorđević, J. (1996). Autonomija ličnosti i vaspitanje. U *Autonomija ličnosti i vaspitanje*. Beograd: Pedagoško društvo Srbije.
- Garz, D., Oser, F. & Althof, W. (1999). *Moralishes Urteil und Handeln*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Gojkov, G. & Paser, V. (1993). Pedagoški stil porodice u vaspitanju. *Pedagoška stvarnost*, 1-2, Novi Sad.

- Gordon, T. (1997). *Umeće roditeljstva: kako podizati odgovornu decu*. Beograd: Kreativni centar.
- Grác, J. (1991). *Psychológia výchovy*. U Duric, L., Grác, J., Stefanovic, J.(urednici), *Pedagogická psychológia*. Bratislava.
- Grandić, R. (1994). Specifičnost odnosa nastavnik – učenik i mogućnosti izgrađivanja saradničkih odnosa. *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta, Knjiga XXVIII*. Novi Sad.
- Graorac, I. (1995). *Vaspitanje i komunikacija*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Hejts, H. (1995). Moralne agende, moralna panika i moralno vaspitanje. *Moralnost i društvena kriza*. Beograd: Institut za pedagoška istraživanja.
- Irović, S. (1987). Komunikacijska dimenzija odgojno-obrazovnog procesa i njezino delovanje na neke aspekte spoznajnog razvoja predškolskog deteta. *Pedagogija*, 3. Beograd.
- Jovanović, B. (2004). *Pedagoško komuniciranje, Komunikacija i mediji*. Jagodina/Beograd: Učiteljski fakultet u Jagodini & Institut za pedagoška istraživanja u Beogradu.
- Klemenović, J. (1999). Pojam, oblici i vrste komunikacije. *Zbornik radova (sveska 14)*. Novi Sad : Katedra za pedagogiju Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Lalić, N. (2005). Nastavnik kao kreator klime u odeljenju. *Vaspitanje mladih za demokratiju, 183-203*. Beograd: Institut za pedagoška istraživanja.
- Milgram, S. (1990). *Poslušnost autoritetu*. Beograd: Nolit.
- Milić, S. (2002). *Individualizovani pristup vaspitno-obrazovnom procesu*. Podgorica: Pedagoški centar Crne Gore.
- Miočinović, Lj. (1994). Vaspitanje karaktera: stanovište teorije socijalnog učenja. *Zbornik 26 Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*. Beograd.
- Oser, F. & Althof, W. (1997). *Moralische Selbstbestimmung – Modelle der Entwicklung und Erziehung in Wertebereich*. Stuttgart: Klett – Cotta.
- Popović, B. (1995). Moralnost na prelomu vekova. *Moralnost i društvena kriza*. Beograd: IPI.
- Radulović, L. (2007). Istraživanje i razvijanje obrazovanja nastavnika za refleksivnu praksu. *Pedagogija*, 4. Beograd.
- Stojanović, A. (2001). Konceptije moralnog vaspitanja iz ugla potreba za inoviranjem metoda moralnog vaspitanja. *Pedagoška stvarnost*, 3-4. Novi Sad.
- Stojanović, A. (2006). Razvijanje komunikacionih sposobnosti u nastavi iz ugla komunikativne pedagogije i savremene komunikacijske paradigme, *Zbornik radova sa međunarodne naučne konferencije "Razvijanje komunikativnih kompetencija nastavnika i učenika"*. Jagodina: Pedagoški fakultet.
- Stojanović, A. (2008). Uticaj multikulturalnog vaspitanja na vrednosne orijentacije učenika [The influence of multicultural education on value orientation of students], *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 5 (2). Zagreb.
- Stojanović, A., Gojkov, G., Grandić, R., Stipić, M., Carić, M., Uzelać. (2010). *Kritičke teorije u pedagogiji*. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.

- Sutherland, K.S. (2000). Promoting positive interactions between teachers and students with emotional/behavioral disorders, *Preventing School Failure*, Vol.44, No.3,110-115.
- Szczęsny, W.W. (2001). *Edukacja moralna*. Warszawa: Żak.
- Šušnjić, Đ. (1997). *Dijalog i tolerancija*. Beograd: Čigoja.
- Trnavac, N. (2004). Tri epohe i teorijske koncepcije o komunikaciji u školskoj nastavi, *Komunikacija i mediji*. Jagodina/Beograd:Učiteljski fakultet u Jagodini & Institut za pedagoška istraživanja u Beogradu.
- Žilinek, M. (1997). Humanistic values in the creative formation of moral identity. *Studia paedagogica: collection of studies of Comenius university*, Vol. 14. Bratislava.

Biographical note

Dr Aleksandar Stojanovic was born in 1970. He obtained a PhD degree in pedagogical sciences from Philosophical Faculty, Novi Sad University. He works at the Teacher Training Faculty in Belgrade and the Preschool Teacher Training College “Mihailo Palov” in Vrsac. He became a senior lecturer of *Didactics* in 2008 in Belgrade. He is teaching *Didactics, General Pedagogy, Pedagogic Research Methodology, Preschool Pedagogy, and Mathematics Teaching Methodology at Preschool Age*. He is a manager of the publishing activity of the Preschool Teacher Training College in Vrsac. Since 2009 he has been a member of the *Education Council* of the Province of Vojvodina. His fields of interest and research are didactics, preschool upbringing and education, moral education, upbringing and educational methods, giftedness, research methodology.