

PARADIGM OF EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT COMMUNICATION IN SCHOOL

Teodor Bivol

PhD Student, "Ion Creangă" State Pedagogical University of Chişinău, Moldova

Abstract: The actual context, marked by a high degree of administrative decentralization previous years, the communication efficiency of the school and how it is perceived externally, depends to a large extent of overall evolution of the school, visible basic statistics on the school population, basic teaching and even complementary funding.

In other words, communication in today's education is no longer optional, and the competitiveness between educational establishments generates diverse educational offerings, formulated according to all marketing laws.

Creating events public relations and promotion, ensuring external visibility are imperative that Romanian school contemporary have no longer afford to ignore in context of demographic dynamics present due of declining birth rates, amid insecurity induced by the economic crisis, and an important emigration. In an ideal situation, the school always relate to local community, from students and parents as well as their staff, aiming to ensure optimal conditions for internal and external communication.

In a real situation, dysfunctions of communication depend on the image, performance and, in extremis, the medium and long term, and the very existence of school: effective communication becomes another function - thankless - associated school unit management (regardless of the proportion of delegation to the image counselor or to the rest of the teaching staff).

Keywords: communication. Educational management, performance, paradigm.

INTRODUCTION

No narrowly structured and specific difference definition can include such a volatile term. Communication cannot be rigorously defined despite the inventories of theoretical definitions, despite the delimitation of the definition categories of communication despite efforts to describe the definition process.

Exchange, relationship, action, interest, influence, semiosis, interaction, and information: none of these terms can cover a bounded area of a fluid entity, communicating, always finding new solid forms (including mental structures) that they can copy. Only the word "sharing" may come close to the complex meaning of the concept of communication, notes Aubrey, Daniels (2007, 23).

However, all these different aspects can be reunited by saying that communicating is to put or have something in common without having to do this and the ways that serve the transmission or the terms (individuals, groups, objects) that are involved in this sharing.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

We called, for the sake of an initial terminological delimitation, to a fluid, dynamic definition proposed by the theoretician who first brought a Critique of Communication.

And etymologically the word "communication" is a derivative of the word "common" (belonging to many or all). *communis*, originating from the Latin verb *communicare* (18th century), and being, in Romanian, a double (as a later loan) of *rom. cumineca*. From the same root have evolved *rum. common*, but through *fr. commune*, *communal* <*fr. communal*, *communism* <*fr. communist*, or *communicated*, *communication*, *communicable*, *communicative*, *communicative*, *communion*. Instead, the term *community*, with a common root, comes from a widespread loan. *communitas* (18th century) (Ciorănescu, 2002: 231).

From the semantic point of view, the Latin verb (probably influenced by the common *common*, from which the *communitarian - communal*, *common - communal*, *community*, but also *communicative*, *communicative*, *communicative* or *communi - communicated*) at the origin of the *Roma* term. *communication* has meant and the action of doing something together and sharing.

The second meaning is at the origin of the present Romanian word and involves the interrelation between individuals.

Through the late Latin term, the word has penetrated most of the Indo-European languages (like neologism), and is also found in the Romance languages: *sp. comunicar* (v.), *comunicación* (s.), *fr. communiquer* (v.), *communication* (s.), *it. Comunicare* (v.), *comunicazione* (s.), and german: *engl. to communicate* (v.), *communication* (s.), *germ: kommunizieren* (v.), *Kommunikation* (s.) or slave: *rus. коммуникация*(s.), *pol. komunikować* (v.), *komunikacja* (s.), *scr. комуницирати*(v.), *комуникација*(s.).

Most languages retain both Latvian meanings, both in relation to the established relationship and in relation to information transfer between people.

Researchers are avoiding a specific definition, once their approaches refer to different points of view coming from different disciplinary fields, or even a review of these points of view. Those who, however, stop at rigorous delimitation of terms do nothing but for a restrictive approach that responds to the purpose for which the study was designed.

In fact, the term "communication" is not the only one that is unable to respond to a closure in a definition. Let's look at other examples: "language", "culture", "public opinion", for which definitions of definitions have been made.

Referring to the inability to define "public opinion," in 1904, Hermann Oncken (apud Noelle-Neumann, 2004: 80) stated that "changing things can not be understood by simply closing them in a formula [...]".

The case of "communication" is similar. It is a changing concept, a concept constantly balancing the epistemic nucleus with the symbolic form: Two external poles, one - the epistemic nucleus - descriptive and legible by definition (from which we can escape through a "Critique ..."), the other - the symbolic form, enveloping our thoughts and actions to such an extent that we can not, theoretically, describe it (Sfez, 2002a: 10).

The symbolic form to which Sfez refers is, not conceptually but intuitively, the "communion" of the meaning that the Romanian philosopher Constantin Noica identifies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

And yet communication is not everything; maybe not to cars, certainly not to people. Communication is something, kin is in the bosom of something.

Communication must be, and in any case, be without rest; kineticism only happens if there is a rest, and the better the rest of the area is.

Communication of data, signals or even meanings and meanings; Communism is under the meanings. The epistemic core is made up of its information and value determined by the actors of communication and / or the socio-historical context.

The two poles (the epistemic nucleus and the symbolic form) can be called, in the meanings of Romanian philosophy, *communicative*, respectively, *communing*.

Communication remains a troublesome concept, however much we try to bring the perspective of the epistemic nucleus into a symbolic form.

First of all, communication requires a different approach, through an inappropriate way of thinking to mental schemes, guiding ideas and sentences of classical epistemology.

This paradoxical way of thinking, atypical to rigid mental structures - in the spirit of Gianni Vattimo and Pier Aldo Rovatti's *debolism* (1983/1989) - was to be called *communicative thinking*: a work instrument also undefined within the rigid, rigid framework of modernist philosophies .

The status of this communicative thinking is profoundly undefined.

She is the organizer of scientific, reflective or professional practices, but at the same time responding to the requirements of the state and the big organizations, as well as inspiring changes in these organizations; Finally, it provokes or just accompanies cultural changes and practices or ways of disseminating or acquiring knowledge (Miege, 1998: 15-16).

To operate in a constantly fluctuating disciplinary area, with terms oscillating as in the subchalian environment between the hard core, the epistemic, and the symbolic wrapping in continuous pulsation, on the trajectories that can not be demarcated by the rigid instrumentation (to consider the possible indeterminacy of the invoice heisenbergian) of "hard thinking" requires and makes use of a different way of mental organization, of weak, fluid communication, self-organized in the solid form of scientific theories.

In essence, scientific merit is that of rigorous organization of content, of sets of statements in theories or the discovery of areas of fecund knowledge? "The real merit of Copernicus or Darwin, the note by Ludwig Wittgenstein (1994/2005: 47), was not the discovery of a true theory, but of a new aspect that is fertile."

From this perspective, post-positivist, communication sciences are the fertile field for the germination of knowledge in the horizon of a new paradigm.

What, then, would the study of communication mean?

Given the diversity of the theoretical approaches to the field of communication, can we conclude, in popperian terms, the dynamic area of the study of communication in what is called "scientific theory"?

Can a statement system be created to underpin such a theory, can a logical relationship be drawn between sentences / statements of that system?

Or, in the case of the creation of one or such theories, can we talk about an inclusion report, about the perception of older theories as particular cases of new theories, also in terms of Karl Popper?.

Certainly, the study of communication implies not only the inability of a conceptual delimitation, but also the existence of different approaches, grouped by scholars in current schools, theories.

There are also relations between models in particular cases, such as the correspondence between Newcomb's symmetry theory (1953) and the approach of Westley and MacLean (1957).

But there is also no general / particular relationship here because the Westley-MacLean model involves expanding the field of study to mass communication, while Newcomb's ABX model (1953: 394) is adapted to this wider area, the intention is to maintain / improve the symmetrical character of the relationships between the actors of communication and the object in the external environment to which they relate.

On the other hand, we operate with statements from distinct theoretical areas, unable to undergo Popper testing, ie the determination and weighing of the logical ratio (based on classical logic, aristotelian) between the propositions of the theory and those of the observation (with the exception of those from proximity of the epistemic nucleus).

We operate with contradictory sets of statements, instead, in the vicinity of the symbolic form (see Chomsky's generative grammar with Sapir-Whorf's linguistic opacity hypothesis), or with differently defined concepts (to stay at Chomsky, see the definition of the linguistic competence of the American linguist in relation to the communicative competence of the anthropologist and linguist Dell Hymes).

Given the fluctuation within the disciplinary area, the study of communication should, first of all, abandon the reference to the central concept of Popper's epistemology, the theory.

Moreover, the growth of the role of communicative thinking, paradoxical thinking which, despite its ambiguous character, succeeds in integrating and articulating theories from different disciplinary areas or, within the same area, from distinct theoretical trends, leads to a different approach.

This approach is centered on the concept of Pierre Bourdieu of social field (from which the concepts of linguistic or discursive field also derive, v. Bourdieu, 1982: 168), as Bernard Miege would have stated: (...) what defines the most good communication is the concept of field, the one whose meaning was given by Pierre Bourdieu in *Questions du Sociologie*: "For a field to function, he writes, there must be stakes and people ready to play the game, endowed with that habitus involving knowledge and the recognition of the immanent laws of the game, the stakes ... ". Communicative thought has itself contributed actively to the formation of this field (Miege, 1998: 120).

In this sense, accepting the study from the perspective of a dynamic theoretical, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic or anthropolinguistic field can not self-set as self-disciplining disciplines, by (re) establishing the borders in a purely modernist manner, specific to "hard thinking", but rather perspective in the elaborate study of the communication.

Moreover, Lohisse notes, praising the analysis of communicative interactions and language as social activities, anthropologists have greatly contributed to the transformation of mechanistic conceptions into organicist conceptions.

Turning to the procedural models of communication, we meet the term information, which is used with regard to the measure of the unpredictability of the issued signal.

In other words, a signal has a higher content of information as the degree of predictability of its production is lower.

The information, in this sense, does not refer to the probability of the event that the message relates to, but to the probability of the signal appearing in the message.

Redundancy has an important role in removing errors in transmitting signal packets. In other words, a message with a high degree of redundancy is easier to convey when the process of communication involves noisy, technical or semantic.

This redundancy, understood in terms of the theory of information, can take three distinct forms: necessary redundancy, minimum information volume for maintaining communication, accepted redundancy, targeting the optimal information volume and superfluous redundancy (a redundant expression!), Assuming an informational volume so large that it blocks communication.

The last of these forms is widely encountered in the contemporary media system, characterized by communication excess coming from everywhere, seemingly without a target and message, interfering with the individual unable to choose, discern.

The superfluous redundancy of mass communication, characterized by Sfez by appealing to the tautism mison, involves the transmission of structured information horizontally, deeply, without intensity, without qualitative analysis, without interpretation, in which case the communication is done in a "turntable" without purpose and endless, widening with each tour and leaving the individual the impression of achieving a synchronous, ecosystemic and self-managing whole, in the conditions in which self-indulgence is actually occurring.

CONCLUSIONS

Communication can be seen as a messaging. She is concerned about how the transmitters and receivers encode and decode messages, how the transmitters use channels and means of communication - that is, the issues of efficiency and accuracy. (...)

For the sake of concision, we will refer to this as the "school-process".

But communication can also be seen as production and exchange of meanings.

She is concerned about how messages or texts interact with people in order to produce meaning - that is, the role that texts have in our education, culture and evolution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aubrey, Daniels, *Managementul performanței, strategii de obținere a rezultatelor maxime de la angajați*, Polirom, București, 2007.
2. Baylon, Ch., Mignot, X., 2000, *Comunicarea*, Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași;
3. Bivol T, 2018 - *Communication management in school education*, Conferința Internațională *Mediating Globalization. Identity in Dialogue*,
4. Bivol T., 2018 The impact of communication theories on the development of the school institution, Simpozion Stiințific Internațional „*Perspectives of sustainable rural development in the context of the new economic challenges*”, Universitatea Agrară de Stat din Moldova, Facultatea de Economie, in curs de publicare
5. Bougnoux, D., 2000, *Introducere în științele comunicării*, Editura Polirom, Iași;
6. Cabin, Ph., Dortier, J.-F., (coord.) 2010, *Comunicarea: Perspective actuale*, Editura Polirom, Iași;
7. Chelcea, Septimiu – *Metodologia cercetării sociologice: metode cantitative și calitative*, București, Editura Economică, 2001.
8. Chisu, Viorica Ana, coordonator, *Manualul specialistului în resurse umane*. Casa de editură IRECSO, București, 2002.
9. Craia, S., 2000, *Teoria Comunicării*, Editura Fundației „România de Măine”, București;
10. Cuilenburg, Scholten, Noomen, *Știința comunicării*, Editura Humanitas, București, 1998.
11. Dinu, M., 2000, *Comunicarea*, Editura Algos, București
12. Drăgan, Ioan, *Paradigme ale comunicării în masă*, Editura Șansa, București, 1996.
13. Handy, Charles, *Understanding organizations*, 1995.
14. Hersey, Paul and Blanchard, Kenneth - *Management of Organizational Behavior - Utilizing Human Resources*, 6th edition, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1990.
15. Mattelart, A., Mattelart, M. 2000, *Istoria teoriilor comunicării*, Editura Polirom, Iași
16. McQuail, D., 1999, *Comunicarea*, Editura Institutului European, Iași;
17. Muchelli, A., Corbalan, J.-A., Ferrandez, V., 2006, *Teoria proceselor de comunicare*, Editura Institutului European, Iași;
18. Schiller, D., 1996) *Theorizing Communication: A History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford;
19. Sfez, L. 2002, *Comunicarea*, Ed. Institutul European
20. Sfez, L., 2002, *O critică a comunicării*, Editura Comunicare.ro, București
21. Smith, A., *Project Management Manual*, Grup SOGES, Imprimeria Filaret, București, 1997.
22. Șoitu, L., 2001, *Pedagogia comunicării*, Editura Institutului European, Iași;

23. Stacks, D. W., Salwen, M. B., (2009), *Integrated Approach to Communication Theory and Research*, Taylor & Francis Routledge, London New York;
24. Thoveron, G., (2003) *Istoria mijloacelor de comunicare*, Editura Institutului European, Iași;