

Józef Podgórecki

Prof. zw. dr hab. Józef Podgórecki - Full Professor, Head of the Chair of Social Communication at Opole University, Poland; author of a few scores of academic course books, monographs and books on social psychology and social communication; expert in personality analyses and conditionings of social communication enjoying national and international renown; supervisor and promotor of a few scores of doctoral and professor's dissertations both in Poland and abroad; manager in charge of a number of research grants and projects in the field of social psychology and social communication; visiting professor at a number of European Universities; real member of the Academy of Pedagogical and Social Sciences, real member of the Humanistic Academy of the Russian Federation. Laureat of international prize of UNESCO – Qol Ghali, which is award to people of science for promotion of international science cooperation.

E-mail: podgorecki@uni.opole.pl

MORAL DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

*You can see good only with your heart.
The most important is invisible for eyes.
Antoine de Saint-Exupery "le Petit Prince"*

It is claimed that the roots of the morality come from social communication because it is communicating that pushes us to help other people. Since understanding is at the root of various aspects of evaluation and actions, it can enforce beliefs and moral rules and in consequence a series of such actions in which we concentrate on helping others. Such social and emotional tendencies are the essentials of abilities of human heart. And these as a kind of allegory are in many languages a synonym of moral behaviour because head and heart need each other. Taking part in the exchange of information every day, we hear about the cease of good manners, sensitivity, kindness or politeness on everyday basis. Actually they show only magnified picture of what we feel in everyday life and we notice among people that surround us – the picture of feelings that are getting out of control. This article points out how to find the sense in this partial nonsense and indicates proper imperatives between communication and ethics and these properly used show the desired values and secure proper rules, evaluation, norms and our behaviour every day.

The endlessness of human weakness, and intended and unintended misery happens to be petrifying. The cruelty of profession or age groups, the indifference of the surroundings, and loneliness make many people give up a fight for their rights which are often oooooooo.

It is there, where one needs motivation and character, difficulties and anxieties make every one of us alone because the others try to understand it and ... nothing more!

The fact that we demand understanding can make our colleagues and pseudo-friends part even more. How can we challenge it? One can make themselves aware of their situation for who of our friends or acquaintances would conduct a work of an archaeologists or where is the guarantee that the search will be successful. On the other hand, repeating that "every man is the architect of his own fortunes" and for these fortunes he should take responsibility often happens to be sadism!

It is said, not without a reason, that we lack manners in human relationships and those manners are rarely a fashion or a way of life in particular groups. It is hard to determine why this is the case. It may be because of some tradition or entangled history. Undoubtedly like in no other field, it is extremely easy for simplifications here. Although not everyone of us happens to be Anglo-Saxon, which in this case is not without significance.

In the past it was often told about honour, respect and sensitivity. Nowadays such words sound somehow empty. The reference has changed. Since it is said that a man is a man as much as he takes part in the world of values, it is probably worth adding the values which connect him with other people. It seems to be the condition of functioning of some groups. Elementary manners of an individual in human relationships is indispensable, it is hard to live without it. It remains a question whether such an attitude is possible or if such a rule can become a general law.

By regarding humanity as a general privilege and not as an achievement, this moral point of view seems to be possible. Nevertheless, I think that the tendency to identify a human with culture is not a gap in thought but a serious proposal. It requires of course some efforts and is connected with both intellectual and moral risk. However, it is because of the fact that these matters are typical, human, for many are the very sense of life, and depend on us, it is easier for a man to regain the respect which as an imperfect being he has lost.

If we acknowledge our moral imperfection, the answer to the problem becomes possible even despite cultural relativism being present.

What characterizes community are not patterns of behaviour, but not encountered so far the number and changeability of these patterns, which means impermanence, temporarity, instability. Particular events are rather acted than experienced. All that is true but the interpretation or evaluation is clearly so astonishing that we still commit carelessness, unpunctuality, contempt, disinterested envy, we more rarely can afford positive surprise, good-wishing, disinterest. One can participate in and play with it. However, the crisis of bonds, the deterioration of norms and nihilism are inevitable.

Social changes, the changes in attitudes, patterns, which gain popularity, objectives to which go, not everywhere can happen in the uniform fashion. The phenomenon of attitude change comprises in itself striving for perfection. It does not mean that it is bound to repeat in the unchanged shape. Not necessarily do parallels exist between the cultured and good-wishing, and between the honest and the moral. On the other hand, we do demand such attitudes. Is it justified?

The signs of being obvious are contained in the thesis that the present state of human relationships is not the result of natural processes but the consequence of activities of people of particular ideas, beliefs and having certain modes of behaviour which generate the overall to our duties. Thus, the instrumentalisation of attitudes is not recommended. Administrative obligations will not achieve much. Apparently, it doesn't mean, the necessity of enforcing uniform attitudes and views. However, it is not meant like in one of the stories by Mrozek entitled the Interval where two wrestlers tied in perfectly balanced grapple were talking for so long that from cogito they came to $e = mc^2$. The case described in *the Interval* seems to be an exception because if two uneducated geniuses meet, life is not enough to conceive and develop inventions of which existence nobody has informed them. We are then bound to resort to common heritage.

It is obvious that getting familiar with culture should be done in small groups which are ruled by a proper philosophy so that the bonds of a new type, the direct bonds could become accessible on a daily basis. I do not regard it as the universal way. It not true, however, that nobody is looking for the cure for unhealthy human relations. The humanist tendencies in modern science are a complex phenomenon because firstly, they have philosophical and social background and secondly there are profound difficulties with their conclusive definition. They embrace various issues and have many representatives in social studies.

Human concepts, mind tendencies, the forms of social activity and even functioning institutions are its confirmation. The use of the term humanist in various contexts is like using words: dynamic, just, desired, good. These linguistic adjectival equivalents are more often connected with evaluation rather than with the heart of the matter. The articulation of humanistic movement in modern social communication is needed and justified as the philosophical and pedagogical attributes of this subdiscipline enable us not only to understand ourselves better but also other people.

Ethics and other sciences on human make up the required background for an enlightened and sufficiently educated pedagogue. The moral base can be a significant source of inspiration and perspective and does not allow vague, wasteful disputes. The worth of moral element in social communication should be proved because such an approach based on thorough theoretical and methodological foundations seems to be sensible.

The justification of the presence of the moral approach can be outlined in the following points:

- moral qualities of social communication are the index of human characteristics, mainly subjectivity and individuality of a person thanks to which they make up the universe of personality,
- the right of existence and functioning of social communication understood as a science as well as art is a man in the sense of understanding themselves and others,
- the processes of social communication are ruled by perceivable interdisciplinary rules which enable us to predict the behaviour as well as affect the attitude of an individual or a group,
- making authentic and actual capabilities ingrained in every man and the construction of proper human attitudes are attributes, which are exemplified especially in the period of upbringing.

In the light of the above statements it easier to be aware of enormous yet still not fully appreciated significance of social communication as far as creative education and re-education of

society , especially the young generation are concerned. The common expression “young generation” we associate with a dynamic structure of bringing up a subject, that is his becoming and development, and this is in turn called the supreme value summum bonum, however, what is supreme can happen no more.

A man, an individual, a student which becomes, has to comprise not only capability (Greek. Dynamis)conditioning the very process of becoming, the change. He also must have an identified objective, ideal or idea according to which the becoming leads. This idea is humanity and it is the objective of any reflection over a man since the ancient times. Humanity (Latin: humanitas) means a man who executes or has executed his own humanity. This idea comprises both philosophy and paideida. The former for being uncovered, and the latter for shaping according to which a man through its subdisciplines (exemplum –social communication).

If we ask humanists whether moral attributes exist and what they express in, we will be given at least a few different answers. However, is the defining of communication and its attributes as separate subdiscipline unnecessary or impossible? It arises from the very nature of the moral movement. Instead of the definition all too often some problems and subjects of interest are given, as well as not precise, sometimes metaphorical descriptions of the nature of communication. It is hard , however, to negate such moral objectives as authenticity, the actualisation of capabilities ingrained in every man, rebuilding broken human relationships, broadening one’s awareness or faithfulness to most hidden feelings. In this sense the moral attributes bring help to people who can understand neither themselves nor others. Nevertheless, can any subdiscipline have a monopoly for learning and ways of functioning of human nature? Dostoyevsky, Shakespeare, Beethoven or Maslov, Fromm, Freud, Rogers, Allport greatly contributed to enriching our knowledge about human condition. Nevertheless, many scientific disciplines are still to solve the mysteries of human nature.

Multidirectional investigative nature of modern social communication due to dynamic social development, affects theoretical and methodological changes in this discipline. The presence of new quality phenomena in human activity makes one look in a different way than before at the discipline whose scope of interest has been broadened and has gone beyond traditional interests of teaching and upbringing. The knowledge of communication processes has a great significance for the explanation of mechanisms shaping the social behaviour of a man. Eager interest in these issues indicates new tendencies in the traditional interpretation of opposition : individual – society. If we assume that a theory must have three elementary functions: predictive, practical and explanatory, then communication surely meets that requirement. It emphasises the role of direct contacts of an individual with other individuals, creates the system of interpersonal relations and in this way it creates the level of elementary social situations, which makes up didactic and educational process with all its determinants. The current model of social communication abandons directive behaviour that gratifies positions typical for sublimation, for the sake of tolerance, creative , non-conformistic actions that free the developmental potentials and the inventiveness of a pupil. One of the significant powers of a teacher is to help the pupil determine individual strategy of working on himself as far as his abilities permit him. The support of individual development , the development of sensitivity, psychological and interdisciplinary maturity in social contacts will determine not only the possibilities of reconciliation between inner and outer operation but it will cause syntoncity and empathic relationships with other people.

Such a concept of the development of an individual must be correlated with communication attributes thanks to which it will be possible to work out the optimum orientation of activity. According to Rogers’ rules learning and teaching should engage and completely in a responsible fashion a person interested in their development who apart from openness to experience is able to build himself in the process of changes. It seems that development in the atmosphere of psychological safety of interpersonal relations based on mutual trust and resignation from guiding actions or forming the personality of the pupil for the sake of activity making them aware that they themselves can secure the success are the grounds for such interpersonal communication that shapes a creative, responsible, and able to self-realization man. People constantly communicate and in this very process, they initiate, retain and change their interpersonal relations, define their social situation, role and tasks, shape their personality and affect others. Thus, social communication with its interdisciplinary legacy (direct relations with social psychology, philosophy, psycholinguistics and ethics) should be found in the processes: didactical and upbringing, self-studying, and self-education. It can also be the source of an inspiration to posing questions and hypotheses, conducting empirical studies and methodological strategies. So far social communication has found it difficult to gain what we call an academic status because of many reasons. Due to its interdisciplinary nature representatives of many social studies do

not make great organizational, system and conceptual efforts to gain more supporters of the knowledge of this field convinced that being familiar with communication processes can considerably improve people's mutual understanding.

The phenomenon of a man is also that in constantly decreasing reality he shapes himself philosophically and cognitively through communication. Communication processes are thus that area for individuals' experience which lies at the base of shaping their own identity. At the same time they allow an individual to acquire the abilities to perform a free monologue, discourse, dialogue or an ordinary conversations. It is best reflected in the well known English expression "I am okay", which actually indicates the attitude to another man and to oneself.

Humanistic thought orientated to communication issues is one of the most complex topics in social studies not only because communication is an area of individual experience, which lies at the base of shaping their own identity, but also because it allows the individual during his development to acquire next abilities, for example of unconstrained observation of surroundings, which in turn allows the realization of values appreciated in society. The transformation of social and cultural heritage—possible thanks to communication processes—accommodates social integration. Therefore, considerable efforts should be made today to make interdisciplinary nature of social communication have its reflection in organizational, system and conceptual accomplishments. Understanding in human contacts means a considerable stability in everyone's actions and the basis for the understanding of the surrounding world.

It is also known that this stability can change. Social communication gives various explanations of this issue using the achievements of various scientific disciplines. It is obviously impossible to present the issues of social communication in an exhaustive fashion. Thus, at this point I will make a hint that there is a broad ground for possible arguments. However, having an extensive material which may be the subject of various reflections and generalisations, I call attention to issues showing their significance and at the same time their complexity.

The notion of social communication becomes universal thanks to which it becomes operative enough in itself. The abilities to think in these categories are the required elements of social psychology, philosophy and pedagogy and clinical psychology. In the face of challenges that XXI brings, everyone of us is obliged to acquire newer and newer skills making successful actions possible. One of the issues which we have to cope with in education, is to keep suitable relations between a teacher and a student (regardless of education level). I am convinced that the success and effectiveness of teacher's work is not about abusing his power and authority but using student's wisdom and creating the atmosphere of mutual trust. This in turn guarantees that school will become attractive to both sides.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Leslie Brothers.: A Biological Perspective on Empathy. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 146.1.1989
- Martin L. Hoffman.: Empathy, Social Cognition, and Moral Action, w: W. Kurtines, J. Gerwitz (red) *Moral Behaviour and Development: Advances in Theory, Research and Applications*. NY 1984
- Robert Levenson, Anna Ruef.: Empathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 63.2.1992
- Józef Podgórecki.: *Komunikacja Społeczna*. Opole. 2000.
- Józef Podgórecki, Maciej Gitling, Artur Kniejski.: *Social Communication for Teachers Tomsk 2009*