Zeitschrift: Studies in Communication Sciences : journal of the Swiss Association of Communication and Media Research

Herausgeber: Swiss Association of Communication and Media Research; Università della Svizzera italiana, Faculty of Communication Sciences

Band: 6 (2006)

Heft: 2

Artikel: Comments on cantoni

Autor: Tornero, José Manuel Pérez

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-791104

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 04.08.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

Studies in Communication Sciences 6/2 (2006) 25-28

José Manuel Pérez Tornero*

COMMENTS ON CANTONI

In the preceding text Lorenzo Cantoni intelligently focuses on the complex relation between communication and education. The following is my view on the core of the issue.

In the first place, the *object*[1]. "Education" – that is, the diversity of processes that receive names such as instruction, teaching, learning, etc. – is based mainly in communication activities (encoding, interpretation, transmission of information, amongst others). So that any transformation of the conditions in which this happens, for example, technological progress, will always alter the conditions of education.

Vice-versa: communication, whatever type it may be, requires educational processes: assimilation and discerning of codes, learning of strategies, mastery of abilities. So that, also, when educational conditions are altered in a given system, consequentially the characteristics of the current communication system are transformed.

In this sense, it is logical that in the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century, the fields of communication and education have acquired a new momentum and have run one into the other[2]. Let us see how. The élan of communication sciences proceeds from the expansion of communication activities that present technologies allow (that have lead to the globalization of communication and to an almost permanent connectivity of individuals, amongst many other processes). The growth of education sciences, on its side, proceeds from the need to conduct, accelerate and expand the processes of learning that condition and imply the vertiginous change of life conditions that technological and scientific progress bring. When technology changes at the pace that it is doing

* Máster Internacional de Comunicación y Educación, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, jmtornero@telefonica.net; g.comunicacio.educacio@uab.es

[1] Cfr. Saussure's distinction (1916).

[2] For an extensive treaty of this theme (Tornero 2000).

presently, it's communication and education sciences' duty to jointly progress if they want to keep their pertinence.

Until here, we have seen the transformations and the importance of our *object*. Let us see what happens with our *point of view*. The analysis of communication has had available, along history, various models related with different perspectives. Communication sciences have not been talked about properly until well into the 20th century. In this context, two models have been the ones, proceeding from different disciplines, that have contributed most to consolidate that field of knowledge: from one side, mathematical information theory[3], and from the other, the model of *semiosis*, that came from linguistics and philosophy[4].

On their side, education sciences have been the recent fruit also of a convergence between psychology, philosophy, didactics and other social sciences and have been based in systemic, evolutionary[5] and behaviorist or cognitivist models (i.e. implying the question of sense).

The present question is to find a theoretically convergent model between communication and education sciences, both at a level of object and of point of view. What can we do regarding this issue? As far as the object is concerned, we only have to stimulate our capacity to perceive and discern the enormous change in the environment produced by communicative technologies[6] – that modify and amplify communicational contexts – and how this influences, and at the same time depends upon, the educational changes.

Regarding the point of view, we have to explore and advance in the adjustment and the coherence of the various theoretical models, which are until now disperse, between communication and education sciences. But explore it not only according to scientific knowledge but also from a practical perspective: combining knowledge with experience, intuition and even art or engineering.

This is the key issue and it will take us time to advance along its way. In the meantime, it is convenient to stimulate debate, proposals,

[3] Weaver and Shannon's.

[4] Amongst both we have to point to the importance of systems theory, constructed thanks to the collaboration of logic, structuralism and mathematics.

[5] Piaget (1967) amongst others; Cfr. Morris, P. (1987).

[6] Innis (1964), McLuhan (1962), Ong (1982), Meyrowitz (1986) and others have treated, as precursors, the transformation of this environment.

research, essays and multidisciplinary development of which Cantoni's text is an excellent example.

References

INNIS, H. (1964). The Bias of Communication, Toronto: Toronto University Press.

MEYROWITZ, J. (1986). No sense of place. The impact f electronic media on social beahavior, New York: Oxford University Press.

MCLUHAN, M. (1962). The Gutenberg galaxy: the making of typographic man, Toronto: Toronto University Press.

MORRIS, P. (1987). Modelling cognition, Chichester: John Willey.

MORRIS, CH. (1938). Foundations of theory of signs. International Encyclopedy of Unified Science, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ONG, W. (1982). Orality and Literacy: The technologizing of the word, New York: Methuen.

PEIRCE, CH.S. (1931-35). Collected papers, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

PIAGET, J. (1967). Biologie et connaissance, Paris: Gallimard.

PÉREZ TORNERO, J.M. (ed.). (2000). Comunicación y educación en la sociedad de la información, Barcelona: Paidós.

SAUSSURE, F. (1916). Cours de linguístique générale, Paris: Payot.