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. “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. 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
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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 theory3, and from the other, the model of semiosis, that came from linguistics and philosophy4.

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, evolutionary5 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 technologies6 – 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.
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.
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