Methodological Paradigm of Social Interaction as the Basis for Modern Education Resources Research

Anna Iosifovna Sherbakova[1]*, Alexander Vladlenovich Kamenets[2], Natalya Ivanovna Anufrieva[3], Evgeniy Aleksandrovich Anufriev[4], Elizaveta Olegovna Zinchenko[5]

[1]Russian State Social University, 129226, Moscow, Vilgelm Pik Street, The House 4, Structure 1, Russia, [2]Russian State Social University, 129226, Moscow, Vilgelm Pik Street, The House 4, Structure 1, Russia, [3]Russian State Social University, 129226, Moscow, Vilgelm Pik Street, The House 4, Structure 1, Russia, [4]Russian State Social University, 129226, Moscow, Vilgelm Pik Street, The House 4, Structure 1, Russia, [5]Russian State Social University, 129226, Moscow, Vilgelm Pik Street, The House 4, Structure 1, Russia. *Email: najniv_almira@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the paradigm of social interaction in the context of its relevance to modern pedagogical research. It identifies the heuristic capabilities of this paradigm for the study of the most topical problems of modern education. It analyses the main pedagogical situations of social interaction that need to be considered when enhancing the teaching effectiveness of the educational process. The authors of the article rely on sociological and anthropological studies in which the situational and interactive approach to the analysis of socio-cultural issues is dominant. The article can be seen as one of possible methodological approaches to the further intensification of pedagogical research of modern education.

Keywords: Interaction, Pedagogical Process, Situation, Frame, Structure, Society, Communication, Modeling
JEL Classifications: Z130, I210, I230

1. INTRODUCTION

The unsatisfactory explanation and solution of many pedagogical problems is ultimately linked to inadequate "reading" and the interpretation of real problematic pedagogical situations. This inadequacy is manifested in inefficient pedagogical strategies, technologies, techniques, often due to the disproportion between the magnitude of a certain pedagogical issue and the scope of its proposed decision. It is in this context that the pedagogical perspective in modern education is almost not studied at all. Thus a fairly common situation happens with the mismatches of nationwide educational teaching requirements (national scale of pedagogical activity) and the interests, demands, specific capabilities of students (the micro-scale of the problem). In this regard, relevant is addressing the sociological aspects of education and relevant strategies of sociological research.

Similar skews toward micro-or macro-level are originally reflected in two poles, two opposite approaches to the study of the social life, including the educational processes: (1) Phenomenological, "microstructure" and (2) macro sociologic, "system." The intransigence of sociological schools representatives to each other is rather typical.

Actually, this opposition is understandable, if to suppose that "microsociology" is biased, in one way or another, to the world of the individuals, certain members of the society, while macrosociology (Parsons, etc.) - to structural-functional direction, reflecting the priorities and features of "system," "over-personal" world (Giddens, 2005; Parsons, 2002). Actually here largely opposite ideological setups are opposed, and they are often practically impossible to reconcile.

One might ask: "May be it isn't worth looking for any compromise between these "sociologies"? Let each of them mind its "own

business," "its circle of problems." In our view, the dialogue between these sociological schools is not only possible but also necessary to formulate explanatory pedagogical models providing effectiveness of actions and interactions in real teaching situations relevant for the conservation and development of the educational system as a whole. For the Russian pedagogy, combining macro and micro-sociological approaches is significant for addressing many educational and didactic issues essential for individuals self-preservation and socialization. Some of these problems are: The optimal ratio of altruistic and egocentric models of social behavior in modern Russia; adequate understanding by many members of the society (particularly the youth) of the ratio of freedom and necessity, security and initiatives; provision of the individuals complete social adaptation by the modern pedagogy etc.

Accordingly, micro-and macrosociology reflect different socio-ecological aspects of social life, significant for pedagogical theory and practice, which are discussed in this article.

2. METHODS

For combining micro-and macro-levels in the pedagogical process one should take as an original unit of socio-pedagogical processes and problems study not a single "actor" and his "social action," as it is common in sociological and pedagogical tradition, but the specific social situations that define the logic of individuals social behavior. It is the social situations, which are "the meeting places" of "large" and "small" social spaces for the functioning of social action subjects (respectively, "formal" and "informal" behavioral characteristics, outside-institutional and institutional components of the conduct, of individual and public interests).

Meanwhile, the notion "situation" and the related to it concept "social interaction," despite their wide use in sociological and pedagogical literature, so far is vague enough to explain the significance of the real social situations. In the first approximation, one could take up the signs of social action situations allocated by Parsons, such as a combination of actor-controlled elements of social action ("means") and uncontrolled elements, often contrary to the objectives of the actor ("terms"). In this interpretation, the significance of social situations for actors is to minimize uncontrolled elements of social action and to expand the scope of controlled items. In the pedagogical context this means forming such a social behaviour, in which an actor seeks to actually affect his own physical, mental and social well-being and the efficiency of social behaviour, developing the actor himself. Accordingly, we can talk about situations, minimally controlled or uncontrolled by an actor (environmental risk situations) and the maximum controlled situations (environmental safety).

Parsons considers, in this case, mainly the situations of social action (but no interaction). Where he admits the fact of social interaction, he views it in the space of already developed institutional norms (Parsons, 2002). Creating, therefore, the models of "normal" society, T. Parsons offers an ideal, effective, in his opinion, structure of such a society. In this society, every actor takes his own functional place, providing the optimal functioning of the entire social system.

In the most streamlined models by Parsons, a priority problem is overcoming uncertainty in situations of social action. In this respect, he evaluates the irrationality, appearing in the social action, in terms of "ignorance" and "error" (Parsons, 2002). But in situations of social interaction, actors inevitably have to overcome some irrationality, often appearing because of unpredictable reactions of one actor to another. This is why social interaction turned out an extremely uncomfortable subject for studies by not only T. Parsons, but by all developers of social action theories, trying to "squeeze" this social reality into linear unilateral schemes of social activity of individual (or groups of) actors.

Trying to overcome Parsons idealization of regulatory "over-personal" institutional structures, E. Giddens suggested "humanizing" social structures seeing them as a result of convention, the result of peoples setting the values of its normative elements. Such an approach to the study of society allowed Giddens to identify the social value of spontaneous interaction, reflecting the established routine interaction in the form of specified frames and actors relevant role patterns (Parsons, 2002).

It is also important to note that for Giddens social institutions exist mainly on the societal level as a more scale and long-term social reality in contrast to outer-institutional social reality, which is no less significant for the society. Giddens also proposed to study social reality, examining, first and foremost, social interaction, expressing social activity of people in different situations. The meaning of optimization of society members social interactions, according to Giddens, is in restoring confidence in social institutions, or in those institutions rehabilitation. The latter were often known to discredit themselves, precisely because they function in isolation from the living processes of peoples interactions, becoming bureaucratic and "dead." In general, despite many subtle observations, conclusions and generalizations that are relevant for the study of social interactions phenomenon, Giddens didnt manage to research their patterns as some set sustainable social situations of universal value for the existence of any society.

Accordingly, further work on analyzing the possibilities of social interaction paradigms for pedagogical processes involves the formation of a typology of social situations with such communication, taking into account the subjective factors, including both objective and subjective aspects of social behavior.

3. RESULTS

For the methodological analysis of the social interaction paradigm, of particular interest may become the research by Hoffman, who introduced an external observer into the situation of interaction and communication. This has given a new dimension to the study of interaction processes - monitoring two simultaneous processes: What actor makes and how he appears to himself and others. Hoffman has established a direct correlation between the strength of the self-presentation to others ("foreground") and the social organization development. Thus, a social organization becomes, according to Hoffmann, "a total theatre" (Hoffman 2003).

Hoffman drew special attention upon the subjective reality as the only reality, accessible to sociological study: Only something that can be fixed by the man himself-truly exists. Yet all the participants of interaction, in his opinion, anyway, are prone to self-deception because of subjectivity. Then the question comes: "Where is the reality, without cheating"? For Hoffman, frames become such a reality. This term, as a key one in Hoffmans sociology, means: (1) Determination of the interaction situation "in accordance with the principles of social organization of events" and (2) "dependence on subjective involvement in them" (Giddens 2005, 71). Both these elements are present in frames.

Hoffmanns study of the "frame" notion played a huge role in the world sociology, cultural studies, psychology and pedagogy-it opened a new sociological reality as sustainable generation of social interactions, in which human subjectivity can be described as an integral part of sustainable, broadcast and repeated social situations, i.e., objectively. However, he (Hoffman, 2003) did not disclose the concept of "social interaction." Characteristically, the vast number of situations addressed by Hoffmann, is evaluated by analogy with the theatrical performances (although he still holds a number of differences between real social action and conditional play action). Society dramaturgy is, according to Hoffmann, one-sided: The actors affect the observing "audience."

The approaches to the study of social interaction discussed by a macro-sociologist Parsons and micro-sociologists Giddens and Hoffmann reflect the most characteristic of these sociologies trend of bringing the interaction processes (on a societal or daily basis) to the actions of individual actors. With this, the following issues remain unclear: "What is the difference in their essential structural characteristics between the situation of interaction and the usual social action?," "How do the social interaction situations themselves appear regardless of their participants?," "How do socially significant rules of this interaction originate?," "How to combine selfish interests of all actors and the interests of the whole society when explaining and making the situations of interaction?," "Can one allocate rather universal situation of social interaction, forming regardless of actors natural intentions and having objective educational significance?"

To answer these questions, it is necessary to overcome the unilateralism of the social interaction consideration only from the positions of individual actors. As soon as these actors begin to interact, they acquire a new quality, becoming interactors. This means that each actor, participating in the interaction, willingly or unwillingly acts taking into account another actors action, plays a role in one way or another, puts on a mask, in which both the characteristics of the current actor, and features of the interaction partner are present (otherwise there will be no interaction). At the same time, each of the actors when choosing those roles (masks) has a prior experience ("knowledge acquirement") of such interaction. This experience can be called a transaction experience, if you bear in mind that the term "transaction" is appropriate when describing the action fulfilled as some algorithm developed mainly in the mental space (fantasy, memory, imagination, a perfect image, a model, life experience, etc.).

In case when while interacting the actor does not have the necessary transaction experience to get an acceptable result for himself, then he gets this experience is the process of interaction. Then the whole process of interaction somehow "drifts" towards a new transactional experience (for one of the interactors, or for both) (Kamenets and Gorbacheva, 2014).

Transaction always tends to the teaching of individual actors, reducing the content of social interactions to individual reality acts and the corresponding parameters.

The reality of the transaction is a "canned" pedagogical potential of the society, having a value for the entire human population as ecologically friendly generally accepted practices, rituals, traditions, attitudes, rules, algorithms of social behavior and general social norms. The content of this reality deepens and develops together with the diversity of social interaction as a live social experience of individuals. The need to "reopen" the transactional reality occurs when interaction is destroyed by some actor that considers his ego to be above the interests of the interaction (for example, a criminal offence, breach of public morals, public outrage, etc.), as well as to ensure the social effectiveness of emerging interactions.

Equally important are the procedural parameters for assessing situations of interaction that always has a particular internal dynamics. This is the process orientation, the result of the process, the content of the process. Another socio-ecological logic is being formed here, compared to the usual assumption of the necessary competence level in the field of social interaction among all of its participants. Their attitudes can be realized when interacting, if both interactors are provisionally the same valency of the demonstrated attitudes - positive, negative or neutral. This is needed to ensure that contact between actors takes place at all, i.e., that interaction starts. But in the process of interaction expanding, the situation can change significantly, as the individually-personal features of interactors, related to the presence (or absence) of existing vital resources for the specific situation of interaction, come to the stage. A vivid example is when one of the interactors shows another interactor his willingness to provide the second with security, getting a counter initiative in the form of trust (Orlova, 2004). As a result, both actors have the transactional experience (or knowledge), awakening the feelings of reliability (Bern, 1988). But in the course of further cooperation, this experience may appear deception, illusion, delusion of one or both of the interactors, because someone (or both) of the interactors may have insufficient amount of relevant vital resources for the represented interaction and then the interaction situation unwittingly overrides, taking into account the real integration of these resources.

Therefore, the study of interaction as a process can generate various combinations of transactors behavior, which do not fit in an unequivocal positive or negative evaluation scale concerning this behaviour in relation to each other. It arises by analogy with the musical form as a different process (often contradictory) of combining interactors behavioral strategies, involved in a particular act of interaction (often divergent, but eventually harmonizing) in relation to the interaction resources (Kamenets, 2011).

Given that a person is a conventionally-real phenomenon, which can be interpreted as "a configuroid" of "real" and "ideal," it can be assumed that in a real interaction, the individual, anyway, expresses himself simultaneously in real and conditional reality. The game between these realities constitutes the specifics of this or that situation of interactors interaction, who make up the core resource (Hejzinga, 1992). One of the prerequisites for the unfolding process is the internal motivation for interaction present in its subjects, which include: Striving for self-identity, self-realization, negative and positive experiences. These motives are internal because they are associated with the subjects prior accumulation of necessary energy typical of "all living beings" and providing the necessary dynamics for further cooperation as "live" with "live."

The pursuit of self-identity as a premise of interaction occurs through its characteristics of own uniqueness self-determination through the "other." Only interacting with the "other," one can fix the difference from the "other" which is in the private "specialness" and self-identity. In this impulse, the cognitive aspect is dominant- the surrounding reality is learnt about through the spontaneous interest in those or other elements of the environment, typical of an entity. The very existence of these interests, their combination is the basis of self-identity. The latter ultimately is a combination of individual interests that are not strictly motivated by varying the external necessity. Accordingly, this motivation is the least pragmatic, but the most independent towards the environment in comparison with other above-mentioned reasons.

Desire for self-realization is largely derived from the previous motives of self-identity, which is confirmed or adjusted primarily through self-realization. This self-realization is also the prerequisite for communicating with the "other," because without the last, self-realization loses all social meaning: If you don't have someone to compare your "self-ness" and, consequently, self-realization, the latter doesn't exist either.

Negative experiences do not occur by themselves either. They somehow have an external real or potential source and are a prerequisite for interacting with this source in the form of fight, flight, and attempts to hide from it and so on. Most clearly this internal motivation is recorded as the instinct of self-preservation. This motivation is less reflected than the previous two, as it has more situational, impulsive nature, tends to the realm of the unconscious.

Positive feelings are the following of the above - mentioned types of inner motives. Closest to them is Freud's phenomenon "libido," but of course, the whole range of positive experiences, previous to interaction, is not limited by it. The whole complex of such preliminary positive experiences is best to describe with the word "anticipation" of these feelings from an external source.

Thus, the studied internal motivations are connected with the necessity of interaction or with the experience of this interaction, making the appropriate social memory and willingness to interact with any entity. These impulses inside the interactor are hierarchized in terms of self-sufficiency and sustainability. The most self-sufficient and sustainable is an incitement to self-identity. This fact is confirmed by numerous self-monitoring sessions and their external manifestations, ranging from true fiction, a sort of "stories" about the characters search for their own identity as the dominant content of literary works, to the empirical observation of daily behavior of highly organized biological specimens (not only man, but also animals), whose self-concentration, occasionally combined with the monitoring the environment makes the main time of their daily existence, if it is not connected with enforced "conveyor" of imposed productive activities, behavioral activity routinizing (Kamenets and Gorbacheva, 2014). But in the latter case as well, if the productive skills are automatized, the manufacturer is often "immersed," that is a manifestation of the inducement to confirm ones identity as a kind of protection of the "self" from its turning into an appendage, a "screw" in the production "conveyor," its "dissolution" in the production process (an outwardly expressed option is "work songs") (Anufrieva et al., 2015).

4. DISCUSSION

The described aspects of social interaction paradigm, despite being little studied, one way or another, have been addressed in the writings of researchers. Wed like to quote Shcherbakovas saying: Today, when we have to say that the musical art and education have not reached a structural balance that determines the harmony of their further development as a single integrated system, we must provide a solid methodological basis on which we can confidently build a strong "building" that can withstand modern civilization. "In the present day, postindustrial "informational" society music is now being reexamined both as a form of art and as a form of social and cultural activity" (Anufrieva et al., 2015). This saying shows that in modern education, particularly musical, the necessary guidance promoting the harmonious development of students have been lost. The authors of the framework paradigm of social interaction can suggest such guidelines. Turning to the problems of contemporary humanitarian education, it is worth noting that a lack of understanding of the social interaction paradigm "leads to impossibility of the effective solution of many social, cultural and pedagogical tasks vital for society both at the micro level and at the macro level (for example, making social and cultural projects considering all the participants possibilities of interaction, formation of civil society representing interests of all social groups, formation of the state cultural policy based on various interaction of most of members of society as active participants of cultural processes, on the inefficiency of many institutional pedagogical practices, etc.)" (Scherbakova, et al., 2014). The works of Blau, Maslow, Marks, Zimmel (Zimmel, 2006) are also devoted to the described problems. These authors are the founders of the social conflict paradigm, which has become relevant to compare with the paradigm of social interaction (Maslow, 1970; Mead, 1925; Mead, 1964; Mead, 1913; Mead, 1963). Meade and his followers-Blumer, Hoffman, Davis, concentrating their efforts on explaining social actions through the values assigned to these actions by the individual. They are more interested in interactions on the low level than in large-scale societal changes. The paradigm of symbolic interactionism represents a model to build theories that perceive the society as a result (product) of the day-to-day

interaction of individuals (Kukushkin, 2006). It is worth noting that Dewey, Jerjen, Driver, Apple explored the possibilities of socio-constructivist understanding of education.

5. CONCLUSION

The preliminary analysis of the social interaction paradigm allows you to finally identify the key anthropologically important resources of social interaction that can be used to improve the efficiency of educational activities. These are time, space, energy, the proprietary-subject world.

For interactional analysis the opposition "real reality" - "conditional reality," where these resources exist, is of particular importance. "Real reality" exists in situations of interaction between specific individuals without regard to their social characteristics on existential and psycho-physical level (such as love, empathy, psychological compatibility or incompatibility, etc.). Conditional reality is an ideal reality as a reflection of the actors mentality, as well as the derivative of social groups, collectives, societies.

Real time-the present time, directly experienced by the performer as personally meaningful, largely felt impulsively and unconsciously.

Conditional time - past time orientation (memories, traditions, legends) as a tribute to the peculiarities of ones mentality, as well as social, public assessment of the facts or future time orientation (desired future that goes beyond the existing situation and therefore estimated as a value basing on the existing mental experience or reputable society groups opinions).

Real space-the actors fixation of his location in physical space. At this the actor can be satisfied with a leader, an outsider or a partner role in this space, depending on his position.

Conditional space-an actors special organization of space for interaction with other actors on the basis of existing notions about the ideal space for such interaction.

Real energy-the actors attraction or repulsion of the actual interaction partner.

Conditional energy-the actors attraction or repulsion of the mediated interaction partners-conditional groups and individuals-social groups, collectives, individuals with a certain social status, etc.

A real thing, physicality is an object directly given to the actor, having some real properties, real utility, available for direct perception.

Conditional thing, physicality-a model, a scheme, a project, an actors system of knowledge about things, about the material object, but not the real thing or some material object itself.

The pedagogical use of those resources in organized situations of social interaction is a promising research strategy (Mudryk, 2009). As part of this methodical task, the study of social interactions

paradigm was continued to explain the social mechanisms of change and dynamics of the activity itself. This paradigm contributes to explanation of the social laws of behavioral activity not only in institutional, but also in outside-institutional situations, because the behavior in an informal, everyday life, is mostly implemented in collaboration (direct or indirect) with others (Kukushkin, 2006).

In this case you can formulate and disclose anthropological criteria of social interaction efficiency such as mutual security, liberty, self-preservation; the resource preservation, acquisition, protection, etc. Ensuring the survival of these criteria involves studying anthropologically significant social situations of interaction, each of which can be reduced to one or another type of sustainable recurring social situations. Accordingly, it is necessary to build axiomatic and paradigmatic and allows of some special situational logic as one of the foundations in studying of social behaviour efficiency (Orlova, 2004; Grishina, 2001).

In line with this logic, the characteristics of outside-institutional process model and institutional interaction were studied.

The outside institutional social interaction was seen as an interaction, developing not under the direct pressure from the public and social norms, institutions, but based on appropriate, environmentally sound necessity associated with survival and self-preservation of interacting entities. The importance of defining social interaction as the special outside institutional space is due to the fact that the institutional sphere disregards the specifics of real experiences and patterns of peoples ecological safety (primarily in everyday life situations) leads to incapacity of many social institutions, bureaucracy of society social life against the interests of the society itself. Typical examples of this trend are: Law creation and practice as the realization of certain social groups interests disregarding the vital interests of all society members; implementation of national policy in accordance with certain political benchmarks when sacrificing peoples vital interests which don't match these benchmarks; overestimating management activities importance while underestimating the independence and creativity of the people themselves in real everyday life; replacement of masses living creativity with bureaucratic schemes etc.

The developed social interaction process model outside the "official" public regulation could be used to study the process of socialization and social adjustment of individuals as the basis for inclusion into the institutional life of the society.

And the problems of outside institutional social interaction has a research perspective, provided the fact that this communication is studied as a process at each stage of which some specific socio-anthropological characteristics are manifested.

Institutional interaction differs from outside institutional one in that it is carried out on the basis of the objective opportunities, set out in the society, of achieving the desired results in the course of this interaction on the basis of the particular society

balance of rights and duties of each individual. The process of institutional interaction here implies the existence of ones own motives to interaction based on the interests of the whole society and symmetrical with respect to the promptings, present outside the institutional process of social interaction.

REFERENCES

Anufrieva, N.I., Anufriev, E.A., Korsakova, I.A., Shcherbakova, A.I. (2015), Worldview formation of the teacher-musician personality in the higher education system. Asian Social Science, 11(6), 99-104.

Anufrieva, N., Anufriev, E., Korsakova, I., Slutskaya, I., Sherbakova, A. (2015), Formation of modern musician's personality in educational environment of higher education institution: Complex approach. Asian Social Science, 11(6), 13-18.

Berne, E. (1988), Games People Play: People Who Play Games. Moscow: Progress. p246.

Giddens, E. (2005), Society Structure. Moscow: Academic Project. p528.

Grishina, N.V. (2001), Psychology of Social Situations. St. Petersburg: Piter. p416.

Hejzinga, J. (1992), In: Ludens, H., editor. The Shadow of Tomorrow. Moscow: Progress. p464.

Hoffman, I. (2003), Analysis of Frames. Moscow: Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. p752.

Kamenets, A.V., Gorbacheva, E.G. (2014), Game in the Space of Humanitarian Education. Moscow: Rhythm. p224.

Kamenets, A.V. (2011), Technologies of Social Interaction in Solving Acute Youth Problems. Moscow: IZD-Vo, MSSU. p120.

Kukushkin, V.S. (2006), Educational Technologies: A Manual for Students of Pedagogical Specialties. 3rd ed. Moscow: March. p336.

Maslow, A. (1970), Motivation and Personality. 2nd ed. N.Y.: Harper and Row. p302.

Mead, G.H. (1913), The social self. Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Method, 10, 374-380.

Mead, G.H. (1925), Genesis of self and social control. International Journal of Ethics, 35, 251-277.

Mead, G.H. (1964), Selected Writings. Indianapolis: Jean Baudrillard. p488.

Mudryk, A.V. (2009), Social Pedagogy: Tutorial for the Students of Higher Institutions. 7th ed. Moscow: Publishing Centre Academy. p224.

Mead G.H. (1963), Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. p440.

Orlova, E.A. (2004), Cultural (Social) Anthropology. Moscow: Academic Project. p480.

Parsons, T. (2002), On the Structure of Social Action. Moscow: Academic Project. p880.

Scherbakova, A.I., Kamenets, A.V., Zinchenko, E.O. (2014), Potential of musical and pedagogical analysis of sociocultural interaction processes. Asian Social Science, 10(24), 140-150.

Zimmel, G. (2006), Selected Works. Kiev: NIKA-Centre. p440.