

Consideration on Class Communication and State of Togetherness in Class Within The Framework of Constructivism

Nilgün DAĞ¹

Geliş Tarihi: 05.03.2016

Kabul Ediliş Tarihi: 25.04.2016

ABSTRACT

Can the constructivist understanding focusing on the individual's experiencing a process extending to "I" take the social structure the individual feels a belonging to, and the togetherness and unity state the structure requires to a secondary and derivative dimension? This question refers to the necessity of recognizing and describing what kind of space a class, and how the class communication and state of togetherness pattern are/should be. The article, in line with the necessity, first deals with the kind of relationship between space and man, what kind of space a classroom is, and what kind of space constructivism envisages; and then tries to describe the kind of pattern the state of communication and togetherness a constructivist classroom has. This study is a theoretical one based on literature review. It has been realized by review, compilation, synthesis and presentation of the existing researches on constructivism, communication, and togetherness.

Keywords: classroom, communication, constructivism, relativism, togetherness

Yapılandırmacılık Bağlamında Sınıf İçi İletişime ve Sınıftaki Birliktelik Hâline İlişkin Tespitler

ÖZ

Bireyin 'ben'e doğru uzanan bir süreci yaşamasına odaklanan yapılandırmacı anlayış, bireyin kendisini ait hissettiği toplumsal yapıyı ve bu yapının gerektirdiği bir arada ve birlikte olma hâlini ikincil ve türevsel bir boyuta taşıyabilir mi? Bu soru, sınıfın nasıl bir mekân olduğu/olması gerektiği ile sınıf içi iletişimin ve sınıftaki birliktelik hâlinin nasıl bir dokuya sahip olduğunu/olması gerektiğini tanıma ve tanımlama gereğine işaret etmektedir. Bu gereklilik doğrultusunda makalede ilkin mekân ve insan arasında nasıl bir ilişki bulunduğu, sınıfın nasıl bir mekân olduğu ve yapılandırmacılığın nasıl bir mekân tasavvur ettiği ele alınmakta; ardından yapılandırmacı bir sınıftaki iletişim ve birliktelik hâlinin nasıl bir dokuya sahip olduğu betimlenmeye çalışılmaktadır. Bu çalışma, kaynak taramasına dayalı kuramsal bir çalışmadır. Yapılandırmacılık, iletişim ve birliktelikle ilgili mevcut araştırmaların taranması, konuyla ilgili bilgilerin derlenmesi, sentezlenmesi ve sunulması yoluyla gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: birliktelik, iletişim, rölativizm, sınıf, yapılandırmacılık

¹ Asst. Prof., Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Faculty of Education, Primary Education Department, e-posta: dagnilgundag@gmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

Constructivism, which constitutes the philosophical foundation considers the world as a group of problems to be dealt with, and focuses on the individual's solving those problems by him/herself and inventing new things. This philosophical approach that focuses most on the individual features and skills of the individual, and realization of learning by oneself takes "do your job yourself" principle as a guide. This understanding brings to mind some questions on how class communication and the state of togetherness will run based on which values and ethical principles. Can the constructivist understanding focusing on the individual's experiencing a process extending to "I" take the social structure the individual feels a belonging to, and the togetherness and unity state the structure requires to a secondary and derivative dimension? Or can the 'individual' focus may make possible a risk and hazard of bringing the state of 'I' to an extreme in a way to exclude the sense of 'we'? Or can the uncertainty of the borders of "individualization" discredit the set of ethical concepts regarding the way one feels and the things he/she connects to, and wear several values that have ethical associations such as love, respect, tolerance, cooperation, trust etc., and that guide human life and relations? Can it delay or rule out one's understanding about what it means to be a society? These questions refer to the necessity of recognizing and describing what kind of space a class, and how the class communication and state of togetherness pattern are/should be. The article, in line with the necessity, first deals with the kind of relationship between space and man, what kind of space a classroom is, and what kind of space constructivism envisages; and then tries to describe the kind of pattern the state of communication and togetherness a constructivist classroom has.

Space

Space is a fundamental concept with various equivalents in several disciplines, particularly architecture. Since conceptualization of space by each discipline is different, it is hard to highlight a stationary, fixed and comprehensive definition. In the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Architecture (1975), space is described as a "cavity or emptiness that separates one from environment to a certain extent, and that is suitable for continuation of his/her actions in it". In other words, space refers to "a building closed from the top, bottom and sides" in architecture (Altan, 1993, p. 79). Geographically, space means "a place or volume where a person, an article, object or organism is placed or which is at a special location in outer space" (Atalay, 2004, p. 483). In geographical terms, space means a place, location area in the world (İzbrak, 1992, p. 347). In the Turkish Dictionary, space means "1. *noun* Place, residence. 2. Home, country. 3. *astronomy* Space".

Adugit (2013, p. 7) describes space as the "border where location, things and movements of people are physically bound to", and Gür (1996, p. 34) as "a three dimensional expression of the intervals, distances and relations of human with human, human with object, and object with object, in brief, the outer space surrounding us."

Both in dictionary definitions and in definitions developed by experts, space is a concrete/physical area independent from its components. In comparison with these definitions sourced by the absolute space understanding of Plato, there is the definition of Aristotle conceptualizing it as a field shaped/produced by the beings interacting with each other. Aristotle considers space as something produced as a result of social relations rather than an absolute and solitary area consisting merely of its contents. Nevertheless, 'human' has a significant place in giving meaning to space. As indicated by Göka (t.y.), spaces are "physical units staging intensive experiences of humans, bearing distinct, subjective meanings for each individual, and affecting and forming one's life indirectly and therefore bearing symbolic meanings on social, emotional and behavioral plan". Consequently, space, in one aspect is a result of human need, and is a construct requiring humans in another aspect. In other words, human is a being that is affected by and that affects and changes space in line with its needs. In this context, there is mutual/reciprocal relationship between human and space, and this relationship is the focus of not only psychology but also several disciplines.

Space theories have almost always been affected by ideological points of view. Just like Harvey (1973), Lefebvre (1974) ve Castells (1977), the leading names of Marxist space theory, have analyzed space within the context of class and social differentiation of the capitalist system, with a reference to the ideological function of space. According to Lefebvre, space is political; it is "what needs to be changed to change the world" (Lefebvre, 1974: 40). So it is a meaning category which is fundamentally significant in understanding and transformation of the societies (Işık, 1994, p. 8, 18).

From another aspect, space is the crossroads for people from different cultures, beliefs and opinions. Consequently it has an asymmetrical structure. However, space is an area that determines "not only the nature of the social relations of things with things, things with people or people with people as division of labor requires, but also their conscientious relations as moral beings" (Adugit, 2013, p. 7). Therefore, it has an interactive, social and moral pattern.

Class as a Space

Class is not only a physical space independent from the teacher and students, but also a social space where the teacher and the students interact within the framework of a set of values, direct their actions with a common sense of purpose, and act in purposeful and regular communication and togetherness. The essence of this social space fundamentally features a cognitive character. Because, class is an environment where students gain and develop knowledge by various means, and thus are in an intensive mental activity. Besides, class is a communicative space due to communicative construction of micro culture; and a moral space because relations are conducted within the framework of certain ethical values. Consequently, class is a special space referring simultaneously to several cases. It refers as a concept to a certain physical location, to an

educational environment where purposed actions and activities are realized, and to a social and interactive space based on the togetherness of people from different social, cultural and economic environments.

The architectural character and physical nature of the class is highly significant to form a class culture. As a matter of fact, Marland (1993) draws attention to the fact that every variable related to physical organization of the class may not only support but also hamper the education and teaching process of each variable. In this context, he points at the necessity that class as a physical space should be not only airy, light and spacious, but also large enough to allow various seating orders, and also should have proper acoustic conditions. The physical environment of a class has six aspects according to Charles and Senter (2005):

1. **Floor Space:** Seating orders (seating orders consisting of horizontal and vertical desks or round and long tables) serve various purposes. No matter how, in a good seating order, teacher and students should have adequate space for passage for easy and effective access. Because only a seating pattern like that can facilitate learning.
2. **Wall Space:** The wall area of the class is a significant area requiring careful arrangement. This not only provides a decorative view, but also is used for educational purposes. This is an area with the bulletin boards where student works are exhibited as well as with maps and tables.
3. **Pencere Önündeki Alan (Countertop Space):** This area is a significant for plants and aquariums, an interesting corner for students because they are close to the window and have natural light.
4. **Shelf, Cupboard and Closet Space:** Teachers are required to take care of several things in the classroom simultaneously. One of them is to keep the roofs with several materials clean and regular.
5. **General Ambience:** Class ambience is an atmosphere dominating the classroom. One of the duties of a teacher is trying to ensure a safe, enjoyable and stimulant atmosphere to make learning fun and effective.

Although the physical adequacy of the classrooms in our country vary from region to region and even in different settlements of the same region, they are highly similar in terms of design. A general description regarding the physical peculiarities of the classrooms in our country would reveal that because the base periphery of the classroom and the number of students on the same do not correspond, most of the classrooms do not have adequate passing area to allow movement of the teacher and students easily as they wish or to enable a change of seating orders. Therefore, students sit by groups of two and occasionally three on desks in successive order, and cannot change the seating order even when they need to work together in cooperation. This compulsory seating order arising from the physical peculiarities of classrooms reveals a restricted attitude/behavior of a student inclined to socialize to ones next to, in front of, or behind him/herself, and brings a form to mind in the broad sense.

Nevertheless, a constructivist class² is one to be shaped according to the learning needs of the students. There should be portable and multi-purpose furniture suitable for transportation, and the technological tools and materials should be positioned easily accessible by the students. However, although a constructivist understanding has been taken as a basis in education after 2005, no change was made in the school buildings and the physical order of the classrooms. Unfortunately, Turkey continues its path with a pedagogical understanding that tries to educate “the students of 21st century with the teachers of 20th century in buildings of the 19th century” (Selçuk, 2013).

An examination of the majority of the classrooms show that the walls are covered with panels exhibiting geographical maps and students works, that the class closet located behind or next to the teacher’s desk is not functional, and that there is not adequate number of shelves and closets available to the students. Although the use of technological tools such as smart boards and projection have showed serious increase in the last ten years, it hasn’t caught the era generally.

Nevertheless, human behavior is formed and developed at a certain physical and social environment. Although the relationship of the student with the space/classroom determines the form of the relationship he/she establishes with his/her class mates and teachers, it also reflects on all of his/her actions from his/her form of performance to looking for solutions to his/her problems – even his/her corporate and private life. For example, in the USA, there is an educational understanding focusing on group work of individuals at all levels of education from before school until higher education. This understanding not only is reflected on the spatial design of the classrooms; but the significance of teamwork reveals itself in the spatial design of work places. The fact that most work places in the USA have been designed as offices with open plan based on cmctn and cooperation is a concrete indicator of the case.

It is not that possible to see the traces of social mentality and cultural elements in the internal decoration of the classrooms or the external architecture of schools in Turkey. Because in Turkey, the school buildings are structures of a need rather than a product of planned and intentional study. Problems caused by the rapid population growth after 1950s and intensive migration to cities has resulted in ‘typical project’ implementation in schools as in most public buildings (Gür & Zorlu, 2006). Typical projects, as in their name, are implementations based on repetition of similar structures, which are still continued today. Typical projects have some disadvantages. First they are not as economic as they are thought. Second, they are bigger or smaller than necessary for some neighborhoods, and so are not functional. Third disadvantage is their multilined and awkward structure because the relation between the garden and classroom has been

² Lesson is not limited to physical space in structuralist understanding. School garden, libraries, museums, streets, etc. areas can be elected as educational spaces in view of activity and conditions (Yapıcı, 2007).

severed. Because regional climatic differences were not regarded, they are problem structures which are not physically aesthetic (Gür & Zorlu, 2006, p. 63).

Of course class is not a physical space only. Class is a space where the teacher and students interact intensively in a routine five days a week. Students learn to behave as a member of a group in this space which is a shared area for the teacher and students, and the teacher affects other students with his/her reaction to the behavior of a student. In this process of interaction, events occur very fast, and several events occur in the classroom simultaneously. The fact that each student has different concerns and purposes cause emergence of several prohibitions/interruptions that cannot be estimated/predicted internally and externally during learning and teaching. All these make classroom a multidimensional space (Watkins & Wagner, 2000, p. 54-58).

Furthermore, class is a social and educative space which makes inevitable gathering together of several students from ones having trouble in establishing open communication or demonstrating behavioral problems to ones with high mental energy, and uniting them in mutual trust and respect, and requiring their communicating via a form of communication different than the usual communication habits. Although the state of togetherness in the classroom is not fully classified as any type of Bauman's analytic classification on togetherness, it can ensure reaching a general judgment by virtue of the determinations of Bauman.

State of Togetherness and Form of Communication in the Class

Communication is a term derived from Latin *communica*, which means "sharing, becoming partners" (Tayfun, 2007, p. 4). Communication is the process of making meanings common between two or more people (Yalın, 2008, p. 12). Communication, which according to Bridge (2003) is the "mutual exchange of thoughts and opinions", is a "scientific area of work examining the effect of the signals and symbols used by people to receive and transmit messages" according to Hargie (1992). An examination of the fundamental concepts in these two definitions shows that the first definition highlights "oral" aspect of communication in contrast to the second, which stresses its "speechless" aspect. Communication is a process involving all kinds of oral and speechless interaction. The first form of communication to come to mind is no doubt oral communication, and is defined in brief as "communication by speaking" (Sillars, 1995). In oral communication, speed and intensity of saying something are just as important as the form of saying.

As to speechless communication, it is the form of communication established via several means such as gestures, mimics, touching etc.. In brief, it is the form of communication realized over visual indicators not involving oral communication. It is grouped into two: *Speechless communication with common codes* (for example; 'nodding' which means 'yes or no', approval or not') means the same for everybody sharing the code in contrast to speechless

communication without common codes (for example; ‘crossing legs’, ‘crossing arms’, ‘dropping head’, ‘blinking’, ‘avoiding eye contact’ etc.), which varies to person and context (Erdoğan, 2011, p. 288-289).

According to the research results by Mehrabian (1971), it was found out that in communication body is effective by 55 %, voice by 38 % (high-low, rhythm, intonation), and words by 7 %. According to the research by Cooper (1989), body was found effective by 60 %, voice by 30 %, and words by 10 % in communication. These findings may be considered to show that speechless communication is adopted more in daily communication compared to oral communication in daily communication and also that indirect communication is preferred/used more. At this juncture, we should remember that direct or indirect communication is a condition varying per culture. As a matter of fact, people say what they want to say to their addressee directly in the Northern European countries and the USA, in contrast to the Middle East country including Turkey where what they wish to say are tried to be communicated via indirect means (Yüksel, 2006). An empirical study by Barnlund (1975, p. 50-54) revealed that there is a contrast between the interpersonal relations of Japanese and American societies. Japanese and American participants of the study stated that the Japanese are ‘shy, official, silent, prudent, avoiding, serious’, and that Americans are ‘confident, forthcoming, sincere, spontaneous and talkative’.

Ito (1989) explained this difference between the ways of communication of the societies via several variables. To him, form of social production, differences of belief and climate; low or high population intensity, homogenous or heterogeneous nature of the societies, individuality or collectivity, basis on ideologies or human relations are factors causing variations in the styles of communication. Because they have the same racial, cultural and historical past and because they share the same beliefs, language and traditions, people don’t have to argue with each other and turn their thoughts into ideology in homogenous societies. Because they are like family. Therefore, their communication culture is “collectivist”, and they use speechless communication more frequently. The people of such a society is shier, more silent and cautious. As to heterogeneous societies, people do not apply to indirect expression due partially to the fact that they don’t have the same cultural and linguistic history, but rather prefer to express their wishes directly and clearly. Their communication culture is “individualist”. Therefore, the people of that society are more self-confident, outspoken and talkative. For western societies, individuality has positive associations in contrast to collectivism which is a negative one. In non-western societies, individuality is considered equal to egoism and self-seeking. The communication culture of societies varies per the value(s) the society³ is based on. In societies based on human relations, people do not take principles, rules, beliefs and ideologies seriously, for them it is more

³ Göka claims that one of the factors coloring the behaviors of Turks is nomadism, and characterizes the relation of Turkish people with space as “temporary” due to the ongoing effect of their nomad history.

important to form and maintain good human relations and group harmony. Nevertheless, people tend to be more confident, hardliner, aggressive and rational in ideological societies, because they find their identities in principles, beliefs and ideologies.

It is possible to see how the emphasis on relations is different in various cultures in concentration of American and Asian parents to different points while playing with their children at playing age. American parents focus the attention of, and ask and answer questions to the child on objects. The objective is to prepare the child to a world where he/she is expected to act independently. Asian parents, however, generally ask questions to their children about their emotions. The objective is to focus the child on emotions and social relations, and to attract his/her attention to the reactions of other people. Similarly, the reading book *Dick and Jane* used widely from 1930 until 1960 in the USA starts with the picture of a boy running on grass. The book involves sentences like “Look, Dick is running”, “Dick is playing” etc. Nevertheless, the first page of a reading book in Chinese starts with the picture of a junior boy on the shoulders of an elder boy, involving sentences such as “elder brother loves his younger brother”, “the brother loves his elder brother”. In fact, communication of relations between people rather than an individual action in the first contact of a child with published books constitutes a concrete evidence of the difference between the two cultures. The case is similar in advertising understanding. American advertisements stress individual benefit like “Get away from the crowd!”, “Live a cheerful life!” in contrast to Korean advertisements stressing collective benefit like “We know the way to unite people!” (Nisbett, 2006, p. 51-64).

To Bauman, togetherness has several types. There is the *mobile togetherness* of busy streets or shopping centers. This type of spaces are fluid, and people are compulsorily side by side, but they are not with each other. Togetherness in train cars, plane cabins or waiting halls is *stationary togetherness*. It is totally arbitrary, random and unplanned. Togetherness in a work place or factory is *tempered togetherness*. This type of togetherness is intentional, and a matrix of structured encounters. So these encounters are normative, bound with rules, pre-framed and short. Another type of togetherness is *manifest togetherness* of a protest demonstration, football match or disco. It is instrumental. The objective is to be together as a crowd. *Postulated togetherness* in contrast to manifest togetherness, is the type of togetherness established in view of the commonness of nations, races, classes, genders etc. in which one feels home. Also there is the *meta togetherness/matrix togetherness* of a bar, pub, holiday beach or dance hall (Bauman, 2001, p. 64-71).

Bauman expresses that most of these encounters can be classified just as *being aside* and *being with*. He claims that there is another way of making encounters meaningful beyond *being aside* and *being with: Being for*. Being for, is a leap to unity rather than gathering discarding the burden of identity (David, 1987, p. 99; as cited by, Lal Fernando, t.y.: 14). In modern and postmodern spaces, people

can be together, be aside, but these states of togetherness can be at best described as “being with” or “being aside” relationships. In these types of togetherness, encounters are either partial or episodic in these encounters, or both⁴ (Bauman, 2001, p. 71).

It is not easy to place education under any form of togetherness summarized here. It can be said that this is a stationary (students and teachers are restricted in certain spaces for certain periods of time generally) and harmonious (structured encounters based on rules and regulations shape the norm here) togetherness. However, no matter how togetherness is, the vital issue for our understanding on how we are together in education is the mode togetherness is staged (Todd, 2003, p. 46). For example Sillars (1995) prefers to name the process whereby students are listeners and memorizers of what teacher tells about the topic as “information” rather than a type/form of communication.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a theoretical one based on literature review. It has been realized by review, compilation, synthesis and presentation of the existing researches on constructivism, communication, and togetherness.

DISCUSSION

Constructivism is the projection on education of postmodernism which is deeply effective on every field from art to architecture, from literature to education. What the Ministry of National Education launched as of 2005-2006 at the first stage of all primary schools in our country is considered as a ‘philosophy’, an ‘approach’, or a ‘learning theory’ by different groups. In other words, constructivism is a point of view with very differing interpretations and sub-forms, but which depends in essence on discovery by the individual himself of his/her own way of knowing and learning.

Several of the constructivist paradigms are in fact different forms of radical constructivism, and the main problem is how the mutually complementary natures of individual constructing and social communication can be harmonized. Whether knowledge is to be dealt with in a social context or individual structuring causes some differences in terms of conceptualization of learning. For example it is a significant question in radical constructivist perspective how a structure to involve cooperative activities and individual experience together and to take into consideration social relations constituting a substantial part of the education process in a class can be formed (Ernest, 1995, p. 483; as cited by: Turgut, 2005, p. 47-48). Because constructivism advocates a relativist understanding which claims all of our knowledge and values and all cognitive

⁴ Encounters are sectional in the sense that some of the multilateral selves are involved. It is also episodic in the sense that their togetherness has no history or future. The social togetherness of postmodernism is episodic.

perceptions regarding the world are relative. This understanding considers persistence on a certain thought as a negative attitude. It alleges that truth changes per place, time, group and individual. This case means that relativism considers every understanding equally accurate because it accepts no criteria separating right from wrong, and may cause sundry risks in terms of the class atmosphere requiring action within a culture of reconciliation. The foundation of the communication process is “finding of common concepts” on which individuals producing and consuming the message agree. Relativism can turn septic and agnostic attitude into a practice of life with its septic and agnostic attitude before events and conditions epistemologically aggravating becoming a party around “common concepts”; and even ultimately result in rough realism and opportunism claiming to possess the entire knowledge of the truth of human being.

Nevertheless, the existence of common concepts, rights and values is too significant to be overlooked particularly for students from 1st to 5th grade of primary school. Common concepts and rights have a vital significance for the students of this age to have a spirit of social solidarity and belonging being raised as individuals with cultural and ethical value, attitude and behavior. Production by relativism of knowledge and reality from its own rationality, thus its epistemological suggestion that each individual’s knowledge is valid may take an individual away from social phenomena. In this context, the risk that the communication and interaction network among students is established over fanaticism and polarization may arise without a common denominator and language.

We should also remember that the concept relativism has a wide range of meanings. Some thinkers put individual and society to the center of this concept in contrast to others who place joy and benefit. No matter what the central concept is, all kinds of relativism needs a neutral mechanism. This neutral mechanism should consist of a range of cultural values particularly in the first five years of primary education. This is because the range of culture values is the main mortar of unity in a country, and a significant reference that materializes belonging of the country to the individual, and the individual to the country. Besides, such range of values from the history of the society has a determining function in revelation and shaping of social identity, which is the fundamental source feeding the sense of belonging. Nevertheless, postmodern thought constituting the background of constructivism denies religions, ideologies and major philosophies on grounds that they block relativism as a “meta message” and takes attention away from universalization focusing on partiality. This causes a crisis of value and meaning through dissociation of social bonds in general and social lack of perspective in particular.

As a simple example, the individual and social lack of perspective to emerge on determination of identities not simultaneously active-together in personal and social life may cause an identity and trust problem in both the relationship of

teachers to students and the relationship among students in classroom atmosphere. The trust problem may cause raising of a generation left in the second step of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and the identity problem may lead to lack of a community, common history and culture to be accepted as reference by as an individual when he/she defines him/herself or the place he/she belongs to.

Relativism, apart from causing the abundance of richness and diversification, may cause a hazard with its principles of contingency and variability. Because contingency and variability may cause occasional assuming of different identities by individuals, and even bearing various different identity elements simultaneously. This case can cause a knotty problem in both individual and social sense. Considering the fact that such a crisis of value and meaning might cause problems to students particularly in the first five years of primary school, this study tries to reveal and analyze with simple indicators the reflections of relativism on class communication and the state of togetherness within the classroom, which is one of the essential points of constructualist.

To produce reconciliation in common points to ensure communication within the classroom seems quite hard due to the contingency and ambiguity, which are the principal teachings of relativism. Because, relativism fails to advice a theory that prioritizes a common mind and dream which are needed in a country, society, family or class, and causes ambiguity about truth, reality, and even roles. It is probable that such ambiguity may cause an earthquake trauma on minds. It seems also very probable that an amoral and ahistoric society would emerge instead of a society with common visions and dreams.

As a conclusion, we should express that the future of Turkey, which has been unable to fully experience modernism in its worldview, moral norms, economy, literature or educational system, is under risk with the pressure of postmodernism. The function of postmodern paradigm, opening truth and knowledge to a deep relativity, and of constructualist, that is its extension in education, is incontrovertibly evident in alteration of the fabric and scent of this territory. In this context, it is obvious that some outcomes and troubles would entail inevitably due to a transformation of spirit of a society that succeeded in keeping its relationship with its ethical values and history alive for years. We should remember that "ethics comes before epistemology".

REFERENCES

- Aduğit, Y. (2013). Görsel mekânlarda ahlâki kayıtsızlık. *Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Sayı: 15, s. 1-24.
- Altan, İ. (1993). Mimarlıkta mekan kavramı. *Psikoloji Çalışmaları Dergisi*, Cilt: 19, s. 75-88.
- Atalay, İ. (2004). *Doğa bilimleri sözlüğü*. İzmir: Meta Basım Matbaacılık Hizmetleri.
- Barnlund, D. C. (1975). *Public and private self in Japan and the United States*. Tokyo: Simul Press.

- Bauman, Z. (2001). *Parçalanmış hayat* (Çev.: İ. Türkmen). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Bridge, B. (2003). *Siz olsaydınız ne yapardınız? Okulda iletişim*. İstanbul: Beyaz Yayınları.
- Charles, C. M., and Senter, G. W. (2005). *Elementary classroom management* (4th ed.). Boston, Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Cooper, K. (1989). *Sözsüz iletişim: İnsan yönetiminde vücut dilini nasıl kullanırsınız* (Çev.: T. Yalkı). İstanbul: İlgi Yayıncılık.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2011). *İletişimi anlamak*. Geliştirilmiş 4. Baskı, Ankara: Pozitif Matbaacılık.
- Göka, E. (t.y.). *Prof. Dr. Erol Göka ile Söyleşi*. [Internet- 18.04.2014] <http://cevresesehir.com/prof-dr-erol-goka-ile-soylesi/>
- Gür, Ş. Ö. (1996). *Mekan örgütlenmesi*. Trabzon: Gür Yayıncılık.
- Gür, Ş. Ö. ve Zorlu, T. (2006). *Çocuk Mekânları*. İstanbul: Yapı Endüstri Merkezi Yayınları.
- Hargie, O. (1992). *Communication: Beyond the crossroads*. Monograph, Jordanstown: University of Ulster.
- Hasol, D. (1975). *Ansiklopedik Mimarlık Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: YEM Yayınları.
- Işık, O. (1994). Değişen toplum/mekân kavrayışları: Mekânın politikleşmesi, politikanın mekânlaşması. *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi*, Sayı: 64-65, s. 7-38.
- Ito, Y. (1989). Socio-cultural backgrounds of Japanese interpersonal communication style. *Civilisations*, Vol: 39, No: 1/2, pp. 101-128.
- İzbirak, R. (1992). *Coğrafya terimleri sözlüğü*. İstanbul: MEB Yayınları.
- Lal Fernando, J. (t.y.). The crisis of identity and unity towards an ecumenical ethic. [Internet- 27.03.2014] <http://www.nhanduti.com/Mangostao.EN.ES%20texts/Jude%20Lal%20Fernando.The%20Crisis%20of%20Identity%20and%20Unity.pdf>
- Lefebvre, H. (1974). *The production of space* (Translated: D. Nicholson-Smith). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Marland, M. (1993). *The craft of the classroom: A survival guide to classroom management in the secondary school*. Oxford: Heinemann Educational.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2006). *Düşüncenin coğrafyası* (Çev.: G. Ç. Güven). 2. Basım, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages*. California: Belmont.
- Selçuk, Z. (2013). *Eğitimde fitrata dönelim* (19.03.2013). Web Site: http://www.yeniasya.com.tr/haber_detay2.asp?id=52013 24.10.2013 tarihinde alınmıştır.
- Sillars, S. (1995). *İletişim* (Çev.: N. Akın). Ankara: MEB Yayınları.
- Tayfun, R. (2007). *Etik iletişim ve beden dili*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Turgut, H. (2005). *Yapılandırmacı tasarım uygulamasının fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının bilimsel okuryazarlık yeterliklerinden "bilimin doğası" ve "bilim-teknoloji-toplum" ilişkisi boyutlarının gelişimine etkisi*. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.
- Uludağ, Z. ve Odacı, H. (2002). Eğitim öğretimi faaliyetlerinde fiziksel mekân. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, Sayı: 153-154.
- Watkins, C. & Wagner, P. (2000). *Improving school behaviour*. London: Sage/Paul Chapman Publications.
- Yalın, H. İ. (2008). *Öğretim teknolojileri ve materyal geliştirme*. 20. Baskı, Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Yapıcı, M. (2007). Yapılandırmacı ders. *Bilim, Eğitim ve Düşünce Dergisi*, Cilt: 7, Sayı: 4.
- Yüksel, Ö. (2006). *Davranış Bilimleri*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.

SUMMARY

Class is not only a space where the teacher and students are physically close, but also a social place of interaction where they bond from several aspects like moral, spiritual, aesthetical, intellectual etc.. Besides class is a space where individuals differing in several respects gather and act in togetherness, where individuals communicate in a way other than their usual communication habits. In the light of the analytic classification by Bauman on togetherness, this compilation study is about what kind of pattern the class communication and state of togetherness in class should have, and discusses what kind of a form of communication and state of togetherness the constructivist approach affecting the Turkish Education System since early 2000s resulted in.

Constructualism, which constitutes the philosophical foundation considers the world as a group of problems to be dealt with, and focuses on the individual's solving those problems by him/herself and inventing new things. This philosophical approach that focuses most on the individual features and skills of the individual, and realization of learning by oneself takes "do your job yourself" principle as a guide. This understanding brings to mind some questions on how class communication and the state of togetherness will run based on which values and ethical principles. Can the constructivist understanding focusing on the individual's experiencing a process extending to "I" take the social structure the individual feels a belonging to, and the togetherness and unity state the structure requires to a secondary and derivative dimension? Or can the 'individual' focus may make possible a risk and hazard of bringing the state of 'I' to an extreme in a way to exclude the sense of 'we'? Or can the uncertainty of the borders of "individualization" discredit the set of ethical concepts regarding the way one feels and the things he/she connects to, and wear several values that have ethical associations such as love, respect, tolerance, cooperation, trust etc., and that guide human life and relations? Can it delay or rule out one's understanding about what it means to be a society? These questions refer to the necessity of recognizing and describing what kind of space a class, and how the class communication and state of togetherness pattern are/should be. The article, in line with the necessity, first deals with the kind of relationship between space and man, what kind of space a classroom is, and what kind of space constructualism envisages; and then tries to describe the kind of pattern the state of communication and togetherness a constructivist classroom has.

This study is a theoretical one based on literature review. It has been realized by review, compilation, synthesis and presentation of the existing researches on constructivism, communication, and togetherness.

Constructivism is a point of view with very differing interpretations and sub-forms, but which depends in essence on discovery by the individual himself of his/her own way of knowing and learning. It is established on a relativist understanding which claims all of our knowledge and values as well as all

cognitive perceptions regarding the world are relative. It alleges that truth changes per place, time, group and individual. Unfortunately, this case means that relativism considers every understanding equally accurate because it accepts no criteria separating right from wrong. This is, however, something risky and adverse in terms of the classroom atmosphere requiring action within the framework of a reconciliation culture. The foundation of the communication process is “finding of common concepts” on which individuals producing and consuming the message agree. Relativism, nevertheless, can turn septic and agnostic attitude into a practice of life with its septic and agnostic attitude before events and conditions epistemologically aggravating becoming a party around “common concepts”; and even ultimately result in rough realism and opportunism claiming to possess the entire knowledge of the truth of human being.

Nevertheless, the existence of common concepts, rights and values is a significant phenomenon that cannot be overlooked particularly for students from 1st to 5th grade of primary school. Common concepts and rights have a vital significance for the students of this age to have a spirit of social solidarity and belonging being raised as individuals with cultural and ethical value, attitude and behavior. Production by relativism of knowledge and reality from its own rationality, thus its epistemological suggestion that each individual’s knowledge is valid may take an individual away from social phenomena. In this context, the risk that the communication and interaction network among students is established over fanaticism and polarization may arise without a common denominator and language.

Especially the future of Turkey, which has been unable to fully experience modernism in its worldview, moral norms, economy, literature or educational system, is under risk with the pressure of postmodernism. The function of postmodern paradigm, opening truth and knowledge to a deep relativity, and of constructualism, that is its extension in education, is incontrovertibly evident in alteration of the fabric and scent of this territory. In this context, it is obvious that some outcomes and troubles would entail inevitably due to a transformation of spirit of a society that succeeded in keeping its relationship with its ethical values and history alive for years.