

International Conference
EDUCATION
Across Borders
Florina

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN MACEDONIA
PREFECTURAL ADMINISTRATION OF FLORINA
MUNICIPALITY OF FLORINA

5-7 October 2012

Thematic Strands

- Language & Literature
- History & Culture
- Science & Mathematics
- Pedagogy & Psychology
- Information & Communications Technologies



UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN MACEDONIA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION



UNIVERSITY ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI-BITOLA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION



UNIVERSITY FAN S. NOLI OF KORÇA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

www.kosmit.uowm.gr/site/educbr

Values in greek and international educational texts. A semiotic approach.

Anastasia Christodoulou

nata@itl.auth.gr

Abstract

The education as we know it today is the product of a long journey that has not yet found its purpose. The journey is constantly redirected due to the influence of multiple factors, social, political, financial, and international interest. The current redirection of education at the international level aimed at creating conditions within an educational environment for the development and correlation with quality of life and students' wellbeing. It is a culture of values education, which (ideally) will result in saving the planet and sustainable development.

The aim of this paper¹ is a semiotic approach about the relation of the objectives of *paideia* and *education* in three different kinds of texts, two legal greek texts and a text-Report of the International Organization² UNESCO chaired by Jacques Delors (where education is described as a 'necessary Utopia'). The reason that the researcher focus on objectives and values in texts of local and international interest about education, it is because of a new trend in the international arena, entitled New Values Education as it is reflected from the international research (Lovat T., et al. ed, 2010).

Keywords: values education, semantic codes, J.Delors-Report to UNESCO, Greek Educational Law 1566/85, Constitution of Greece [Article 16(2)].

1.Introduction

There is a crisis in human values pervading the world, and in this midst of this crisis education is called upon to undertake the significant task of promoting a positive transformation of cultural values. Values-based education seems to be a top priority worldwide, possibly because even though values are considered to be a necessity in life, they seem to be deficient in practice (Nanzhao 2002: 353-357).

This study's focus is linked to a discussion in semiotic terms on objective- and value-related topics discussed in micro- and macro-level educational texts. Thus, within the scope of a semiotic textual analysis, I was interested in the explicit references made to the objectives of *paideia*³ and education as promoters of values, in texts that have different contexts, namely a local context for Greek texts and an international context for UNESCO texts.

The texts chosen to be analysed are different in terms of the type of text, the power they hold, their frame of reference and size. More specifically, the following texts were chosen: (a) the objective of *paideia* stated in the *Constitution of Greece* [Article 16(2)]⁴,

¹ This paper is based on the book, Χριστοδούλου (2012).

² See, Νάσκου-Πεπράκη (2011) for more information about the role of the International Organizations.

³ *Paideia* is a greek term (the ideal of education) and it means (in ancient Greece) a system of broad cultural education, and the culture of a society (Oxford Dictionary of English, 2010: 1276).

⁴ Article 16(2). "Education constitutes a basic mission for the State and shall aim at the moral, intellectual, professional and physical training of Greeks, the development of national and religious consciousness and at their formation as free and responsible citizens".

(b) the objectives of compulsory nine-year education listed in *Greek Educational Law 1566/1985* [Articles 1(a-e), 3.1, 4.1 and 5.1] and (c) the text titled ‘From economic growth to human development’, in Delors, J. (2002), *Learning, the Treasure Within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century*; Paris, UNESCO Publishing, pp.69-84.⁵

The first two texts, as the principal institutional texts establishing paideia and education⁶ in Greece, were for me a means of securing an ‘institutional starting point’, while the UNESCO Report was an important perspective on education in our era, particularly where the chapter connecting growth and human development is concerned.

My hypothesis was that, even though we are dealing with three different texts, there is a notional as well as ideological relationship between them which is linguistically expressed using regulatory terms, whether consciously chosen or not. The purpose of this paper is thus to explore the way in which these texts are related.

The definition of paideia provided by the Constitution leads to the uniform construction of an evaluative rather than conceptual (scientific) structure of paideia. Semantic structures — namely elements that build concepts — and their correspondence with social reality are axiomatic in nature rather than evidential. The legal definition of paideia found in the Constitution is not an evidential sequence of forms, but rather an axiomatic rule. It is an atemporal description that makes no reference to a particular socio-historical context (Βέλτσος 1974: 44-45).

The objective of paideia laid down in the Constitution largely determines the objective and goals of the education laws. Furthermore, the term education is reshaped into individual values within the goals established by these laws (Βρεττός & Καψάλης 1999: 110-111)⁷. An important stage in the education process is the determination of the goals of each subject, which progresses from the general to the more specific; in other words, from the education ideal to the overall objectives of education, and then on to the goals and objectives of the detailed courses, the writing of school books and so on.

It is a well-known fact that UNESCO’s modern-day role is to seek global visions of mutual respect and the sustainable development of nations. The UNESCO Report was the collective effort of a committee of eminent figures, who worked together under the presidency of Jacques Delors in order to express their thoughts on the changes they deem necessary in education in the twenty-first century so that humanity may successfully deal with situations directly related to human survival (climate, pollution, ecosystem degradation, disruption of ecological equilibrium, overpopulation, hole in the ozone, desertification, non-renewable resources). The UNESCO Report discusses the economic and social crises that humanity is facing in the 21st century and goes on to describe New Education as a ‘necessary Utopia’ and powerful means of fostering human development, a means that will meet the needs and demands of the new era.

⁵ In order to better present the research and the analysis results, the texts in the corpus of analysis have been conventionally assigned symbols, namely A (the objective of paideia in the Constitution), B (the objectives of compulsory education in Law 1566/85) and C (the UNESCO report).

⁶ This paper does not focus on pedagogic achievements: it analyses the texts as promoters of values while adopting a semiotic rather than a critical, interpretative or evaluative approach.

⁷ The specification of objectives has been the subject of heated debate at many levels (Βρεττός & Καψάλης 1999: 116-121).

2.Data and analysis

As an integral part of a material, socio-economic and political context, the texts have been analysed and interpreted using a socio-semiotic rather than a merely formal (formalistic) approach (Lagopoulos 2004: 161-162, Lagopoulos & Boklund-Lagopoulou 1992). Based on semiotics theory, the texts chosen constitute different meaning systems, and hence different means of communication that have encoded ideologies, given that they have different contexts. Texts, as ideological forms, often have a ‘latent consciousness’, a hidden ideology, since they present a particular image of the world (Storey 1993: 2-6). The ideology mainly functions at the level of the associations made, of frequently unconscious meanings that the texts convey. In this sense and according to Barthes, an ideology can be likened to a leader’s effort to limit certain associations, establish new ones and to generate new connotations.

To the extent that each word or expression is ideologically charged, particular importance is placed — over and above the meaning of a term — on its semiotic value, in other words, on the particular semiotic charge of each term when compared with other semiotically related terms. The ‘value’ of these terms, as ideologically charged terms, reflects their ideology, which makes it possible to explore associations in related terms (Βενιζέλος 1981: 141). In essence, the discussion on the analysis of the terms *paideia*, *education* and *values* is not one of contrasting meanings, but a comparison of world views (Iedema 1995: 22-36).

The delimitation of vague or undefined concepts (*paideia*, *education*, *values*) —concepts which have variable content or are unspecified to a small or large extent (e.g. morality, good faith, public interest) — is neither uncommon nor a marginal phenomenon, and is dealt with in many disciplines (philosophy, pedagogy). Vague concepts have a varying semantic content with a broad and elastic scope that is determined by the speaker and the context in question. Owing to their chief attribute, namely their close ties to social reality, vague concepts throw an era’s prevalent values into high relief (Κουτούπα-Ρεγκάκου 1990).

A vague concept’s conversion to another concept (its transformation, specification, replacement) is indicative of the arrangement of the term’s boundaries within the relevant context and also of the restrictions placed on the term’s content. It is within this framework of restrictions and clarifications that the concepts *paideia*, *education* and *values* are linked in the three texts chosen. To achieve its goal, this study has made use of Greimas’ (1966) model of semiotic analysis, as implemented by Lagopoulos & Boklund-Lagopoulou (1992), Boklund-Lagopoulou (1980, 1982, 1986), Χριστοδούλου (2003, 2007) and Kourdis (2009).

The objectives in the three texts, A, B and C, were approached as articulated semantic sets that carry an ideological charge stemming from their relevant frame of reference. The analysis focused on the texts’ structural elements, that is, their codes. Eighteen codes were identified that cover the texts’ semantic content. They are, in alphabetical order, the: cultural code, economic code, emotional code, environmental code, geographic code, intellectual code, learning code, moral code, national code, physical education code, professional code, religious code, school education code, social code, technological code, temporal code, values code and well-being code. There follows an

overall presentation and distribution of the eighteen codes in the three texts of the corpus of analysis (Table 1)⁸.

Table 1. Comparative presentation of the codes in the three texts, A, B and C

A	B	C
Values code	+	+
Professional code	+	+
Social code	+	+
Intellectual code	+	+
National code	+	-
Moral code	+	-
Physical education code	+	-
Religious code	-	-
	Geographic code	+
	Cultural code	+
	Technological code	+
	Economic code	+
	School education code	-
	Emotional code	-
		Well-being code
		Learning code
		Environmental code
		Temporal code
TOTAL 8	TOTAL 13	TOTAL 12

Thus, based on the above table, we note that text A has eight codes (values code, professional code, social code, intellectual code, national code, moral code, physical education code and religious code), text B has thirteen codes (values code, professional code, social code, intellectual code, national code, moral code, physical education code, geographic code, cultural code, technological code, economic code, school education code and emotional code) and text C has twelve codes (values code, professional code, social code, intellectual code, geographic code, cultural code, technological code, economic code, well-being code, learning code, environmental code and temporal code).

Certain conclusions can be reached from the analysis data and Table 1 regarding the relationship between the three texts (A, B and C).

⁸ In the table, the symbol + indicates the code's existence in the relevant text and the symbol – its absence from it.

3. Conclusions

The analysis data have made it possible to identify the relationship between the three texts and to put forward certain parallel views.

First conclusion. The first relationship evident in Table 1 is that the three texts (A, B and C) intersect where their semantic codes are concerned, given that they have a common core of four codes (intellectual code, values code, professional code and social code), albeit with a different semantic content. The other codes do not at first glance appear to be connected in any way. We can thus define the initial relationship between the texts as $A \cap B \cap C$ (A intersect with B intersect with C) in a set Ω (where Ω is the set of all the elements comprising the term *education*, a term with the potential to provide multiple semantic meanings).

Second conclusion. Taking another look at the relationship between the texts, based on the analysis, we could consider the terms *new paideia* and *new education* as synonymous in text C. In this case, text C can be examined: (a) in terms of its equivalence to A, that is, $A \Leftrightarrow C$, since both texts describe the education ideal (*paideia*), and (b) in terms of B being part of C, that is, $B \subset C$ (B is a subset of C)⁹. The interest ratio of B to C concerns the exploration of the texts' differences in terms of semantic codes. What needs to be determined is B's difference in terms of the new elements in the new educational proposal, with regard to quantitative and qualitative aspects, in other words B's complement in C (Table 2).

Table 2. Comparative table of codes found in texts B and C and rate of participation in their reference set

Codes	B	C
Values code	31.0%	50.0%
Intellectual code	22.0%	2.5%
Social code	18.0%	15.0%
Cultural code	4.0%	2.5%
Economic code	3.0%	15.0%
Learning code	-	10.0%
Environmental code	-	5.0%
Physical education code	6.0%	-
Professional code	4.0%	-
National code	3.0%	-
Geographic code	3.0%	-
Religious code	2.0%	-

⁹ Set A is a proper subset of B, or $A \subset B$, if and only if every element of A is an element of B, but there exists at least one element in B that is not an element of A. If set A is a subset of reference set Ω , then A's complement is all the elements in Ω which are not elements of A.

Emotional code	2.0%	-
School education code	1.0%	-
Technological code	1.0%	-
Moral code	-	-
Well-being code	-	-
Temporal code	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%

Based on Table 2 above, of the group of eighteen codes included in the analysis: (a) five codes are common to B and C (30.0% of the total number of codes), namely the values code, the social code, the economic code, the intellectual code and the cultural code, (b) two codes are only found in C (15.0% of the total number of codes), namely the learning code and the environmental code, (c) eight codes concern B (45% of all the codes), namely the national code, the professional code, the religious code, the emotional code, the school education code, the technological code, the physical education code and the geographical code and (d) three codes are found neither in B nor C.¹⁰

There follows a presentation of the comparative (qualitative and quantitative) data of the five common codes found in B and C as well as a description of their semiotic mechanism.

(a) It is the values code that is mostly referred to in the two texts. In text B (30.0%), the values code is associated with: (i) intellectual values (progress, growth and development of the personality), (ii) values of justice (law), (iii) moral values (respect for human values, equality, ethics), (iv) social values (creativity, progress of society as a whole, freedom), (v) personal or professional values (cooperation, initiative, responsibility), (vi) humanistic values (love for one's fellow man, nature, the environment, friendship, humanism), (vii) political values (democracy, collective effort, constructive dialogue), (viii) religious values and (ix) national values.

In text C, the values code is associated with: (i) material values (nutrition for all), (ii) biological values (health for all), (iii) intellectual values (cultivation of man's ability to control his development), (iv) values of justice (justice), (v) moral values (global ethics, respect for the natural environment), (vi) social values (collectiveness, contribution to social progress, racial equality, assumption of responsibility by all members of society), (vii) personal or professional values (cooperation, initiative) and (viii) values that determine quality of life (ecology). In addition to the per capita income index (economic values) and technological indices (intellectual values), new education will also have to take into account the environmental (global ethics), cultural (intellectual values) and ecological (environmental values) dimensions of the term *growth and development*.

¹⁰ These codes have however been linked to sub-chapters 1 to 5 of text C, which are not included in this table because they describe the current economic model in the world while sub-chapters 6 and 7 describe the vision of development through education and are presented here.

We therefore note that the two texts incorporate a number of values. Their difference lies in the type of content as regards the values code and in their correlations. Text C differs from B in that it incorporates into its values system material and biological values (nutrition and health for all) — values that determine a nation's well-being — as well as other values, such as environmental ethics, economic values, cultural values and ecological values. Text B, too, has certain values that are not found in C, namely humanistic values, political values, religious values and national values, which stem from the particular (local) context and the relevant historical background.

It should be noted that text C's learning code is associated with the right of all people worldwide to education; it is also associated with education levels, research and innovation, as well as with knowledge, training, educators and the adaptability of education to society's needs. Education aims to activate the potential of today's and future human beings. It is proposed that human potential can be activated by incorporating a number of values in education.

We could therefore say that, where education is concerned, the semiotic mechanism in text C is oriented around values: *education (as everyone's right) + attributes (adaptability to society's needs) = values-based education (in order to activate human potential)*. The values orientation seems to be more significant than any other orientation when it comes to human development. If it is to solve the various social issues that have arisen (unemployment, hunger, social inequalities, environment, resources), education will have to become flexible, adaptable and dynamic and will have to respond to local conditions so as to achieve democratic participation, eradicate poverty and unemployment, promote self-employment, foster self-awareness for the improvement of living conditions of future generations, promote survival as a passport to life, encourage new activities at the individual and societal level and enable social inclusion (social code: 1.5%). Education will have to be based on education (intellectual code: 2.5%), an education that is associated with numerous values concerning the survival of modern man and the following generations (values code: 50%).

Added to the above agglomeration of values in C is the environmental code (at 2.5%), which refers to humanity's living conditions being threatened as a result of the current economic model and to the consequences of the rate of development, industry and non-renewable energy sources. In other words, the semiotic mechanism identified refers to the following association: *education = values-based education = solution of social and environmental issues = human development*.

(b) The social code in text B (18.0%) is associated with humankind, democratic citizenship, harmonious social inclusion, the improvement of man's life, interpersonal relationships, life experience, balanced human development, behaviour as prescribed by the values system, the relationship between the individual and groups, as well as social characteristics such as descent, identity, race, sex, age and group (pupils). Where the social code is concerned, the difference between B and C is only evident in the correlations with other codes. In other words, B does not sufficiently link the solution of social issues to values-based education.

(c) The economic code in text B (1.0%) concerns man's improvement within the context of his cultural, social and economic life so that he may achieve balanced growth. In text C (15.0%), the economic code is associated with non-material investments and education rather than with what is currently applicable in the world (global economy

and wealth, unfair redistribution of productive surplus, competition and expenses, market inefficiencies and increased production, rise in GDP per capita, sales, capital and investments and economic modernization based on the current model of modern growth and development, growth rates, the relationship between education and development and the Asian growth and development model as a good example).

As regards the economy, the semiotic mechanism between B and C tends towards the following association: *economy = investment in non-material values = investment in education = (balanced) human development*. Previously an end in itself, the economy now becomes a means to an end in C, since it changes content and becomes associated with education. Text C somehow demonstrates a change in the content it had up until now in the current growth and development model, since without education there cannot be any growth and development or any solution of social issues.

(d) The intellectual code in text B is much more prevalent (22.0%) than in text C (2.5%) and also differs in content from the latter. The references in B concern the development of intellectual skills, mental cultivation, the recognition of social value and parity, literature and the arts, human psychosomatic powers, aesthetics, development, knowledge assimilation, verbal expression, knowledge and its acquisition, skills, capabilities, talents, interests, the ability to distinguish relationships and interactions, the ability to understand and express symbols, the cultivation of the senses, the organisation of actions, social concerns, language cultivation, mental development, the organisation of values into a system, relationship with the world around us.

In C, the intellectual code is associated with the broader view of man's development and his ability to control and organize his environment according to his needs. The semiotic mechanism in C can thus be expressed as follows as far as the intellectual code is concerned: *intellectual code = code of values = human development = man's ability to control and organize his environment according to his needs*. In other words, text C focuses on human needs, which is not the case in text B. Man's recognition and control of his needs and his relationship with the environment are the incentive for his development, in other words, they constitute a relationship of self-awareness between man himself and the world around him.

Third conclusion. A third perspective of the relationship between the three texts identifies an equivalence between A, B and C, which tends towards a certain equilibrium (as regards the codes and their relevant semantic charge) that describes 'educated' man. In other words, it identifies an equivalence where $A \leftrightarrow B$, $A \leftrightarrow C$, but with different codes articulated in each case (B, C).

This view is based on the reasoning that each and every definition of the objectives of education tends to transform the ideal of education (*paideia*). More specifically, if we consider that the objectives of education reveal an era's level of self-awareness and its attitude to humankind's earlier cultural development and changes, then we could say that the objectives of education are constantly changing, and this transformation is progressing towards the development of an ideal, namely educated¹¹ man. This means that given that the ideal reflects a specific world theory, a spherical perception of human existence with regard to an understanding of the meaning of human life (including the

¹¹ Evidently, the resultant outcome of the overall potential of education, in the manner that the Constitution defines it, is that man becomes educated, or learned (Παπανούτσος 1977: 98).

restrictions and capabilities of human existence in the world), then this perspective must be reflected in the objective of education and must undergo change (Παυλίδης 2006: 99-127).

Moreover, if we accept that: (a) the objectives of education embody a selective stance towards cultural assets and express broader social and moral ideals, (b) man's modern needs are the criteria by means of which cultural goods are selected and (c) education brings about change in individuals, its purpose being to enable individuals to achieve a desired future state in which people's perceptions of the content of a good life play an important role in the education objectives set, then we can assume that every 'education objective' encodes, systematizes, brings into awareness and selects specific cultural goods (Παυλίδης 2006).

The above, in conjunction with the analysis data, lead to an investigation of the relationship between the four codes included in the objective of education (text A), namely the national code, the moral code, the physical education code and the religious code, which are not part of the common core of codes existing between B and C on the one hand and A on the other (first conclusion). Using more systematic terminology, we are led to think of the relationships between A on the one hand and B and C on the other being specified through transformation. From Table 1 we can deduce that there is a core of four codes that is common to A, B and C (values code, social code, intellectual code and professional code).

Within this context, when comparing the three texts, we observe that of the set of eight codes in A, as the basic core of education, the religious code is absent from B and four codes — the national code, the moral code, the religious code and the physical education code — are absent from C. The absence of the above codes from B and C may be an indication of their transformation or replacement with other codes, which can be justified by the different context of the texts. The transformation of the education ideal (as a constant, irrespective of context) into education objectives assumes different values, which indicates the flexibility with which vague concepts can be given semantic meaning depending on their frame of reference.

The equivalence between the three texts is not merely a general and abstract relationship; it assumes a very specific form owing to the relationships between the semantic codes. As we will see, these relationships are not neutral, but assume a more specific form (based on the above).

In fact, we observe that: (a) the national code in text A (Greek) remains a national code in B (Greece, Greek), but changes to a geographic code in text C. In other words, the interest in a national territory in B becomes an interest in the international and global environment, which concerns the education of all the people in the world rather than only that of the Greeks.

(b) The moral code in text A remains a moral code in B, but becomes an environmental moral code concerning human respect for the environment as the heritage of future generations.

(c) The physical education code in A remains a physical education code in B, but in C becomes a learning or cultural code. In other words, within a local context, the physical education code remains constant, but in an international context (text C) it is transformed or incorporated into two other codes, namely the learning and cultural codes.

(d) The religious code in A, which is absent from B and C, has possibly been moved to the three texts' common core of codes and has become a code of values. This can be justified, since in an international sphere, which concerns humanity as a whole, a religious consciousness would be an obstacle. In other words, an international text (C) that concerns everyone would transform the religious code into a code of values. The above equivalencies show that the relationships between texts are truly relationships of transformation.¹²

In this case we observe, based on the analysis, that the group of codes merged in texts B and C, in order to form an equivalence with A, is in fact different, as we can see in Table 1. The paradigmatic articulation of the above equivalence — $A \Leftrightarrow B$, $A \Leftrightarrow C$ — is therefore a qualitative keystone on which the codes of the definitions of education (B, C) are built in relation to the eight codes of the objective of paideia (A). The qualitative keystone reflects the ideological sphere of each context (local, international), as seen above. In other words, the codes participating in the articulation of the equivalence $A \Leftrightarrow B$ and $A \Leftrightarrow C$ are different in terms of the sets to which they belong, their types of reference and the articulation between references. Otherwise, the paradigmatic articulation of the definition of the objectives of education in the two texts would be the same in both contexts (local where Greece is concerned and international where UNESCO is concerned).

The conclusions thus indicate the type of relationship between paideia and education (or the building of the relationship) in three different texts (A, B and C), based on the process of transformation of the objective of education (irrespective of context) into objectives of education. Thus, based on the above three conclusions, we cannot safely refer to just one relationship between the three texts. Instead, we must speak of three relationships that are specialized (based on different perspectives of the texts).

References

- Βέλτσος, Γ. (1974). *Σημειολογία των πολιτικών θεσμών. Σημειολογική ανάλυση της 'Ελευθερίας της πληροφόρησης' και πολιτική εξουσία*. Αθήνα: Παπαζήσης.
- Βενιζέλος, Ε. (1981). Σημειολογικές παρατηρήσεις πάνω στο Σύνταγμα του 1975. *Αρμενόπουλος- Επιστημονική επετηρίδα* (2), σ.135-142.
- Boklund-Λαγοπούλου, Κ. (1980). Δομές συνειρμικής σημασίας και ανάλυση λογοτεχνικών κειμένων. Στο *Σημειωτική και κοινωνία* (σ.207-224). Ελληνική Σημειωτική Εταιρία. Αθήνα: Οδυσσέας.
- Boklund-Λαγοπούλου, Κ. (1982). Οι σύγχρονες μέθοδοι ανάλυσης λογοτεχνικών κειμένων. *Φιλολόγος* 29, σ. 145-162.
- Boklund-Λαγοπούλου, Κ. (1986). Η κοινωνική λειτουργία των λογοτεχνικών κειμένων στη μεσαιωνική Αγγλία: μια κοινωνιο-σημειωτική προσέγγιση. Στο *Η δυναμική των σημείων. Πεδία και μέθοδοι μιας κοινωνιοσημειωτικής* (σ.73-94). Θεσσαλονίκη: Παρατηρητής.

¹² Moreover, Boklund-Lagopoulou (1980) notes that there is an ideological — restrictive — mechanism that determines the organization of texts. This mechanism is fundamentally socio-historical in nature, since there are social limits that prescribe what a social group can perceive and what it cannot. On the other hand, Kapsomenos (1996) states that when one pole of a relationship is synonymous with or equivalent to other terms, then that pole can be classified under a broader paradigm.

- Βρεττός, Γ. Ε, Καυγάλης, Α. Γ. (1999). *Αναλυτικό πρόγραμμα. Σχεδιασμός-αξιολόγηση-αναμόρφωση*. Αθήνα: Ελληνικά Γράμματα.
- Greimas, A.-J. (1966). *Sémantique structural. Recherche de method*. Paris: Larousse.
- Delors, J. (2002). *Learning, the Treasure Within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century*; Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Iedema, R. (1995). Legal ideology: The role of language in common law appellate judgments. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* Vol. VIII, n.22, 21-36.
- Καψωμένος, Ε.Γ. (1996). Προβλήματα μεθόδου σε μια κοινωνιο-σημειωτική προσέγγιση της λογοτεχνίας. Παράδειγμα ανάλυσης: το κλέφτικο τραγούδι, στο *Η ζωή των σημείων*, σ.453-484. Θεσσαλονίκη: Παρατηρητής.
- Κουρδής Ε. (2009). Signs, culture and ideology in Southeast Europe. Semiotic codes in language, cultural and translation attitudes from the perspective of the Greeks. In *Synthèses 2: Langue, Interculture, Communication*, Département de Langue et de Littérature Françaises de l'Université Aristote de Thessalonique, p.113-134.
- Κουτούπα-Ρεγκάκου Ε. (1990). Ο ρόλος των αόριστων εννοιών στο σύγχρονο κράτος δικαίου. Στο Κ.Μ. Σταμάτη (επιμ.), *Όψεις του Κράτους δικαίου. Ιστορικές αναδρομές στην ελληνική θεωρία και αναζητήσεις*. Αθήνα-Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδ. Σάκκουλα.
- Λαγόπουλος, Α.-Φ. (2004). *Επιστημολογίες του νοήματος, δομισμός και σημειωτική*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Επίκεντρο.
- Lagopoulos, A. Ph. & Boklund-Lagoroulou, K (1992). *Meaning in Geography: The social Conception of the Region in Northern Greece*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Clement, N. (ed), (2010). *International Research Handbook on Values education and Student Wellbeing*. London, New York: Springer.
- Nanzhao Z. (2002). Interactions of education and culture for economic and human development: an asian perspective. In J.Delors, *Learning, the Treasure Within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 239-246). Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Νάσκου-Περράκη, Ρ. (2011). *Το δίκαιο των Διεθνών Οργανισμών. Η θεσμική διάσταση*. Αθήνα-Κομοτηνή: Αντ. Ν. Σάκκουλας.
- Νόμος 1566/1985. *Δομή και λειτουργία της πρωτοβάθμιας και δευτεροβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης και άλλες διατάξεις*. (ΦΕΚ 167Α/30.09.1985).
- Oxford Dictionary of English*, 2010, Third Edition.
- Παπανούτσος, Ε.Π. (1977). *Φιλοσοφία και παιδεία*. Αθήνα: Ίκαρος.
- Παυλίδης, Π. (2006). Αναζητώντας τους σκοπούς της εκπαίδευσης. Για την επανεξέταση του ιδεώδους της αυτονομίας. *Σύγχρονη εκπαίδευση*, τ.147,σ. 99-127.
- Παυλίδης Π. (2012). *Η γνώση στη διαλεκτική της κοινωνικής εξέλιξης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Επίκεντρο.
- Storey J. (1993). *An introductory guide to cultural theory and popular culture*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Σύνταγμα της Ελλάδος, όπως αναθεωρήθηκε με το Ψήφισμα της 27^{ης} Μαΐου 2008 της Η' Αναθεωρητικής Βουλής των Ελλήνων, Βουλή των Ελλήνων, 2010

Χριστοδούλου, Α. (2003). *Σημειωτική και σχολικά εγχειρίδια*. Θεσσαλονίκη: University Press.

Χριστοδούλου, Α. (2007). *Σημειωτική και πολιτισμός στην ξένη γλώσσα*. Θεσσαλονίκη: University Press.

Χριστοδούλου, Α. (2012). *Παιδεία, εκπαίδευση και αξίες. Μια σημειωτική προσέγγιση*. Θεσσαλονίκη: University press.

Χριστοδούλου, Α. & Κάρτσακα, Ε. (2012). Μοντέλο χαρτογράφησης αξιών σε μουσειακό περιβάλλον. *Τετράδια Μουσειολογίας*, τ.8.

Brief bio

Anastasia Christodoulou is assistant professor in Semiotic in the Department of Italian Language and Literature, at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. She holds a M.Sc. degree and Ph.D.degree from Sciences of Language, Communication and Technology in Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Her research interests lie in the areas of Semiotics and Culture analysis (text and images) in Education and a more recent interest is values .