

MATERIAL, INTENTION AND ORIENTATION OF THE MESSAGE

Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU,
Professor, PhD, CCSCMOP, University of Craiova, Romania;
E-mail vladutescu.stefan@ucv.ro

Abstract

The present study is located to the epistemology of communication and aims mainly to clarify the inscription of the message with intent and the orientation given by it. The secondary aims to highlight ten types of materials with which the message is constructed (signs, codes, clues, indicators, clues, signals, symbols, images, symptoms, default stories). The method used is a comparative-meta-analytical one. The conclusion reached is that any message is targeted, that every message has a purpose.

Keywords: communication, message, purpose, orientation, intention

1. Action, interaction, transaction

Any communication is a simultaneous and inevitable action, interaction and transaction. Finally, it can be a transaction between two communicators or between a communicator and several communicators, between a receiving communicator and a text. In any case, communicators to

“be on the same wavelength” must run the three states of being a communicator: action, interaction, transactions. When they pay attention to the same information, communicators reach the highest level of communication, that of transaction type. In other words, complete, perfect, total communication is a transaction that has been imbued with action and interaction. The central element of the communication transaction is the relationship, a flexible and attentive reaction to feedback and feedforward. The communication relationship is usually part of social relationships that influence the interpretation and use of messages. A lover and his girlfriend, under the moonlight, are in a social transaction that risks a lot to give, on the one hand, a certain emotional content and on the other hand to give certain meanings to everything that is said. Obviously, there is always a difference in quality between a close and direct communication relationship and a long-distance or long-term communication relationship. At the same time, whether we have a face-to-face or mediated communication, or it would be immediate or distant in time and space, the communication relationship will have three cardinal elements and two fundamental forms of action. These three cardinal elements are the sender, the message and the receiver. It is no longer necessary to defend the idea that the message has its own existence, independent of both sender and receiver. When someone wants to question this idea, then they need to think about how they feel when they go to put a letter in the mail and would like to take it back to change something. The letter is completely out of his control. The message is a letter.

Once built and sent, it becomes independent; the message producer can no longer change the message once it is placed in the communication stream. The producer of the message, the sender is in the situation of a general who would send his troops to battle without accompanying them, in which case he, the general, must wait for the news on the front to know if his orders are obeyed, how the enemy army reacts and what is the result of the battle. Once

sent, the message will enter the receiver's power. In this sense, Gilles Willett points out: "The message exists in the form of a sign or a set of signs with no other meaning than that assigned by the receiver, due to a cultural apprenticeship" (Willett, 1992, pp. 83-84). The message is not made of signs, but of meanings. Let's be clear: language is a system of signs. So the sign belongs to the language. Instead, meanings are elements of discourse. The message is the force of speech; it is not constructed from signs, but from contextual-situational decodings of signs, that is, from meanings. Without a decoder (receiver), speech has no message. The receiver gives by force of his mind the force of speech through the message. In addition, it is likely that the two strong communicators (sender and receiver) will never give the exact same meaning to a micro-message, a message-building material, a message in its entirety and even that, between sender and recipient, "equivalence "The meanings of a speech should not be perfect. The message is simply a set of meanings in direct connection with the traditions, customs, cultural acquisitions of communicators. These meanings will be largely affected by the cultural framework, the existential experience, the situation of the recipient and the psychological context. The issuing communicator constructs from different materials, the optimal meanings thanks to which he hopes to provoke this or that communicative and / or practically social effect or behavior. This would be the first act of the communication process. The receiving communicator scans, inventories the received meanings and makes a selection that he structures as a message; subsequently, he interprets this message as articulated and reacts to it. These two acts are not clearly differentiated temporally and structurally; however, they are distinct and based on different motivations. It turns out that the first function of communication is to put people in a relationship, to substantiate a transaction. Let's take an example: a communicator says "Good evening" to another communicator; he does not intend to convey anything about the current state of affairs. In fact, he makes

a polite and friendly gesture, generating a micro-message of friendship. Another example: someone is reading a newspaper; in doing so, this communicator is informed of changes in its environment; In addition, this communicator is exposed to taking a certain dose of persuasion administered by the editors and chroniclers of the newspaper and has fun with comics and some reports. Starting only from these examples, it can be seen, it can be deduced that it is rare that the messages have only one purpose and that, very often, the manifest content of the messages is not the one taken into account at all. The latent message of communication may be more meaningful than its manifest content. The uses, uses that can be given to one and the same message can vary greatly from one communicator to another. Any message can have multiple functions for the same receiver. Thus, an entertainment message will not be used by all for the purpose of strict fun, some can use it, interpret it politically, others in a social sense. Any message can be functional in various ways.

Communication always involves an action, interactional, relational-transactional component that has a structuring role. In this perspective, Klaus Krippendorff states the following general law of communication: “Any process of communication, once initiated and maintained, leads to the formation of a structure” (Krippendorff, 1971, p. 171). In other words, what is developed over time is a mutually acceptable model of interdependence, ie a structure. Krippendorff defines communication as a “process of transmitting a structure between the parts, identifiable in time and space, of a system” (Krippendorff, 1969, p. 107). This system can be biological, cognitive or social in nature (Cioroai et al., 2019; Yücesan, 2020). The whole process of communication is a dynamic and open system of messages. Data analysis can determine whether these processes have their own existence and specific characteristics. Communication is manifest in the system when its behavior cannot be explained by the behavior of its parts taken in isolation.

Communication always involves a grid encoding one form of communication into another form of communication, for example transforming a mental image into a verbal message.

2. Intention and orientation in the message

The relationship, the action, the interaction, the transaction and the meanings form the core of the message; they are found, they can be identified in the structuring center of the message. If there is no action, interaction, transaction, meaning and relationship, then it must rightly be considered that there is no message. Outside the transaction, what is observed, what it means is not ordinal to the message. If finally there is a synthesizer a transaction, then we must conclude that this simple yet complex fact is already significant and that there is a message. As for meanings as such, they can be of two kinds: assigned or found (Voinea, 2015; Voinea, 2017; Strehie, 2015). Whatever category it belongs to, the meanings always depend on a communicator and a situation. Constantin Noica pointed out that “the fundamental question of knowledge is whether to understand means to find or to put meanings” (Noica, 1993, p. 51). He opted for the thesis of meaning, that is, man puts meanings. Just as Martin Heidegger demonstrates that any comprehension must be preceded by a pre-comprehension, so, we say, before any message there is a pre-message: the pre-message consists in a unilateral or bilateral investment of intentionality. Specifically: there is no message without a trace of intent. The message is generated by a unilateral or bilateral intention. It bears irrepressibly an intentional inscription: either recipient- “ial”, ie induced by the issuer, by the recipient, or recipient- “ial”, ie induced by the recipient, or an inscription, a bilateral imprint. The intention of signification represents its distinctive sign, the mark of individualization. On the other hand, as a constitutive element of a consciousness that lives only as a consciousness of something, as a consciousness towards something, the intention inertially

takes over from this the teleological directivity, the orientation, the tendency towards, with a Greek word is impregnated with an “orexis “. The intention turns out to be teleological, it contains a project of influence. By coordinating ideas, it can be inferred that any message has a teleological character.

The purposes for which the necessary energy is provided become causes and produce effects. Thus, the final structure of the message intervenes, becomes manifest in the communication circuit and produces effects, induces influences (Negrea, 2018; Negrea, 2019a; Negrea, 2019b; Voinea, 2019). Under these conditions, it seems pertinent to ask questions such as “with what intention is the message transmitted, what is the intention of the message: to persuade, to convince, to seduce, to manipulate, to flatter, to control, to to scare, to make a mess, to terrorize etc. “

3. The material of the message

Indeed, the analysis of intention, which must be directed at understanding the tension between the expression of a need and satisfaction, does not explain the phenomenon of the message, but makes understand the way in which individuals use the signs and codes necessary for its particular practical production. The material of the message can be formed by signs, codes, clues, indicators, clues, signals, symbols, images, symptoms, implicit stories. These 10 types of materials can be used either using one, several or all of them within the same message. The differences in understanding their message come from what materials each receiver considers the communicator-sender has selected and used. In other words, the message is first and foremost a matter of choosing the production material and a problem of thinking in terms of the material used. Whoever chooses the material well will build a better message. On the other hand, whoever understands the message in appropriate terms regarding the material used, will be able to understand more accurately the projected message, the constructed message.

The material of the message carries much of the intent of the message. Indeed, the analysis of the intention of the message allows to reveal the level of consciousness and the type of strategy of the interlocutors in a communication situation, as well as the value induced by a message. Intention is the criterion of the semiological message (Mounin, 1968, p. 37). The selection of a message by a recipient is not guaranteed, because the recipient will understand the meaning and intent that the sender will encode. Interpretations and meanings of a message are always reduced to a small number of possibilities, even if the interrelationships between thought, objects and symbols allow access to a huge range of interpretations and possible meanings. A message cannot be interpreted anyway: some factors intervene in reducing the possibilities of interpreting a message. On the one hand, memory, experience, apprenticeship in the given cultural context have contributed to the construction of our mental structures as matrices of perceptions, attitudes and interpretations. On the other hand, as each communication situation has its own characteristics, some words we use are loaded with a certain meaning. And this is because the human being has a certain sense of consensus, compromise and convergence, because he accepts, in most cases, what is declared to be true without asking questions (Pelau & Rosca, 2018; Enachescu, 2020; Jora et al, 2020; Şahin & Kargın, 2020).

An act of communication allows to create realities due to signals, signs, symbols, meanings, sub-meanings, in a word due to messages. Acceptance of the act, its integration in the phenomenon of organization, makes possible the emergence of structure, order, meaning and significance (Alaran et al., 2020; Fernández-Bedoya et al. 2020). However, messages that result from an act and a communication situation always have a great deal of ambiguity about the ways to interpret them and to assign / discover / find their meaning. The signs and messages that produce it by assembling them can mean all kinds of different things depending on the context (physical, social, etc.) of

communication. “It does not communicate with unique or isolated peers, but with sets of signs, joined according to certain rules. In other words, it does not change signs, but messages” (Willett, 1992, p. 124). Signs do not allow communication unless they are combined in such a way as to produce meaning, to produce information. Truth is not a message, neither to be nor real. “Truth is real” (Heiddeger, 1988, p. 156); all that is real is message. The act of “moving” is not a message, but a combination of movements capable of signifying the sequence of approach is a message (Талалаева, 2020; Чернова, &Талалаева, 2020). The sequences “Peter-admire-Paul” and “Paul-admire-Peter” form two satisfying messages. The same words make two messages with different meanings. The sequence “rabbit-jump” is an ambiguous message, the form “-le” of the definite article indicating the singular number, and the form “sar” of the verb indicates the plural. The verb “to come” is not a message, but the form “comes” is one, it is a message. In order to produce, build or understand messages, we need communication codes. But only communication codes allow communication in the narrow sense of information exchange through messages. A communication code is the union of two components: a repertoire of signs and one of the rules for joining these signs, which allow the production of meaningful messages (intelligible and information-bearing): “it is a system of signs with the rules of use”, as Carnap says (Apud Mounin, 1975, p. 108). Natural languages or language codes (German, French, Chinese, etc.) are obviously among the most developed communication codes (Xue, Yang & Chen, 2020; Şahin, Kargin, Uz & Kılıç, 2020; Şahin, Kargin & Kılıç). In communication (in the narrow sense of the term), we send and receive messages (and not just information), and for this we must use communication codes. That is why it is said that messages are encoded and decoded. The message requires knowledge of the codes. Codes are repertoires of signs associated with some merging rules to produce meaningful messages. The main action of the codes is to allow communication

in the sense of exchanging messages. The code / message ratio is dialectical. In mass communication, with messages circulating in one direction (or almost), the receiver would be constantly confined to a passive role. The scientific study of perception shows that to perceive means to seek, to differentiate, to distinguish, to filter, to sort, to re-know, to compare, to associate... in short, it means to re-construct reality. The receiver must know the code used by the sender (lexicon and rules) and, starting from this knowledge, reconstruct the message issued, associating with the perceived words and their combination “good, adapted” meaning. Three factors complicate this operation: the concrete variability of linguistic utterances, the polysemy of linguistic signs and the existence of parallel messages with linguistic messages. Moreover, the way we receive signs, signals and messages has two levels: denotation and connotation. Indeed, when we speak we do not limit ourselves to encoding linguistic messages, we produce at the same time, voluntarily or not, all kinds of non-verbal messages (such as gestures, positions, facial expressions, etc.) and paralinguistic messages (such as tone and volume, flow rate, etc.) (Narita, 2019). These parallel messages confirm, accentuate, nuance, relativize or sometimes contradict the linguistic message itself. Thus, the statement “I am of course calm” can be denied by paralinguistic elements (very fast flow, very strong and sharp voice...) and paraverbal elements (redness of the face, tremors, jerky breathing...). The “true” message is the result of all these micro-messages, and in order to decode a message we must really build a meaning for it, taking into account any potential content of the communication. Because it best allows you to take into account all the micro-messages that flow simultaneously across multiple channels, face-to-face communication facilitates richer exchanges - complete, complex - than mediated communication. It should be added that the receiver is not limited to perceiving and decoding: it interprets. Indeed, the meaning it gives to the received messages depends not only on their global

communicative content (numerous simultaneous messages circulating in various channels), but also on the context of communication, in its broadest sense. To fully understand a message, we should correlate it with its overall context. Messages, in the strict sense of the term, are only one element of communication, and their meaning depends on both the formal content and the relationship between the participants in the communication process, which is always a systemic transaction: the behaviors of one depend on those of the other. and each other. For Mounin, for example, the scientific study of signs is restricted to the only signs that have been created to serve the media (ie, communication codes) and not to social codes, to take the terms we have already used (Mounin, 1975, p. 16).

4. Conclusion

Action, interaction, transaction and meaning appear as cardinal dimensions of the message, which is characterized by processes of transformation, combination, interpretation, representation, transmission, dissemination, exchange and sharing of meanings. As for the sign, which refers to something other than itself, it is the pivot of relationships, interactions and communication situations through which relationships are established with reality and the construction of realities. They are influenced by factors, forces and ways that intervene, in the form of messages and meanings, in the production of representations. This relationship depends equally on the needs and values of the protagonists and is influenced by situations and events that always involve a set of factors and forces of various kinds, as well as the groups to which each person belongs. In short, all communication factors intervene in the sender-receiver relationship and determine the chances of success or failure of the message, as well as the state of convergence or divergence of the interlocutors. They also demonstrate the complexity and

richness of the elements, forces, events, and processes that characterize the relationship between a sender and a receiver in a communication situation.

REFERENCES

Alaran, M. A., Agboola, A. A., Akinwale, A. T., & Folorunso, O. (2020). A New LCS-Neutrosophic Similarity Measure for Text Information Retrieval. In *Neutrosophic Sets in Decision Analysis and Operations Research* (pp. 258-280). IGI Global.

Cioroai, E., Pudlitz, F., Gerostathopoulos, I., & Kuhn, T. (2019). Simulation methods and tools for collaborative embedded systems: with focus on the automotive smart ecosystems. *SICS Software-Intensive Cyber-Physical Systems*, 34(4), 213-223.

Enachescu, V. A. (2020). Behavior Management and Preferred Education Techniques used by Teachers Working with High School Students. *Revista de Management Comparat International*, 21(1), 54-59.

Fernández-Bedoya, V. H., et al. (2020). Green Marketing and Its Incidence in the Decisions of Purchase of Peruvian University Students. *Modern Economy*, 11(1), 1-9.

Jora, O. D., Apăvăloaei, M. A., Roșca, V. I., & Iacob, M. (2020). “Mens Sana in Sound Corporations”: A Principled Reconciliation Between Profitability and Responsibility, With a Focus on Environmental Issues. *Sustainability*, 12(4), 1589.

Krippendorff, K. (1969). *The Analysis of Communication Content: Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques*. Wiley.

Krippendorff, K. (1971). Communication and the genesis of structure. *General Systems*, 16, 171.

Morgan, P. R. C. J. L., & Pollack, M. E. (1990). *Intentions in communication*. MIT press.

Mounin, G. (1968). *Clefs pour le lingvistique*. Paris: Seghers.

- Mounin, G. (1975). *Linguistique et philosophie*.
- Narița, I. (2019). A Set-Theoretic Approach to Communication. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Communicatio*, 6(1), 7-16.
- Negrea, X. (2018). Narcissism and the new free market Segment. About the new narrative identities. *Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management*, 4(1), 122-128.
- Negrea, X. (2019a). Local Journalism and Social Journalism-Isomorphism and Proximity. In *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice* (pp. 225-231). Editura Lumen, Asociația Lumen.
- Negrea, X. (2019b). Social journalism in online world. Conceptual delimitations. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 6(1), 227-234.
- Pelau, C., & Rosca, V. (2018). Controlling Instruments for the Sustainability of a Business: Research regarding the Application of Marketing Controlling Instruments in Business. In *Managerial Strategies for Business Sustainability During Turbulent Times* (pp. 277-291). IGI Global.
- Sandu, A. (2020). *Bioetica în criză sau criza Bioeticii? Iași, Lumen*.
- Şahin, M., & Kargin, A. (2020). New Similarity Measure Between Single-Valued Neutrosophic Sets and Decision-Making Applications in Professional Proficiencies. In *Neutrosophic Sets in Decision Analysis and Operations Research* (pp. 129-149). IGI Global.
- Şahin, M., Kargin, A., & Kılıç, A. Generalized Set Valued Neutrosophic Quadruple Sets and Numbers. *TIF*, 23.
- Şahin, M., Kargin, A., Uz, M. S., & Kılıç, A. (2020). Neutrosophic Triplet Bipolar Metric Spaces. *TIF*, 150.
- Strechie, M. (2015). Cicero-an Investigative Journalist. *Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management*, 1(1), 61-71

Voinea, D. V. (2015). *Imigranții români din Statele Unite ale Americii*. Craiova: Sitech.

Voinea, D. V. (2017). Ethical implications of filter bubbles and personalized news-streams. *Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management*, 3(1), 189-190.

Voinea, D. V. (2019). Newsworthiness and the expectations of sources in health journalism. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review Volume 6, Issue 1, 2019*, 222.

Willet, G. (1992). *La communication modélisée*. Éditions du Renouveau Pédagogique, Ottawa.

Xue, H., Yang, X., & Chen, C. (2020). Possibility Neutrosophic Cubic Sets and Their Application to Multiple Attribute Decision Making. *Symmetry*, 12(2), 269.

Yücesan, M. (2020). FMEA analysis in mechanical installation project based on best worst and neutrosophicahp integrated model. *ElektronikSosyalBilimlerDergisi*, 19(73), 363-382.

Талалаева, Е. Ю. (2020). Преодолениеграницыязыка в философии Л. Витгенштейна и М. Хайдеггера. *ВестникТомскогогосударственногоуниверситета*, (451).

Чернова, Я. С., &Талалаева, Е. Ю. (2020). Онтологическаясущностьмолчания в философии М. Хайдеггера. *Манускрипт*, 13(2).