

THE ILLOCUTIONARY ACT AND THE POWER OF THE MESSAGE

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

Abstract

This study is circumscribed to the pragmatics of communication. The thesis under investigation is whether the message is a practice of power. It is found that between the communicators there is an inevitable and always denied war for control of communication. The fight to impose meanings is fought on all available channels. Predominantly, the conflagration of communication is one of words. The imposed illocutionary acts contribute to the power of the message.

The conclusion reached is that the message is a matter of power: any message aims at the accumulation, preservation and / or imposition of power.

Keywords: communication, communication channel, language acts, speech acts, children

1. Communication relationship

The constituent elements of a relationship between two individuals perceived and known from the point of view of communication are few, although the processes in which these elements are involved are multiple and complex: source, message, channel and receiver. Communication is more than a simple linear process of changing and sharing messages and meanings. By reducing communication to an exchange and sharing of messages and meanings, the person is fragmented into two entities, ie the sender and the receiver, even if they are essentially two roles that are assigned and dissociated when scientific analyzes are made. These elements are acceptable when considered from the point of view of a basic paradigm and, taken in isolation, are already of great complexity. However, they should always place them in their own context and take into account the situation, cognitive, affective, mental, social, political and religious factors, as well as communication skills. Communication is a phenomenon consisting of systemic, transactional, circular, selective, non-repetitive, unpredictable, irreversible, cumulative, complex processes that guide the evolution of the meaning and significance of what is and what appears.

Through these processes it is shown what seems to us to have a form and a content, what seems to us to be structured, organized and ordered in time and space as a message. There are processes that make the past, present and future of a communication act interdependent and that guide the evolution of human behaviors and personality. Moreover, since the relationship, action, interaction, transaction and meaning are the center of any message, its scientific study should begin with the processes and constituent elements of a relationship between two entities. The message is meaningful. Rather, it is a meta-significance phenomenon that allows to understand and explain, in a communicative perspective, the fundamental aspects of the wide range of actions, interactions, transactions between elements, individuals and even

organizations (Peptan, 2019; Toma & Tiari, 2019). From this perspective, it would then be possible to understand the fundamentally non-entropic nature of the message phenomenon, to identify and define the concepts of study and communication science.

2. Building the message

Producing a message is not the result of chance. Implicitly or explicitly, communicators seek to produce specific effects depending on their needs and their perception of the situation. So intention is related to the system of relational tension that exists between individuals and can be generally expressed as provoking the need to communicate. The idea of control is inseparable from the idea of finality. Being able to verify and act through a message on a situation necessarily requires a knowledge of the purpose or objective to be achieved.

The content of communication, the message, is the first means by which individuals have social relationships with each other and with the environment. However, as the communication is not only linear, the communicator is not the only one to exercise control, because he must adjust to the structures and processing capabilities of the interpreter (Pîrvu, 2012; Frunză, 2019). However, it is clear that there is a relationship between messages, power and control. The content must be reproducible in a permanent form. The content of the message is characterized, according to F. Fearing (1955), by the use of sign-symbols. These sign-symbols are a significant representation of reality. The message relates projectively to the idea of intention. The specificity of the intentions depends on the degree of precision with which the communicator predicts the effects of the message it produces (Fernández-Bedoya et al. 2020; Martínez). In the personality structure of the communicator, the intention is a manifestation of the variables needs-tensions. It plays a role of selection and structuring. The interpreter is

always included in the psychological field of the communicator when the latter produces a message (Cerban, 2018; Jones, 2020). The specificity of the intentions therefore defines the power that the interpreter's image has over the message produced by the communicator. The consumer is always inscribed for the purposes of the message, which ensures its coherence and cohesion. In chronological order, first, the power of the message is expressed in the importance that the communicator attaches to the planning of his communication.

The target of planning is the interpreter. Consequently, the messages are:

- a) explicit in terms of the desired effects on the performer;
- b) voluntarily manipulating in this sense the different aspects of the content (for example, during a propaganda campaign, the communicator targets a particular audience and assumes that this audience has needs, that it is aware or not of the problem to be solved and that it is intelligent or stupid).

Less “targeted”, less teleologically oriented messages are first centered on the communicator, as he seeks more to express himself than to provoke effects in others. These are unplanned and, beyond the personality structure, first reflect the emotional dynamics of the author.

Intentional and highly planned messages are powerful communications, because the author aims through their content to produce important effects on the consumer: cognitive, convincing, persuasive or emotional. Content control is then linked to the control of the effects sought and the power structures within the ongoing communication mode (Ghiță, 2018; Maritz, 2019). These strictly planned communications-messages are the work of professionals (relations, publicists, propagandists). The degree of reality represented is the function of the manipulation of the content by the communicator. The freedom that is attributed to the communicator when structuring the content of the communication determines the degree of reality or fiction (Similaru, 2007; Schubert, 2017; Bell & Martin, 2019).

The meaning of the message is given by an “adjustment” of comprehension, which depends on the level of convergence of the communication partners. The receiving subject and the transmitting agent each belong to several primary groups (family, friends, current of scientific opinion). These groups transmit their values to the individual and shape him from them. They influence the sender when selecting and producing the message and guide the receiving subject in selecting and perceiving the message and how it reacts. Individuals and primary groups are located in a social organization in which they tend to integrate, assimilate and in the modeled framework that generally maintains communication as a process of exchange and sharing of messages and meanings. To understand the message, its functioning and the consequences of its various effects on individuals, common sense, the daily experience of consuming messages is not enough. Philosophical knowledge related to the phenomenon of the message is required, it is mandatory to model or master a clear and distinct concept of the message. As Paul Attallah (1991) strongly points out, “studying the circulation of messages without knowing why they are circulating, that is, in what interest, means condemning oneself to being a mere executor of social power. It means to turn with pleasure into a capital manager, an efficiency specialist, a persuasive communication strategist without really understanding who and what is being worked for. Before you manage communication, you need to know why you are communicating. “

3. The illocutionary force of the message

As show J.-L. Austin (1975) and J. Searle (1969), the act of language consists of a hierarchy of subordinate acts, distributed on three levels: i) the level of the locutionary or propositional act: the act of saying; ii) the level of the illocutionary act (or of the illocutionary force): what we do by saying; iii) the level of the illocutionary act: what we do by saying. If we tell someone to

close the door, there are three things that can be done. The predicate of the action (to close) is related to two arguments: you and the door. It is the act of saying. If this is said by the force of an order, and not by that of a finding, or a wish, or a promise, then this is the illocutionary act. Finally, by giving an order, certain effects can be caused, such as fear; these effects make speech a stimulus that produces certain results. This is the perlocutionary act, the effect, the action. Adhering to Austin-Searle's thesis, Paul Ricœur expands its field of action. It confirms its validity during the speech (Gioroceanu, 2010; Ionescu, 2015; Ionescu, 2017). The illocutionary force is based both on mimicry and gesture, as well as on the inarticulate aspects of discourse, which we call prosody. It follows from the research of the French philosopher (Ricœur, 1984, p. 208) that it is necessary to understand by “the meaning of the act of language or more precisely by the noema of saying, not only the phrase in the strict sense of the propositional act, but also the illocutionary force and action illocutionary, insofar as the three aspects of the act of language are codified, elevated to the rank of paradigms and where, consequently, they can be identified and re-identified as having the same meaning. “By coordinating the ideas of the sentences about the act of language, one can configure the abduction that the message gathers in one direction the illocutionary force of the acts of language that compose the discourse and which are also called acts of speech or acts of speech (Charaudeau, 1983, p. 84). The message has the unitary force of the acts that compose it. It can be stated, following another clue, that the message is the force of the meanings that one attributes to a speech. The message gains power only through a consciousness that assigns meanings. In the manifest absence of a receiver there is no message, only speech. In this perspective, the concept of “language act” remains valid, instead, the motto introduced by J. Searle consisting in the assertion that “language acts are a variety of human actions”, being at the same time “the minimum basic units of linguistic communication”. (Searle, 1969,

p. 9 and p. 39), can no longer be accepted, not even admitted as a platform for discussion.

Communication means action, interaction, transaction through the message. The act of language is, on the contrary, an event of language, having a unique meaning. It can be a component of communication, and not a minimum unit, because it is not certain that from the combination of any of the types of language acts a communication can arise. Then, the act of language must be located in the speech, which is why some call it the act of speech. The action of thought is transposed through language into discourse. It makes language acts compatible in relation to their locutive, illocutionary and perlocutive qualities. The success of the unitary integration of language acts is measured by the coherence and cohesion of the discourse, qualities that in the alternative are also transmitted to the message. On the new premises we can say, as J. Habermas does, that “through the act of language, discourse has an action component” (Habermas, 1983, p. 458). The following implication becomes translucent: thinking wants to become visible, to manifest through action within a state of affairs; for this, it puts pressure on the language-instrument-means in order to translate its influence on an objective reality that only through language is the domain of evidence. Language, like any language, diffuses action into discourse. In the process of intermediation that the abstract language realizes in order to fulfill the expected action of thinking, certain meanings are precipitated as nuclei, called acts of language (de Graduados, 2019; Clitan & Barbu-Kleitsch, 2020; Guzun). The minimum units acquire conceptual organization: the forms are concretized in a formulation. This is the “living manifestation of language”: speech. Once the language falls into discourse, the action is instantiated. Language becomes subjectivized, and thought-occurrence becomes attributable to an “I”. “I” in the language we are either all or no one. The sophisticated argument of the third would fit perfectly with those who would like to be someone in language,

someone between everyone and no one. This possible objection can only be dampened by accepting any “I” as a discursive self. The grammatical “I” lacks action power. Language creates still lifes or paintings, static paintings. The reality of language is discourse. Language allows for two concrete “I’s” of discourse, one in discourse and the other behind discourse. 4.

4. Conclusion

Any speech is that of a person who is speaking for himself or for someone else. Even if a discourse could be assumed, appropriated by any of us, it will not belong to all or anyone, that is, it will not be a work of language, but only a production generated by language. The discourse presents and is crossed by the three characteristics of the act of language, locutivity, illocutivity and perlocutivity. The articulation of the force of thought as discourse in a force in discourse will be called the message. The message is the force part of the discourse, the one in which all the possible allocated energies are synthetically integrated: the force of ideas, the force of emotions, the rhetorical force, the convincing or persuasive force, the teleological force, the action force. The message is the concept that designates the discursive illocutionary substance. “Everything is summed up in power” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 22): language, discourse, message.

REFERENCES

- Attallah, P. M. (1991). *Théories de la communication sens, sujets, savoirs*.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (Vol. 88). Oxford university press.
- Banța, C. I. (2019). Some considerations regarding the concept of myth (definitions, classifications). *Anuarul Institutului de Cercetări Socio-Umane „CS Nicolăescu-Plopșor”*, (XX), 135-144.

Bell, R. L., & Martin, J. S. (2019). *Managerial communication for organizational development*. Business Expert Press.

Cerban, M. (2018). The identification of minor types of processes from a functional perspective. *Journal of Romanian Literary Studies*, (13), 74-78.

Charaudeau, P. (1983). *Langage et discours. Problématique sémiolinguistique de lanalyse du discours*.

Clitan, G., & Barbu-Kleitsch, O. (2020). Distorting the Message of Religious Symbols by Fallacious Reasoning in the Electoral Posters of Political Campaigns. In *Collective Capacity Building* (pp. 59-72). Brill Sense.

de Graduados, E. (2019). *Facebook y su influencia en la construcción de identidad, autoestima y vida afectiva* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Austral de Chile).

de Graduados, E. (2019). *Strategies to Reduce Employee Turnover in Childcare Centers*.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Diferență și repetiție*, Editura Babel.

Ene, M. (2011). *Vălurile Salomeei: literatura română și decadentismul european*. EUV, Editura Universității de Vest.

Fearing, F. (1955). *Language in Culture*. University of Chicago Press.

Fernández-Bedoya, V. H., Esteves-Pairazamán, A. T., Grijalva-Salazar, R. V., Ibarra-Fretell, W. G., Paredes-Díaz, S. E., Suyo-Vega, J. A., ... & Chávez-Mayta, R. W. (2020). Green Marketing and Its Incidence in the Decisions of Purchase of Peruvian University Students. *Modern Economy*, 11(1), 1-9.

Frunză, S. (2019). On the Communication and Practice of Philosophical Counselling and Philosophical Practices. *Logos, Universality, Mentality, Education, Novelty*. Section: Philosophy and Humanistic Sciences, 7(2), 73-77.

Ghită, C. (2018). *Coliba din mijlocul palatului. Frica și marile idei*. București: Cartea Românească.

Gioroceanu, A. (2010). Illocutionary Force and Romanian Orthodox Sermons: An Application of Speech Act Theory to Some Romanian Orthodox Sermons. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 6(2), 341-359.

Gioroceanu, A. (2018). *Texte juridice, perspective lingvistice*. Craiova, Aius.

Gioroceanu, A. Illocutionary force in criminal judgments. *Studies on literature, discourse and multicultural dialogue*, 1088.

Guzun, M. Despre propagandă în presă la modul serios.

Habermas, J. (1983). *Cunoaștere și comunicare*. Editura Politică.

Ionescu, A. (2015). Neutralité neutrosophique et expressivité dans le style journalistique (Neutrosophique Neutrality and Expressiveness in Journalistic Style). *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 10, 58-64.

Ionescu, A. (2017). Stratégies discursives d'orientation thématique en français et en roumain-regards croisés. In *The Proceedings of the International Conference Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue*. Section: Language and Discourse.

Maritz, A. P. (2019). *Linguistieseenskappe van propaganda* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University (South Africa). Vanderbijlpark Campus).

Martínez, M. R. Marketing verde para pequeñas y medianasempresas sustentables. *Las ciencias sociales y la agenda nacional*.

Peptan, C. (2019). Information and intelligence in security equation. *Annals of the Constantin Brancusi University of Targu Jiu-Letters & Social Sciences Series*, (2).

Pîrvu, E. (2012). Discorso, identità e cultura nella lingua e nella letteratura italiana. *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi di Craiova*, 21, 22.

Ricoeur, P. (1984). *Metafora vie. Univers*.

Sandu, A. (2018). Etica publicării științifice și a comunicării cunoașterii. Etică și integritate în educație și cercetare, 401-436.

Sandu, A., & Frunza, A. (2019). Informed consent in research involving human subjects. In *Ethics in research practice and innovation* (pp. 171-191). IGI Global.

Schubert, S. (2017). Exploring the Ontological Nature of Teachers' Conversations Within a Dominant Ideology: A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Inquiry (Doctoral dissertation, Flinders University, School of Education.).

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.

Similaru, L. (2007). Don Juan. Gloria y decadencia de un mito literario. *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica*, 8(2), 187-194.

Toma, M., & Tiari, P. (2019). Integrerade transporter företteffektivareflöde.

Tudor, M. A. (2013). *Epistémologie de la communication: Science, sens et métaphore*. Editions L'Harmattan.

Vicol, N., & Calechina, O. (2018). Construcția identității prin limbă și prin educație. *Analele Universității "Dunărea de Jos" din Galați. Fascicula XXIV, Lexic comun/lexic specializat*, 20(2), 179-185

Yücesan, M. (2020). Fmea analysis in mechanical installation project based on best worst and neutrosophicahp integrated model. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(73), 363-382.