

## **DRAINAGE OF SOME AREAS OF UNCERTAINTY IN THE FIELD OF COMMUNICATIVE INSTANCE CONCEPT**

**Ștefan Vlăduțescu,**

Associate Professor, University of Craiova, A. I. Cuza Street, Craiova, Romania

Corresponding Address: Rodna Street no. 46, Craiova, Dolj, Romania

E-mail: stefan.vladutescu@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

The study finds, supports and explores some of the uncertainties surrounding the core of the concept of communicative instance. Examine joints concept and try articulating it as a useful tool in understanding, describing and explaining the phenomenon of communication.

Method is one meta-analytical. The main conclusion that emerges from draining and dropping the halo of doubt and uncertainty is the principle of communicative instance: within each communicative event occurs and remain an instance of communication, understood as a mutual computational and decisional human device of co-building, co-organization, co-implementation and co-management of communication processes.

**Keywords:** communication uncertainties, principle of communicative instance, communication beings

(Acknowledgement: The study is developed under the research grant of internal competition for grants from the University of Craiova - Romania).

### **1. Introduction**

Communication emergence takes place reasonable quickly under the pressure of a construction which is placed ontological in preliminary of a communication initiation. Human being propensity toward communication is a cognitive construct previous. Any human being has impregnated in his cognitive and cogitative fund structures to start a co-building of communication. Previous communication kernels appear as some connectors that make passive, relation before that „electric signal” to be released. These previous connection „cables” are cogitative potential structures. Without to graduate a certain school any person has idea how to achieve a communication. Communication is, in its basically components, o habituation as walking, cycling, running etc. Communication doesn't need education or special training to put it into effect. To communicate is, principal, a habituation as any other. From here results the fact that initialization and the rolling on of a communication are basal cultural habituations of human being.

### **2. Functions of Communicative Instance**

Communication is a process with a quickly emergence, because human being is built cultural and for communication. There is a previous science of communication and a previous know-how of communication that are visible in communication practice. Human being is fundamental communicational being. Communication is not at all a simple thing. But

communicational potential of human being it is so high, but that it seems that a communication is originated by itself. Cultural facility of human being determines an unreasonable quickly edification of communication. Communication construction is produced under initial automated control of a communication instance. The cultural facilities are previous connectors through which will be put into action a concrete communication. Previous cultural facilities allows installing of an communication instance which conducts initial automatic communication releasing and which further generates communication rolling on.

Electric current of communication makes to be constitutes communication and persons to become communicators. The instance which configures, commands and controls communication release and communication performing-finalization communication instance. Also communication instance is that one who validates persons as communicators.

Communication generates communicators as communicators. It generates them, it constitutes them. Without communication, persons are not communicators. Communication endows them with a special and fundamental role: that one of communicator. Communication impregnates with a role. The person becomes communicator only if communication is constituted. By entering in communication area take place accreditation as communicator. Accreditation is made by communication instance and also it is that one which defines the profile of specific communicator. Instance decides if somebody is and what kind of communicator is he.

As it is known, nobody can get in as communicator, so that to induce a communication of which who is pointed to not be aware. Communicators communicate as “communicators”. If an intervenient is not accredited as communicator, he doesn’t accede in communication. We know that communication means “communization”. An intervenient no accredited as such, he hasn’t what to communize. Communicational contribution of an no accredited intervenient is ignored. To have something to say in communication neither communicator is coming too late. Validation as communicator is made according to goal, presence, expectations, requirements, desires etc. Communication delays the no accredited ones. Adapting principles (Burgoon-Stern-Dillman) shows that in communication can’t accede only through adaptation, and adapting it is a process, and not a simple instant moment. On the other hand, is well-known “the goal/grasp model” which presents and describes “how people come to evaluate and choose the other people as communicators” (Liska J. R., Cronkhite G., 1995, p. 77) (also Craia, 2008; Abrudan, 2009; Crețu, 2009).

But through which procedure are accredited, are validated communicators? Who decides if and how has to answer to an intervenient? Who observe intervenient conformation to communization principle and to adapting principle? Computational organ that sets oneself up as decision-maker is communication instance.

Communication instance accredits communicators and adjust communication function. It is the conscious of communication event. Through it is managed adapting to context, situation, circumstance. Through it is installed implicit or explicit communication contract. This cogitative organ it isn’t a convention, it is a communication construct. It is an automatic product of communication. Even though two persons change code elements, each hearing himself, a communication instance organize communicational transaction. Anywhere is communized something using some communicational codes and it is grasped a minimal adaptation (is answered in same code, is continued on same subject etc.) we have to find out existence of this sequencer organ. Each communization emanates a communication instance. It isn’t only conscious, guarantor, organizer, communication evaluator, it is also communication producer and communication consumer.

First of all we have to keep in mind communicative instance as assessment and accreditation organ of communication process and communicators. Communicative instance gives quality right

of existence. It is an ontological organ, generator of communicational existence. There aren't valid communication processes in which to not grasp emergence of a communication instance. Hence, communicational are in a great measure, constituted of communication acts and in a little part of communication facts.

Instance communication functioning is observed easiest in transactions that take place between stranger persons, not known or between heterogeneous systems. Persons find easy a way to communicate, because through communication decision is instituted automatic a communication instance that helps to communication emergence. Communication instance installing is visible as often as is emerging a communication. Communication instance is internal conscious of communication. It generates emergence and communication functioning.

Any communication is rolling on inexorable law that brought to first communication generating. Principally, communication instance assure conversion of communication ontogenesis in communication philogenesis. When think diachronic, either information, or material, or communication, primary and almost automatic appeals to lawful ontogenesis-philogenesis. Any current communication propagates communication emergence from the beginning. Any actual communication and concrete emerges analogues to mode how it was born, came in sight, appeared communication. When we communicate, almost intangible and invisible, we repeat communication creation from its beginning. The stages and operations of current concrete processes of communication reproduce generic and without strategies the process of communication constitution as process generally human. Communication philogenesis repeats communication ontogenesis. Communication emergence understanding helps to have a deeper comprehension of communication system, of functions and structure of communication system, as well as a rolled on systemic-structural processes to carry out the functions.

Michael Tomasello establishes origins and beginning of communication ontogenesis in territorial characteristic of human being to cooperate. Human beings, shows this, are drove by „cooperative, even shared, intentions”. Cooperation is generated by a cooperate motivation that consist of in help requesting, disposition to supply information related to useful things and in cultural attitude of helping. Tomasello stipulates that, naturally, communication appears first nonverbal level, gesture and pantomimic, as „primordial uniquely human communication” (Tomasello M., 2008, p. 3) (also Gorun, 2007; Gifu, 2011; Ţenescu). Communication systems are not given, they are constructed. These are built on „a kind of psychological platform” which has „social-cognitive and social-motivational infrastructure” and which allows as „various systems of conventional linguistic communication (all 6.000 of them) could be built” (Tomasello M., 2008, p. 2). This “communication function” is practiced in communication system and in relation with communicators skills. Function practicing is favored by human fundamental skill to create and use in common communication means. Michael Tomasello attaches that „the ability to create common conceptual ground-joint attention, shared experience, common cultural knowledge is an absolutely critical dimension of all human communication” (Tomasello M., 2008, p. 5) (also Dâncu, 1999). In other terms, communization function of communication that we consider nuclear finds practical application through a retrievable skill in all types of human communication: ability to create common conceptual ground”. We consider that „ability to create common conceptual ground” is fundamental component of communicative instance.

On the other hand, Luc Steels explores „what cognitive mechanisms are implied in this joint construction of communication systems” (Steels L., 2006, p. 347) (also Calota & Ilie, 2013). He remarks that, generally, in „learn language” process from their parents, children learn the language and also, acquire a „system” which is used „through the rest of their life with little change”. He keeps in mind the Galantucci's thesis concerning „emergence of human communication”.

Galantucci's thesis shows that, principally, human beings are capable to transact, even without a prior clear model, and to install complex functional communication systems: „Communications systems emerge” „in relatively reliable manner, and did so quickly” (Galantucci B., 2005, p. 743); by different procedures and by integration of „information from different sources”, these „develop” and become „efficient” (Galantucci B., 2005, p. 748 and p. 758) (also Motoi, 2010; Cobley & Schultz, 2013).

In any communicational discourse actions a communication instance which for its enunciation component (characteristic each type of communication) has brands that appears on discursive surface as specific language acts for each type of discourse. “Communication instance is imaginary organ with executive functions which is built according to a communication situation by implicit or explicit acceptance of communicative forces. It decides and allows system to function” (Berger R., 1973, p. 97) (also Maior, 2009; Maior, 2010). Communication instance is decisional organ: it assigns communicators roles, it establishes process statute and development programs of this. It is a social, interpersonal product, it actions only through protagonists of whose complicity sometimes refused or retracted is also installed, on the other hand. At a detailed analysis, it has two sources: internal – communication creates itself, integrating specifically or deriving from external norms it assigns norms through “transactional accord”; external – communication absorbs commandments, rights and obligations outside of transaction.

As it is known, the discourse instance concept is better defined. Generic, communication instance has the same composition and exerts the same function. This similitude is not coming from fact that both would derive from same substance, but because they have the same substance. Genetic, between them there is a relation of producing: communication generates discourse.

Communicative instance is a denominative convention for organizational procedural forces of communication act: communicators, agents, actors, arch-receptors (observer, researcher). Strategic circumstance of discourse is subjectivity that is designated through “me”. Autoreference ego is dependent of a some discourse instance. By enlist itself in “me”, in certain circumstance, individual assumes circumstantial constrains and experiences a right of which subject are presented. Elements assembly which, taking into account, are transformed in constrains, as well as relations between these and subject that is denoted pronoun “me” constitutes, after E. Benveniste (Benveniste E., 1974, p. 81) (also Cerban, 2009; Cerban, 2010), discourse instance. For each communicative subject there is, therefore, a discourse instance. The language ego becomes ego of discourse. Each instance of discourse has its own elements or, rather, through ego enunciation variability introduces for elements of a standard instance (role, time and place) variations and differences which a real communication exceed them. In discourse instance there is a “me” and a “you” or a “we” and a “you” (also Vlăduțescu G., 2013). The third person is not found in instance, it is defined without relating to this, being dependent of linguistic context. There isn't communication without taking into consideration both utterance and utterance conditions. Discursive strategies of concertation (Bratosin, 2007), summarization, restatement, paraphrase, tactic argumentative-discursive procedures of demonstration, exemplifying (Dumitru & Kroon, 2008), exposing (Dumitru, 2011), illustration, repetition, are established at instance level.

In a standard communication situation we associate two discourse instances: one of communicator and one of “inter-communicator”, particularly for linguistic discourse: speaker – interlocutor. The subject is every time an instance, appreciates A. J. Greimas (Greimas A. J., 1976, p. 11): “Discourse subject is so this instance which is not content, according to saussurian conception, to assure passing from virtual status to actual status of language: appears as place where is ascended putting mechanisms assembly in discourse of language”. Me designates the person who enunciates present discourse instance that contains “me” (Eluierd R., 1985, p. 32) (also

Kruijff-Korbayová & Steedman, 2003). This instance is by definition unique. A pertinent analysis of “producing instance” and of “reception instance”, as instances forms, achieves professor Gherghel (Gherghel I., 2009, pp. 19-23) (also Batâr, 2003; Dinu, 2008; Iancu, 2011; Iancu & Tranciuc, 2012).

Communication instance is inserted in any kind of communication. Subsequent, being a discourse, any literary reviewing has an instance: lyric, epic, dramatic. Lyric instance role is to orient poetic movements, to achieve lyric status inducing and environment, to configure poetic situations. Epic instance is that one which manage presentation procedures or depicting, of structuring perspective. For example, Nicolae Manolescu, allows that passing “from Doric to Ionic (as Romanian types- n.n.) is produced when internal perspective of the novel starts to be again assigned. But it is assigned to a supra individual instance, anterior omniscient author, but to one or more personages” (Manolescu N., 1980, p. 49). Objective novel is procedural oriented by a supra individual instance, psychological novel is mobilized by a personal instance. Rather, fictive author who gives perspective is one “who performs the functions of transcendent instance, similar to God in relation with real world” (Manolescu N., 1980, p. 54). The novel of XX century, in case of Albert Camus’s novel makes that the assessment perspective to be on the ground as reference system in reality plan: “Responsibility for them, points out N. Manolescu, comes back to a human being, not to an instance that is missed human will. Romanian instance can be transcendent-omniscient, can be personal-psychological or personal-volitive”.

Elements assembly taken into account in common according to both of discourse instances constitutes communication situation, composed of role, space and time. Communication instance is generic resultant of transaction between communicational actants-actants-transactants mutual related to a preview communication contract.

Whichever would be the type, value, production mode, mean or transfer channel, communication remains, by itself theoretic-identical, knowledge and construction, conceptual organization of the world and fundamental gnosis practice. From various semiotic materials (words, images, gestures, draws etc.) respecting certain principles, according to different procedures (operations, actions, motions, manipulations, mechanisms, strategies) by using means (languages, codes, sub codes) and specific instruments (knowledge, concepts, categories) goal adjusted, between ground (as auto correction through feedback) and sky (as anticipation through feedforward) it is arisen an imposing edifice, a cognitive construction: this is communication. It has systemic character and dynamic and it is organized on semantic, structural and pragmatic coordinates (Mihăilescu, 1999; Colhon & Tandareanu, 2010; Codoban, 2011; Craig, 2013).

Performed discourses in a certain communication situation are a communicator’s job who defines his statute and enunciate mode. Performing mode, broadcasting mode and consuming mode of discursive communication carries impression of receiver communication situation, sometimes of source-institution. A communication, that is auto regulating, requests least implicit or explicit separation of meanings transmitting in two domains, one productive and the other receptive-emphatic. This is not in fact only a restatement from point of view of communication as social instance of a auto regulated area existence. It could be argued that separation acceptance of those two domains is proof that communicational auto regulation doesn’t exist. Anyway, such presupposition has to be abandoned, because it is based on discontinuity sophism between reality and language. Indeed, no type of communication can’t exist without an assurance system of order in production, distribution and consumption of meanings or so called informational goods – information. This however does not imply existence of some distinct communicational institutions; normally, communicational order is only a function of social order of which is part. Never exist, along history, within society, a differentially communicational system, isolated, autonomous.

### 3. Conclusion

Communicative instance is “organ” of constitution of ontological elements and managing of administration communicational procedures, production, organization, programming and control of communication. Organization and functioning of discourse take place in strict circumstance of communication instance. Through functions that exert different components, communication “dictates” discourse flow. Discourse as production is programmed one at the level of communication instance that appear on discursive surface as discourse instance. Discourse mechanisms are put in function through communication instance decision.

### References

- Abrudan, M. (2009). Metode de Cercetare în Științele Comunicării. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai-Ephemerides*, (1), 117-142.
- Afloroaei, S. (2008). Distinct Ways of Thinking and Distinct Experiences of Truth. *Journal for Interdisciplinary Research on Religion and Science*, (2), 157-188.
- Batâr, D. (2003). *Sociologie*. Sibiu: Editura Psihomedica.
- Benveniste, É. (1974). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Vol. 2. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berger, C. R. (2010). *Message Production Processes*. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication Science*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berger, R. (1973). *Artă și comunicare*. București: Editura Meridiane.
- Bratosin, S. (2007). *La concertation dans le paradigme du mythe*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Calota, G., & Ilie, G. (2013). "The Lost Generation". An Analysis on the Employability of Higher Education Graduates in Europe. Case Study: Romania. *Internal Auditing & Risk Management*, 8(2).
- Cerban, M. (2009). Types of Reference – Achieving Cohesion by Creating Links between Elements. *Translation Studies. Retrospective and Prospective Views*, 12.
- Cerban, M. (2010). Syntactic Relations versus Semantic Roles within Relational Framework. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Științe Filologice. Lingvistică*, (1-2), 259-264.
- Cobley, P., & Schulz, P. J. (2013). *Introduction*. In P. Cobley & P. J. Schulz (Eds.), *Theories and Models of Communication* (pp. 1-16). Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Codoban, A. (2011). *Imperiul comunicării*. Cluj-Napoca: Idea Design and Print
- Colhon, M., & Tandareanu, N. (2010). The inference mechanism in conditional schemas. *Annals of the University of Craiova-Mathematics and Computer Science Series*, 37(1), 55-70.
- Cotoară, D. (2003). Modele ale comunicării. *Studii de Biblioteconomie și Știința Informării*, 7, 103.
- Crețu, Ioana-Narcisa, *Introducere în științele comunicării. Note de curs*. Sibiu : Editura Universității „Lucian Blaga”.
- Craia, S. (2008). *Dicționar de comunicare, mass-media și știința informării*. București: Editura Meronia.
- Craig, R. T. (2013). *Constructing theories in communication research*. In P. Cobley & P. J. Schulz (Eds.), *Theories and Models of Communication* (pp. 39-57). Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Dâncu, V. S. (1999). *Comunicarea simbolică. Arhitectura discursului publicitar*. Dacia, Cluj-Napoca.

- Dima, Ioan Constantin, Grabara, Janusz, & Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2012). *The Situation of Competitive Clusters in Some EU States*. Journal on Business Review (GBR), 2(2), 4. DOI: 10.5276/2010-4804\_2.2.193
- Dima, Ioan Constantin, & Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2012). Risk Elements in Communicating the Managerial Decisions. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 27-33.
- Dima Ioan Constantin, Vlăduțescu Ștefan (2012). *Persuasion elements used in logistical negotiation: Persuasive logistical negotiation*. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Dima, IC & Vladutescu, Stefan (2013a). Some Consequences of the Negative Journalistic Communication in the Austerity Period. *Science Series Data Report*, 5(7), 2-7.
- Dinu, Dana (2008). Aspecte ale evoluției semantice a cuvântului latinesc civitas. In D. Dinu *Lexicologia limbii latine*. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.
- Dumitru, M. (2011). Fictional objects and free descriptions. *Revista Română de Filosofie Analitică*, (1), 25-40.
- Dumitru, M., & Kroon, F. (2008). What to Say When There Is Nothing to Talk about (Qué decir cuando no hay nada de que hablar). *Crítica: Revista Hispanoamericana de Filosofía*, 97-109.
- Eluierd, R. (1985). *La Pragmatique linguistique*. Paris : Nathan.
- Galantucci, B. (2005). An Experimental Study of the Emergence of Human Communication Systems. *Cognitive Science*, 29(5), 737-767.
- Gherghel, Ioan (2009). *Forme de manipulare televizuală*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Limes.
- Gîfu, D. (2011). *Violența simbolică în discursul electoral*. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință.
- Gorun, H. T. (2007). Le contexte politique et institutionnel de la Roumanie moderne. *Revista Universitară de Sociologie*, 4(2), 190-201.
- Gorun, A. (2010). Educational offer, education demand and institutional capacity. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 7(12), 1-8.
- Greimas, A. J. (1976). *Semiotique et sciences sociales*. Paris: Seuil.
- Iancu, N. (2011). Un deceniu de la 9/11. *Revista Română de Studii de Intelligence*, (05), 124-136.
- Iancu, N., & Tranciuc, G. (2012). Planning and Strategy in Reforming Romania's SRI. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 25(1), 111-129.
- Iorgulescu, Alexandra (2009). Seneca, poet dramatic. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Științe Filologice. Limbi și Literaturi Clasice*, 6(1-2), 64-68.
- Kruijff-Korbová, I., & Steedman, M. (2003). Discourse and information structure. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 12(3), 249-259.
- Liska, J. R., & Cronkhite, G. (1995). *An ecological perspective on human communication theory*. Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Maior, George Cristian (2009). *Incertitudine. Gândire strategică și relații internaționale în secolul XXI*. București: Editura Rao.
- Maior, George Cristian (2010). *Un război al minții. Intelligence, servicii de informații și cunoaștere strategică în secolul XXI*. București: Editura Rao.
- Mangra, M. G., Cotoc, E. A., & Traistaru, A. (2013). Sustainable Economic Development through Environmental Management Systems Implementation. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 6(1).
- Manolescu, N. (1980). *Arca lui Noe. Eseu despre romanul românesc*. Vol. 1. București: Editura Minerva.
- Mihăilescu, V. (1999). *Fascinația diferenței*. Paideia.

- Mircea, I. A. Traditional and Modern Approaches in the Construction of Literary Histories Emerged after 1990.
- Motoi, G. (2010). Piata muncii din Europa în contextul crizei mondiale și impactul asupra tinerilor. *Revista de Stiinte Politice*, (28).
- Otovescu, A. (2008). *Românii din Italia*. Ed. Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Otovescu, D. (2010). *Tratat de sociologie generală. (Discourse of general sociology)*. Beladi publishing house, Craiova.
- Radu, C. (2005). *Comunicare verbală și nonverbală*. In F. C. Rus et al. (Eds.), *Științe ale comunicării. Note de curs*. Cluj-Napoca : Editura Accent.
- Shopovski, J. (2011). Contribution in the Company. *European Scientific Journal*, 98.
- Siminică, Marian, & Traistaru, Aurelia (2013). Self-Directed Learning in Economic Education. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(12).
- Smarandache, Florentin, & Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2014). *Neutrosophic Emergences and Incidences in Communication and Information*. Saarbrucken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of Human Communication*. MIT Press.
- Steels, L. (2006). Experiments on the emergence of communication. *Trands in Cognitive Sciences*, 19(8), 347-349.
- Țenescu, A. Les grands espaces de circulation en tant qu'hétérotopies chez Frédéric Beigbeder. *Analele Universității din Craiova*, 518.
- Vlăduțescu, G. (2013). Ontology and Metaphysics: Whether They Are One. *Balkan Journal of Philosophy*, (1), 73-74.
- Vlăduțescu, G. (2007). *Istoria filosofiei ca hermeneutică*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2013). Three Diachronic Paradigms of Communication. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(12).
- Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2014). Eight Computational-Communicative Operations of Building Information. *Mitteilungen Klosterneuburg Journal*, 64(1).
- Vlăduțescu, Ștefan. A Battle with Uncertainty of Communication as an Academic Discipline.
- Vlăduțescu, Ștefan. Communicative Message as Nuclear Thinking of an Aspirational Desire.