COMMUNICATION CONTRACT IN PATRICK CHARAUDEAU'S VISION

Alexandru Mihai LOACĂ

Stud., Faculty of Letters, University of Craiova, Romania

Abstract

The French and Italian communication schools have contributed to develop the notion of "communication contract". This article presents the vision of the French, Patrick Charaudeau, about the communication contract, which starts from the idea that the communication situation is the generating factor of any speech. Depending on the communication situation, the actors of communication must obey specific rules, which they are supposed to be familiar with. Depending on these communication situations, certain expectations are created, which are not always respected by the interlocutors. Thus, we can say that the "communication contract" is not always respected. Through the interaction of actors, those who know the "rules" of the communication situation can rebuild the "communication contract" in their favor.

Keyword: communication contact, communication situation, purpose of communication, discursive strategies, identity

1. Introduction

Patrick Charaudeau is a linguist and discourse analyst, and his research his research focuses on the analysis of the genres of discourse, which are considered implicit "communication contracts" that are established between the locators involved in the discourse process.

2. Father of the concept

Charaudeau opened the discussion of the communication contract in 1983. Following the point of view of the "father" of the notion of "communication contract", Patrick Charaudeau, talking about human communication consists, first of all, in talking about the issue of the identity of the speaker as a communicative being, and therefore of his right to communicate (González-Domínguez, 2015).

In other words, for any subject who wishes to speak the question that arises is whether this is justified, otherwise, there would be no subject of discussion.

Sometimes it is about more or less institutionalized rules that come to the aid of this agonizing query that seems to avoid discussing about the need to ask such a question (Andreescu, 2013).

Therefore, there are a number of situations that exemplify the above-mentioned, namely: a lecturer presented as such, to a convention, with his titles and functions, may believe he is entitled to speak. Similarly, the moderator of a debate, as long as it is recognized by other partners, has the right to ask questions and a teacher in its class, as soon as it is recognized as such, it also relies on a number of linguistic roles. Sometimes these rules result from the phenomenon of regulating daily exchanges, which ends with the establishment of practices where members of the same cultural community are recognized (Charaudeau, 1983; Charaudeau, 1993; Charaudeau, 2002). Therefore, it is

considered that the "right to speak" granted to any speaker and his / her recognition by the other tenant does not depend on the fact that someone assumes the role of speaker and the other has the role of reacting. The first one must satisfy a certain number of conditions with a certain exchange situation and the other, by a certain behavior, concedes that these conditions are satisfied, thereby recognizing even the solidity of that word, in that particular situation, and the existence of its interlocutor. As an example of the above, this situation leads to the fact that, even in institutionalized communication situations, such as within a conference or inside the classroom, nothing gives a definitive verdict. Any lecturer or professor knows that beyond the institutional alibi - whose right to speak seems to be conferred by the simple presence of the audience (listeners, students) - there must be the recognition of the identity of a subject characterized by competence (Beciu, 2016).

The recognition of the "right to speak" and the recognition of the "identity" of the speaker are the two hypostases around which the communication contract is being constructed, such as a coin circulating between the partners of a communication act (Angermuller, Maingueneau & Wodak, 2014; Stepinska, 2014). The discussions about human communication inevitably lead to the meaning it builds when someone communicates, because it is supposed that language makes sense. The meaning is first directed towards the partners of the speech act and determines the way of existence of the speaking subjects and, by the sense, constructs representations on the world. The meaning, even if perceived as tenacious, is not necessarily founded on the truth. A philosopher of language recalls that the meaning is built on "the generalized theatricalisation of community life, the daily play of the simulacrum, consciously or unconsciously assumed, sharing the roles, metaphorizing and imagining our words" (Parret, 2012, p. 11).

So, the meaning represents both the myth and our reality. It is built at the confluence of what we say and we don't say, more precisely, by combining the implicit with the explicit. Certain conditions must be met in order for the speakers of a social community to recognize this mutual right to speak and construct the meaning and, also, to build the communication act.

Four principles that underpin these communication conditions have been identified over time (Charaudeau, 2002):

1. The principle of interaction - the act of communication is an exchange between two partners in an unsymmetrical relationship because they are also engaged in two types of behavior, namely one that consists in the production of speech-transmitters, the other in the reception-interpretation of that speech. These behaviors are related to the mutual recognition of the two basic roles. An "evaluation vision" is created between the two partners, which legitimizes them as a communicating subject.

2. The principle of relevance, which is based on two things: firstly, the interlocutor thinks that the speaker has an intention, which will motivate the discourse; secondly, both actors of communication share a minimum of things that build dialogue, so they are given the opportunity to change their roles along the way. One of the great problems in this case derives from this perception of common knowledge. Some knowledge should be acquired through the culture, the social class of the locals, the age, and others based on the previously accumulated knowledge. Despite this assumption, there may be errors about how that knowledge has been interpreted by each person.

3. The principle of influence, which states that what motivates the intent of the speaker is part of an actional goal and forces it to establish a set of

discursive strategies. These strategies depend on the rules that each topic takes into account when communicating with their partner. The partner may perceive the influence exerted on him as favorable, unfavorable, or indifferent in relation to it. That is why the subject chooses to resort to the use of seduction, conviction,

4. The principle of control, which determines both the conditions of contact between the communication partners, which are mutually recognized as legitimate partners, but, as well, the conditions that will continue and will lead the communication exchange.

Taking into account that the principle of influence puts partners in a discussion battle and that, whenever one of them takes the word, loses some of its identity or even completely disappears, the principle of regulation allows the subject of communication to implement certain strategies which purpose is to ensure the continuity or breakage of the exchange (Charaudeau, 2002):

- acceptance/rejection of the other's word and right to communicate;

- upgrading/downgrading the partner;

- the demand/confession from the speaker, the identity that can be related to a collective identity for "us" that differentiates itself from other groups, or the individual identity "me" that differentiates itself from others.

Charaudeau offers a class of students as an example. In the classroom situation it is often assumed that there are two types of partners: on the one hand, the teacher, on the other hand, the students taken as a homogeneous collective entity. In class, any teacher is a multiple "I" because he uses different types of expression that respond to different communication partners (students, institution, society, etc.) and students are sometimes "me" when faced with teacher or other student groups. From this set of diverse identities and cross-views, exchanges are regulated.

These four principles, indissociable from one to another, build what Charaudeau calls a "communication contract".

A part of partners' identity is determined by such a contract so that they are justified in the exchange situation in which they are part of their goals of fulfilling the principle of influence and relevance and the roles of their speech as a result of the regulatory principle.

"The communication contract" links partners in a kind of objective alliance that allows them to build together the meaning while self-legitimizing. If there is no possibility of recognizing such a contract, the act of communication is irrelevant and the partners have no right to communicate. In classroom situations, as in any other communication situation, partners must share the same contract as well as some of their values and knowledge (Charaudeau, 2002).

Obviously, the discursive implementation of an act of communication is richer and more complex than these basic strategies by the fact that these behaviors can be played, they can hide each other and leave the intentionality of the subject only in the implicit depths.

Communication is, every time, individual and social involvement in a bet: "How can we gain recognition of the right to speak and how to approach one another?"

The awareness of these contractual relationships is one of the fundamental conditions for participants to measure how much space will allow them to maintain their right to speak and develop their influence on each other.

The contract is a framework of recognition to which partners subscribe to establish exchange and intercomprehension. Therefore, it is the order of social imagination (which does not mean it is fictitious). Again, it results from the combination of social practices and representations that are a common kind of common denominator. However, this recognition framework can be updated

differently depending on the partners involved and can change over time, along with changing social practices and representations.

The idea of strategy is closely related to the subject, which is considered to be the organizer, even if unconsciously (Lopes & de Araújo, 2016; Domunco, 2016). Charaudeau (2001) defines four terms of linguistic strategies:

a) In the context of discursive strategies, we need to take into account the complementary notion of constraints. The constraints arise both from the identity of the participants and from the place they occupy in terms of their purpose, their content and the material circumstances in which the discourse takes place. Through linguistic exchanges, the discourse is built on its own. The actors of communication need a fixed frame ensuring the stability and predictability of their own behavior, to determine the margin of manipulation in which they can act. This is Charaudeau's "communication contract," which partly constrains linguistic subjects and gives actors a space to use strategies.

b) Any act of communication is defined by a general behavior of the individual that is consistent with his objective. This is the subject of the search that the subject tends to tilt. To achieve this goal, actors need skills such as using more types of behavior and choosing between what they have. The theory subsumes some action strategies.

c) For this possibility, there needs to be an obstacle that makes it difficult for the subjects to reach the goal. The obstacle may be a possible superior performance of the interlocutor. Charaudeau believes that achieving the goal depends on people who oppose it.

d) To solve the obstacle, the goal must overlap the goal. It is necessary for the actor to take into account the usual rules and to keep in mind other procedures to which he can call. Also, the subject has to make some language choices to influence problem-solving. Depending on the obstacles and

uncertainties that can arise the individual is obliged to calculate in advance the risks and benefits of each election.

The discursive strategies are considered in relation to the communication contract. In the negotiation process between the communication contract and the strategies, one can say that the first choice is because the behaviors can be anticipated, but the second cannot be planned in advance because it depends on the competence and the will of the subject, although sometimes they are not necessarily so conscious. Strategies can be unconscious, which does not mean unconscious literacy, but rather they are not always the clear, rational result of a communication plan developed by the subject. Strategies are multiple, but they can be grouped into three categories, each of them corresponds to a stake type. These stakes are distinguished by the purpose they set (Charaudeau, 2002).

A. The first stake speaks about the legitimacy stake, which is based on the need to create or strengthen the legitimacy of the speaker. The actor of communication may have doubts about how it is perceived by his public regarding the right to speak. Subjects must, therefore, persuade their interlocutors that the intellectual level and their way of expression are appropriate for the position they occupy. Because the legitimization strategy aims to recall or strengthen a position of authority, it also has a justifying discourse. Subjects rarely offer self-justification speeches, which can lead to counterproductive attitudes and doubts may arise in the minds of the interlocutors. It is considered that the person justifies himself/herself only if he/she does not have enough authority to speak. If justification arises from the request of the interlocutor, it only consists of reminding the authority of the subject, adding to it a certain power.

B. The second stake is credibility and is based on the need for the speaker to be credible to the interlocutors, either in connection with the truth of the discourse content, or in relation to what he really thinks. In the speaker's

mind appears the question "How can I be taken seriously?" It gives rise to several discursive attitudes:

- An attitude of neutrality that causes him to quit in his speech any judgment or personal assessment. In this case, the discourse becomes a discourse of the gross truth, which cannot be questioned.
- A distancing attitude that causes the speaker to use a cold and "passionless" attitude. This attitude can be used to comment on the results of a survey or to demonstrate a thesis.
- An engagement attitude that determines the speaker to take a position in choosing the arguments he will present in the speech. This attitude gives the impression of interlocutors that the subject is capable of influencing the audience.

C. The third stake is capture and is based on the need of the subject to be sure the communication partner shares his ideas and opinions or is even impressed by the subject's capabilities. In order to impress the other, the subject has a choice between several discursive attitudes:

- A controversial attitude that puts him in a position to question the values that the third party defends and to which the interlocutor may join to make him change his mind. Practically a destruction of the opponent is achieved by attacking ideas in which he believes.
- An attitude of dramatization, in which the subject uses dramatic stories to relate his deeds. It appeals to the beliefs that the audience have, ensuring that the emotions of the speaker are shared. For example, dramatization allows us to designate a guilty person against whom we can turn our desire for revenge.

3. Conclusion

Communication is, every time, individual and social involvement in a bet on how to acquire the right to speak and how to get closer to our interlocutor. The communication contract is a recognition framework to which partners subscribe to establish an exchange. Therefore, it comes from the social imaginary order, but it is not fictitious; it results from the combination of social practices and representations that are a kind of common denominator. However, this recognition framework can be updated differently depending on the partners involved and can change over time, along with changing social practices and representations.

REFERENCES

Andreescu, M. (2013). The Communication Contract and the Rituals of Televised Debates. International Journal of Communication Research, 3(3), 245.

Angermuller, J., Maingueneau, D., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2014). The discourse studies reader: Main currents in theory and analysis. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Beciu, C. (2016). Sociologia comunicării și a spațiului public. Iași: Polirom.

Charaudeau, P. (1983). Langage et discours. Élémentes de sémiolinguistique (théorie et pratique). Paris: Hachette.

Charaudeau, P. (1993). Le contrat de communication dans la situation de classe. Inter-actions: l'interaction, actualités de la recherche et enjeux

didactiques. Metz: Centre d'analyse syntaxique de l'Université de Metz, 121-136.

Charaudeau, P. (2002). A communicative conception of discourse. Discourse studies, 4(3), 301-318.

Domunco, C. F. (2016). Highlights for the Construction of a Didactic Discourse Focused on the Learning Subject in" Kung Fu Panda" Animation. In Studies and Current Trends in Science of Education (pp. 121-130). Editura Lumen, Asociatia Lumen.

González-Domínguez, C. (2015). Laicism in France from communication. Matrizes, 9(2).

Lopes, P., & de Araújo, D. C. (2016). Understanding the role of the subjects in the language act: a case study of the events of March 15, 2015 on Twitter. Comunicacao, Midia E Consumo, 13(37), 29.

Parret, H. (2012). The aesthetics of communication: pragmatics and beyond (Vol. 2). Springer Science & Business Media.

Stepinska, A. (2014). Media and Communication in Europe. Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH.