

Message as Fundamental Discursive Commitment of Communication

Ștefan Vlăduțescu

University of Craiova, A. I. Cuza 13, Faculty of Letters, Department of Romanian Language, Romanian Literature, Education Sciences, Communication and Journalism, Craiova, Romania

Abstract. The study is circumscribed Communication Ontology. It is based on two preliminary observations. First of all, as usual linguistic term, the message is clear and passive idea. On the other hand, as a concept, the idea of message is active, confused and elusive that needs clarification.

Our approach is centered on clarifying site zetetic message across meanings generated in the communication process. Since the entire amount of meanings (created, co-constructed, generated, resulting in communication) which constitutes the discourse, is fundamental to detect contours, configuration and figure of the message.

Corpus starting material consists of incidental reflection of the specialist in semiotics Roland Barthes on how to communicate a message such as "condolences".

From meta-analytic examination position of Roland Barthes and other leading specialists positions expressed over the years, like G. Bateson, R. Rommetveit, G. Gerbner, D. K. Berlo, M. Burgoon, C. R. Berger, B. J. O'Keefe, J. G. Delia, M. E. Roloff, G. J. Shepherd, W. Douglas, P. D. Battista, M. L. Fleming, W. H. Levie, P. J. Shoemaker, S. D. Reese, J. O. Greene, J. P. Dillard, S. Kemper, K. Kemtes, R. Capurro, J. Holgate, B. R. Burleson, S. R. Wilson, are drawn five ascertaining-conclusive elements. I reflected on these elements making comparisons, building inferences, abductions, inductions and deductions and I set five axiomatic findings.

First axiomatic finding is that there is no pure message or there is no message as message: message exists only in concrete form of discourse. Second axiomatic finding is that communication message is the nucleus of the meanings of the discourse. Third axiomatic finding is that, in fact, the message is the rationale of the discourse. Fourth axiomatic finding is that message production and discourse production are parallel and concatenated. The fifth axiomatic finding is that the message determines the form, type, shades and tones of the significance of the discourse.

Keywords: message, message production, discourse, discourse production, commitment of communication

1. The message cannot be even message

The message is the most important product of communication relationship. A second objective of the communication, after the communication itself, is to configure a message and this message to have an interpersonal, group, organizational, social effect. The message is the internal core of communication. Wherever they come into contact two or more persons, the essence of communication between them will constitute the co-construction of a message. In the absence of a message can not talk about communication.

To be in a position to open the message concept it is necessary to start from a point just, as much as in words we can fix an axis of thought in language. This reference center should be the discourse, vivid manifestation of language in relation to the "conveyed meaning" as message, in definition of E. Benveniste (1966, p. 196). The message is not performed than self endorsement as pure message. Basically, the message is formulated as discourse. An example of language coupling of the message offers us Roland Barthes. The reputed French sociologist gives a communication situation to which has direct access mundane comprehension. A friend, Roland Barthes shows, lost a jewel and I want to send my sympathy. Then I begin spontaneously to write a letter. Still in development, the used words are without satisfaction: they appear as phrases. The feeling is that I do phrases of a deeply affectionate sense. I say myself then that "the message I want to convey, so my sympathy" (Barthes, 1987, p. 116) could be reduced to one simple word: "condolences".

Actually, in the given communication situation, the message is "condolences". At the same time, the purpose of communication is opposed the message become worn, become formula. The real message itself ("condolences") it looks to be a cool message. It seems, therefore, reversed in relation to what you want to convey: just warm of compassion. "I'll then conclude that to correct my message (i.e., to make it exact), you not only modulate it, but also to give this variation an original top, invented even" (Barthes, 1987, p. 116). It can be recognized in inadequacy an inevitable of message constraints: the message can't be presented as such, it must resort to a discursive carrying in it a literary inertia. This need to modulate discursive the message in process of transmitting

is intended to be as a ruse that "literate" of us infiltrates in any act of communication. In this situation, it is said: literature deforms life and insinuates that a *sine qua non* condition of emotional permeability. "Condolences" is, like "I suffer", "I sympathize", "I train", "I love", "I influence" , "I understand", "I persuasive", "I convince" and so on a "first message". R. Barthes called also the letter that put into language the message, also message. At what Barthes accepted to be "discourse" is called "message". Barthesian "second message" is discourse. In the same idea, for example, speaks confirmatory also C. Sălăvăstru about the imposition or obstruction of "message of a philosophical discourse" (Sălăvăstru, 2001, p. 38) (also Capurro, 2003; Capurro, 2011; Holgate, 2011).

Letter of condolence is discourse (Vlăduțescu, 2013a). This letter contains the message "condolences". To have the pointed effect, the message "condolences" must be modulated as discourse. This is the just the principle of literature: neither, writing becomes work unless it can vary in certain conditions "first message". That message is varing in conditions of varying literality or phisolophicalness. These conditions cannot be ultimately connected only by the originality of the "second message". The originality of the message enunciation as discourse ("first message" as "second message", in Barthes's terminology) represents the fundamental process of expression, of the effable, of exprimable. Any discourse is the work of formatting techniques and a message enunciation. The discourse is the original way in which the message is sent. "Condolences" is simple and banal. To express exactly the warm of compassion, after thousands of years of evolution language-cogitative apparatus, banal message is inappropriate. I'll think "condolences" and I'll put this message in an originally rhetorical discourse. The maturity of language using requires the banal message to be discursive. It is law and, emphasizes Barthes, I just obeying the law "I have the possibility to communicate exactly what I mean" (Barthes, 1987, p. 116) (also Bateson, 1956; Berlo, Lemert & Mertz, 1969; Greene, 1997; Greene, 2000; Burlison, 2007; Burlison, 2010; Sandu, 2011).

"What I mean" is the message. "What I say" is the discourse. Saying is a commitement of meaning. Any discourse is a commitement of a message. Every

discourse carries a message. Every discourse is impregnated by a meaningful message. The discourse is the second message.

At Barthes "what I mean" is "the second message", the discourse. Thus, automatically, productive thinking accepts as normal to substitute to message a discourse. In literature, in philosophy, as also in private communication of condolences, who wants to be less "false" must be as "more" original. As less "false" means as "indirect", we say, i.e. possibly as much rhetorical. This is because remaining to the message we should remain exposed to commonplace. The message is saved of banality in the originality and, parallel, in the falsehood of discourse (Vlăduțescu, 2004; Coșoveanu, 2002; Iorgulescu, 2009; Strechie, 2009). The message existence is saved by discourse. Interpretation is the way from discourse-communication back to the starting probable message. Interpretation originality comes from accurate non-retrieval of the original message, but finding a revealing message, attributable to producing original thought. In interpretation we meet and follow the movement of producing thought (Burgoon, Jones & Stewart, 1975; Jackson, 1992; Kemper & Kemtes, 2000; Keck & Samp, 2007). The discourse originality against the message banality leads our thought to inspiration. The creation consists of original modulation of the message. Inspiration comes to guarantee the message utterance truth. In fact, inspiration "falsifies" in "originally" the message, transforming it into discourse. And thus, making from message spontaneously a discourse we remain with the impression that "we are" fully authentic (Fleming & Levie, 1978; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; O'Keefe & Delia, 1982; O'Keefe & Delia, 1988; Dillard & Solomon, 2000; Dillard, 2008; Țenescu, 2009; Păun, 2013).

Returning to Barthes's reflection in her imperfection "first message" - "second message" is revealed that the reason that finds opportunity in authentic transformative discourse is real. Exactly: "this message should immediately tell all my pain, this pure message should denote only what is in me, this message is utopian" (Barthes, 1987, p. 117).

Barthes's error is to confuse the message, on its transformational side, with the discourse. The message is real; its transmission as such is a utopia. The

message is, firstly, thinking, cogitation. The discourse is, firstly, language, expressing and expression (Vlăduțescu, 2013c).

To say direct and unmediated, the message is a launching that language culture no longer recognizes. Formatting and enunciation interpose inevitable. The "condolence" message sent by a letter "freeze" the warmth of compassion. The expectation is that the message to be put into a discourse and rhetorically. It is possible that a message we have committed to a discourse to be returned laden with infinite sub messages that we do not accept them. But this constitutes the risk of output in the world of any discourse: to be comprehended thus or even against certain illusory intentions authorial. Personal utterance can arise only in a language and just as form of discourse ordered internal by a single instance (Higgins & Rholes, 1978; Metzger, Flanagin, Eyal, Lemus & McCann, 2003; Bratosin, 2007; Kao, Chuang, Wang & Zhang, 2013). Writing simple "condolences", compassion of productive thinking becomes indifference and only connotes respect for certain usage. The message will be accompanied of a set of negative automatic additional messages: indifference, lack of warm etc. Therefore, in order to defend the true message, productive thinking should put it in a discourse in which to inoculate also security instructions. (The true message is thinking.) Putting the message in language is performed by a cultural inertia modeled by moral, ethical, literatural, philosophical, theological, mythological etc. To ensure viability within a discourse, to message should to implant additional messages through certain secondary codes. Language-cogitative insertion of the message is based on security on formatting and enunciating.

2. Message is engaged as discourse

Anyone who wants to be accurate must be exaggerated. The message is unable to be transferred as message. The message always comes after. The message comes after the discourse ended. To shuder you to write only the message is a failure on the language border movement domain (Frunză, 2011; Gifu, 2011; Cojocaru, Bragaru & Ciuchi, 2012). Language is perceived as being tight, when the message is extraordinary. Any message to be correctly formulated will push the limits of discursively: of the language and of the

cogitation. A solution for "limitless" of the language was found in apophasis, and a solution to unlock cogitation (for absolute expressing of absolute) M. Heidegger found in his "logos" (the logic of silence). Logos, meeting of language with cogitative, has no limits. When he talks to himself, the cogitative spirit sends himself messages. Thinking is centered on messages, produces messages. Talking to others produces discourses. For us, our feelings and ideas are messages that carry their own name. How we cannot get out of ourselves, our messages would be anyway perceived by others as discourses. The great danger of our developer world is to confuse the message and discourse. This danger is never exceeded. Accustomed to doing the curtain appearances, almost it is hard to eat raw truths emanating from the message. Discourse is, above all, a way to defend the directly, unmediated truth of the message. Not to be a simple package, the discourse is a garment that perceives what is and covers.

Therefore, having the perception of fatality of conscience as discourse, the productive thinking does not risk to transmit, to engage directly the message (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Averbek & Hampe, 2008). The cogitative spirit transfers his spirituality as discourse form. Message thinking (cogitation) becomes language discourse. It follows that discourse is inevitable, and the message only approachable mediated (Vlăduțescu, 2002; Vlăduțescu, 2009). Any property on the message is denied. Taking into account that the message is a discourse, any message got through interpretation is an orphan message. Language is unable to transfer messages and he also makes visible the impossibility of the message recovery when thinking should ensure her, also by language, a way of re-appropriation. Productive thinking is seen, inertial and frustrating, forced to distort the message (i.e. the original message, the truth, the genuine thinking). Ascertained plethora of language requires connotations management to keep more or less the control of message production (Berger & Douglas, 1982; Berger & Battista, 1993; Ciupercă, 2009; Berger, 2010; Manolea, 2013). The best connotation that can be saved is an indirect one, circuitous, i.e. rhetorical. We can talk about the rhetoric of putting the message in discourse. Through rhetoric, paradoxically, the least deformed is what we want to say. Rhetoric saves the message: this is only in productive thinking projection. From

the perspective of consumer thinking, rhetoric and natural logics only provides the transfer. Productive thinking maintains the contact with himself and with the message as long as he controls his own expression, as long as he remains in the situation of a spirit for which to speak means first of all to listen his own utterance. Self-consciousness is unmediated consciousness of the personal message. Self-concernment, self-consciousness, self-respect and all other identity spiritual values are based on the identity message. The message of each is that speaking which, against everything, listen of his own utterance. In communication take place a transfer of utterance-message (Rommetveit, 1968, Rommetveit, 1974; Grewal Gotlieb & Marmorstein, 1994; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996; Wilson, 1997; Park, 2012). The result is, in relation to a produced utterance, an un-discours-ively utterance, an un-constructed utterance (Ionescu, 2013). The discourse is writing of the other, and the other writing is the speaking that listen his own utterance, i.e., message identity. The writing submits a message. This message is not prime message, original, but a message put into discourse. The writing message comes after writing is completed. The idea is that the message concerns always the other, the discourse concerns all of us. The discourse is prepared for all who would be pointed by a message, that even in the discourse that carries it is lost. No message "direct", "pure" fails to communicate, because it will be perceived as discourse. There is no pure message or there is no message as message: the message only exists in concrete form of discourse

Returning to "condolences", such a direct message is no longer able to communicate compassion. In fact, when it manages to convey it, it is forced to resort connotative to other evidences of this. Just by broaching the discourse with its forms it makes to avoid derision of feelings released in the circuit of communication. In fact, the designed message is formatted, is enunciated, is emotional modulated and is cogitative modeled. Over designed message is applied a form and it is applied a technique (Vlăduțescu, 2013b; Traistaru, 2013). The form and rhetorical technique recover partly the designed message, but released as discourse in communication circuit another message: a discoursing message. The derivative message, i.e. the recovered one after the exploitation and exploration of the discourse, cannot coincide, and interpretation says us that

is not the same with first message. Putting into the discourse is not only reporting of language capabilities and cogitative of productive thinking, but, also makes visible the limits of language theatre and cogitation. Through these samples logos, of putting in discourse, the language and cogitation are understood and can be understood and dominated by themselves. In this process of auto-comprehension post-discourse, the language and cogitative prove their limits and expand by itself forcing the limits the domination zone. In essence, the testing of the limit means a pressure on limit. The originality of putting into discourse and integration in logos that includes the discourse constitutes the price that has to pay to make to be accepted the designed message. The productive thinking works in excess relative to the designed message. The strategic plethora constitutes a necessity of message itself (Vlăduțescu & Ciupercă, 2013). The consumer thinking forces the productive thinking to put originality into message enunciation. Consumer, already indulged with spices of thousands of years of language-cogitative evolution, it would feel the sent message such as rudeness, indelicacy or insult. To save of such suspected reproaches, the productive thinking is producing the message original by formatting and enunciation. The discourse constitutes therefore another thing than pure and simple communication of the designed message. If the designed message means pure and bland communication, the discourse means a luxury communication. The discourse shows us that in the current era of thinking development (producing and consuming) to say few things of designed message are needed many details. Originality comes as a condition and as an exigency of accuracy, of efficiency (Gerbner, 1969; Shepherd & Condra, 1988; Berger, 1997; Berger, 2000; Berger, 2003; Tudor, 2013). Message alone is unable to be promoted as message. In order to consider it sent exactly itself, the designed message must to be filled with details and to deform the type of originality.

3. Conclusion

Apparently, the message is contemplative, theoretical, non-practical. But the truth is that mental and practical message is the essence of communication. Emotional, volitional and cognitive- cogitative message is a desire aspirational

thought. It is there that the production and the product. It is a process and the result of a process. This complex is the message production. The produced message is message production. In reality, the message production is a discourse. Product message is called discourse.

Mentally, the message is cogitative, is thinking. The discourse is language production. Message production and discourse production are mutual approaches, but non-identical.

The relationship between the message and the discourse has three dimensions: a) discourse is a result of the message, b) discourse is deeply impregnated by message and c) of discourse irradiates a message.

References

- [1] Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2002). Crafting a change message to create transformational readiness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(2), 169-183.
- [2] Averbeck, J. M., & Hample, D. (2008). Ironic message production: How and why we produce ironic messages. *Communication Monographs*, 75(4), 396-410.
- [3] Barthes, R. (1987). *Romanul scriiturii*. București: Editura Univers.
- [4] Bateson, G. (1956). The message "This is play.". *Group processes*, 2, 145-241.
- [5] Benveniste, É. (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale I*. Paris: Gallimard.
- [6] Berger, C. R. (1997). *Message production under uncertainty*. In J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 221–244). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [7] Berger, C. R. (2000). Goal detection and efficiency: Neglected aspects of message production. *Communication theory*, 10(2), 156-166.
- [8] Berger, C. R. (2003). Message production skill in social interaction. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 257-289). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [9] Berger, C. R. (2010). *Message Production Processes*. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication Science*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [10] Berger, C. R., & Battista, P. D. (1993). Communication failure and plan adaptation: If at first you don't succeed, say it louder and slower. *Communications Monographs*, 60(3), 220-238.
- [11] Berger, C. R., & Douglas, W. (1982). Thought and talk: "Excuse me, but have I been talking to myself?". *Human communication theory*, 42-60.

- [12] Berlo, D. K., Lemert, J. B., & Mertz, R. J. (1969). Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 33(4), 563-576.
- [13] Bratosin, S. (2007). *La concertation. De la pratique au sens*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- [14] Burgoon, M., Jones, S. B., & Stewart, D. (1975). Toward a Message-Centered Theory of Persuasion: Three Empirical Investigations of Language Intensity. *Human Communication Research*, 1(3), 240-256.
- [15] Burlleson, B. R. (2007). *Constructivism: A General Theory of communication Skill*. In B. B. Whaley & W. Samter (Eds.), *Explaining Communication: Contemporary Theories and Exemplars*. New York: Routledge.
- [16] Burlleson, B. R. (2010). *The nature of Interpersonal Communication*. In C. R. Berger, M. Roloff, & D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen, *The Handbook of Communication Science*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [17] Capurro, R. (2003). *Angelitics, a Message Theory*. In H. H. Diebner & L. Ramsey (Eds.), *Hierarchies of Communication* (pp. 58-71). Karlsruhe: ZKM.
- [18] Capurro, R. (2011). Angelitics, a Message Theory. In R. Capurro & J. Holgate (Eds.), *Messages and Messengers: Angeletics as an Approach to the Phenomenology of Communication* (pp. 5-15). Vol 5. ICIE Series. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.
- [19] Ciupercă, E. M. (2009). *Psihosociologia vieții cotidiene*. București: Editura ANIMV.
- [20] Cojocaru, S., Bragaru, C., & Ciuchi, O. M. (2012). The Role of Language in Constructing Social Realities. The Appreciative Inquiry and the Reconstruction of Organisational Ideology. *Revista de Cercetare și Intervenție Socială*, 36, 31-43.
- [21] Coșoveanu, M. (2002). *Quick Approach to Shakespeare's Plays*. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.
- [22] Dillard, J. P. (2008). Goals-plans-action theory of message production. *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives*, 65-76.
- [23] Dillard, J. P., & Solomon, D. H. (2000). Conceptualizing Context in Message - Production Research. *Communication Theory*, 10(2), 167-175.
- [24] Fleming, M. L., & Levie, W. H. (1978). *Instructional message design: Principles from the behavioral sciences*. Educational Technology.
- [25] Frunză, S. (2011). Does communication construct reality? *Revista de Cercetare și Intervenție Socială*, 35, 180-193.
- [26] Gerbner, G. (1969). Toward "cultural indicators": The analysis of mass mediated public message systems. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 17(2), 137-148.
- [27] Gîfu, D. (2011). *Violența simbolică în discursul electoral*. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință.
- [28] Greene, J. O. (2000). Evanescent Mentation: An Amelioative Conceptual Foundation for Research and Theory on Message Production. *Communication theory*, 10(2), 139-155.
- [29] Greene, J. O. (Ed.). (1997). *Message production: Advances in communication theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- [30] Grewal, D., Gotlieb, J., & Marmorstein, H. (1994). The moderating effects of message framing and source credibility on the price-perceived risk relationship. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 145-153.
- [31] Higgins, E. T., & Rholes, W. S. (1978). "Saying is believing": Effects of message modification on memory and liking for the person described. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14(4), 363-378.
- [32] Holgate, J. (2011). *The Hermesian Paradigm: A mythological perspective on ICT based on Rafael Capurro's Angelitics and Vilem Flusser's Communicology*. In R. Capurro & J. Holgate (Eds.), *Messages and Messengers: Angeletics as an Approach to the Phenomenology of Communication* (pp. 58-89). Vol 5. ICIE Series. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.
- [33] Ionescu, A. (2008). *Modalitateurs illocutoires et argumentation*. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.
- [34] Ionescu, D. (2013). Non-contradiction. The Main Way of Progress of Professional Interwar Magazines in Oltenia. *Journalism and Mass Communication*, 3(8), 528-531.
- [35] Iorgulescu, A. (2009). Seneca, poet dramatic. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Științe Filologice. Limbi și Literaturi Clasice*, 6(1-2), 64-68.
- [36] Jackson, S. A. (1992). *Message effects research: Principles of design and analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- [37] Kao, D. T., Chuang, S. C., Wang, S. M., & Zhang, L. (2013). Message Framing in Social Networking Sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*.
- [38] Keck, K. L., & Samp, J. A. (2007). The dynamic nature of goals and message production as revealed in a sequential analysis of conflict interactions. *Human Communication Research*, 33(1), 27-47.
- [39] Kemper, S., & Kemtes, K. (2000). Aging and message production and comprehension. *Cognitive aging: A primer*, 197-213.
- [40] Manolea, D. (2013). Conceiving, Designing and Developing Teaching Strategies in Instructional Design. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(28).
- [41] Metzger, M. J., Flanagin, A. J., Eyal, K., Lemus, D. R., & McCann, R. M. (2003). Credibility for the 21st century: Integrating perspectives on source, message, and media credibility in the contemporary media environment. *Communication yearbook*, 27, 293-336.
- [42] O'Keefe, B. J., & Delia, J. G. (1988). Communicative tasks and communicative practices: The development of audience-centered message production. *The social construction of written communication*, 70-98.
- [43] O'Keefe, B. J., & Delia, J. G. (1982). Impression formation and message production. *Social cognition and communication*, 33-72.
- [44] Park, D. (Ed.). (2012). *Cognitive aging: A primer*. Psychology Press.
- [45] Păun, M.-G. (2013). Pedagogical Strategies in Instructional Design. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(10).

- [46] Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1979). Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 37(10), 1915.
- [47] Rommetveit, R. (1968). *Words, meanings, and messages: Theory and experiments in psycholinguistics*. New York: Academic Press.
- [48] Rommetveit, R. (1974). *On message structure*. New York: Wiley.
- [49] Sandu, A. S. (2011). Appreciative Philosophy. Toward a Constructionist Approach. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 10(28).
- [50] Sălăvăstru, C. (2001). *Critica raționalității discursive*. Iași: Editura Polirom.
- [51] Shepherd, G. J., & Condra, M. B. (1988). Anxiety, construct differentiation, and message production. *Communication Studies*, 39(3-4), 176-189.
- [52] Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1996). *Mediating the message*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- [53] Strehie, M. (2009). Comunicarea în Roma antică în *Analele Universității din Craiova, Seria Limbi și literaturi clasice*, VI, (1-2), 92-100.
- [54] Traistaru, Aurelia (2013). Consolidation of the green marketing profile in current austerity period. *Jokull Journal*, 63(9), 125-135.
- [55] Tudor, M.-A. (2013). *Epistémologie de la communication: Science, sens et métaphore*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- [56] Țenescu, A. (2009). *Comunicare, sens, discurs*. Craiova : Editura Universitaria.
- [57] Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2002). *Informația de la teorie către știință. Propedeutică la o știință a informației*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- [58] Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2004). *Comunicologie și Mesagologie*. Craiova: Editura Sitech.
- [59] Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2009). The Coordinates of the Negative Journalism. *Annual of the University of Mining and Geology "St. Ivan Rilski"*, 52, 29-32.
- [60] Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2013a). Feedforward irradiation in Psychology, Psychopedagogy and Communication. Principle of Feedforward. *Revista de Psihologie*, 59(3), 254-263.
- [61] Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2013b). The Communication Membranes. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(31).
- [62] Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2013c). A Completion to the "Traditions" Matrix-Standard R. T. Craig, Induced by the Transformation of Communication-as-a-Field Membrane in Communication-as-an-Universe Membrane. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3(10).
- [63] Vlăduțescu, Ștefan, & Ciupercă, Ella Magdalena (2013). *Next Flood Level of Communication: Social Networks*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- [64] Wilson, S. R. (1997). *Developing theories of persuasive message production: The next generation*. J. O. Greene (Ed.), *Message production: Advances in communication theory* (pp. 15-43). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.