ANALYSIS OF THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE - INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES.

Claudia-Raluca STAMATESCU
University of Craiova, Romania

Abstract: The analysis of the discourse reveals, through the study of texts, that complex antagonistic world, which underlines the discourse, which the author/speaker often presents as "real world", although it is not always taken for granted by the readership/audience. Verbal strategies of conviction or persuasion have, in this sense, the objective to overcome this contradiction, trying to present the author's discourse (in our case the institutional discourse) as being true. The aim is not to build a piece of literature, but to act on the other through words, because the institutional discourse, not only the political or commercial one, tries to persuade, to convince, to conquer its target audience (in our case students from final grade, students, social partners, etc.). At the same time, if we refer to the sphere of the institutional discourse/speech, then the world of words is not subjective, but objective, (re)presenting realities and forms of social behaviour.

Keywords: institutional discourse, communication, pragmatics, audience design

1. Introduction

In a broad sense, the institutional discourse belongs to the sphere of public communication and it is based on the interaction between an institution and its audiences (internal and external). When we refer to an institution, we have in mind the political, administrative, educational, economic entities and other units with a major impact on the social system and on the target population. Like political discourses, advertising and so on, the institutional discourse takes many forms (oral, written, multimodal).

2. Institutionalising discourse

Analyzing the concept of *discourse* involves a variety of points of view from different directions of language research, which put the discourse, especially if we take into consideration the pragmalinguistic perspective, in relation to the phrase, utterance and the text. The analysis of the social discourse (institutional) is a type of knowledge, from which and through which a discourse, a text, and the speech is analyzed (Rus, 2002:87-89). This current analysis calls for an interdisciplinary analysis, such as: linguistics, pragmatics, semiotics, anthropology, sociology in so far as to allow to identify the existing relationships between meaning structures and the social/ institutional/ political and social, cultural realities, etc. In the analysis of the discourse, however, the theoretical, methodological, and practical principles cannot be determined for certain. The conceptual and methodological toolkit used in studying texts or in investigating discourses are largely borrowed and belong to other distinct disciplines than the

discourse analysis itself; despite this fact, it differs from the disciplines mentioned above in so far it is the discourse presented as a combined study of linguistics and social structures, or, rather, it can be said to offer a contextualized interpretation of the speech (Sean, 1977: 318; Salavastru, 1999: 91). Accordingly, the analysis of the institutional discourse is not presented as a one-dimension analysis. There are different layers of significance, which require different instances of analysis. Among these dimensions, we mention grammar (morphology and syntax), semantics and pragmatics (within which the theory of speech acts seems to be the "richest" due to its ability to relate language to context and communicative, real life purpose interaction).

The semiotic dimension of the text, on the other hand, by highlighting and reconstructing the unspoken part, which is hidden for different reasons and crosses the grammatical units of meaning. This dimension generates the real meaning of the discourse, through mobilizing social agents. Certain points of view, including ours, consider the rhetorical dimension as fundamental in the construction of the meaning, due to the fact that the rhetorical figures play a crucial role in communication and have the ability to disrupt the order of any discourse. Other researchers highlight other levels of discourse analysis, such as stylistic or argumentative levels, which are just as important as the previous one, and selecting one or more levels of analysis is closely related to the theoretical and practical objectives of a researcher (Sell, 2007: 73-77).

If we exclude the grammatical level, as strictly linguistic, the analysis of the discourse would focus on the structures of discursive meaning, which can be examined with the help of speech acts (and implied meaning), with those of mass communication, with those offered by semiotics, rhetoric or with those of constructivist sociology or phenomenology. It is widely acknowledged, all these levels foster the analysis of the social production of meaning. We must remember that the analysis of the meaning of discourse from an interdisciplinary perspective situates the text in relation to the social, political and cultural structures of a society. This type of relationship offers different meanings from that of grammatical units / structures, not to be decoded by using the lexicographical data provided dictionaries.

The differences between grammatical units and those of the unit of discursive meaning lie in the fact that the decoding of the message is not operated by grammatical means, but by procedures (implications) of retrieving the semantic information with which the speaker operates. A unit of discursive significance is characterized by maintaining the reality of the speaker / writer, which involves taking into account, in a unit of discursive significance, all the structures of significance that the issuer introduces to produce the discourse and achieve its objectives by initiating communication, where the discourse significance is the result of the speaker/writer -audience / readership interaction, and the relationship between the two is not reduced to an intratextual relationship, but it involves certain systems of representation, such as the social imaginary, whose existence meets the needs of a group and represents the conditions of social life, while discourse is a means of communication (conviction and persuasion) between a speaker / writer and their intended audience / readership (institutions and people).

Thus, in the discourse-society relationship, the structures of persuasion (discourse) and the structures of acceptance (the social imaginary) are combined. A discourse is socially accepted and, therefore, more or less effective if it is able to translate into the

definition of its content different schemes of representation than contain presuppositions. An effective institutional discourse is that which best captures and systematizes the wishes and aspirations of the audience / readership and therefore depends on rationalization efforts, both on the part of the speaker / writer (in the elaboration process) and on the part of the audience / readership (in the decoding process). Ideology and culture are most often two elements integrated in the production of all types of discourse, but neither ideology nor culture appear in grammatical units in an explicit way (Skinner, 1970: 68).

3. Framing the institutional discourse

The reconstruction of the real meaning as the privilege of discourse analysts who seek to discover the implicit, which, for various reasons, remains hidden, as in the case of discourses promoted by universities, in which the implied intention is to promote the educational offer, to strengthen visibility, to boost the public image and ranking, to persuade prospective students, students, graduates and social partners. In this context, the discourse becomes an effective and efficient means of consolidating reputation, in the category of institutional transmits through its discourse.

This reality, however, should not lead us to look at the audience/readership as a homogeneous mass, which can be easily manipulated. This twofold dimension of meaning, ideological and socio-cultural, is not always easy to examine, because, in addition to being achieved through certain verbal strategies (at a strictly linguistic level), it involves social, cultural and political structures of significance, and for this reason, discourse analysis cannot be limited to strictly linguistic work, as it incorporates in its analysis (all) sociological theory (also linked to the intercultural approach to institutional discourse) (Rus, 2002:78-80).

Furthermore, when considering the analysis of the public discourse, such as the institutional one, we must keep in mind that the production of the discourse is not an isolated act, nor individual, but a collective one (a means of communication, manipulation, of enshrining dominant ideologies) - any discourse reflects the complex rational world in which imbalances, to say the least, related to ethnicity, race, language, religion, nation, or the like are evident. In other words, we could state that the world is enacted through speech and in it, and the analysis of the role of discourse in society is currently considered as one the substantial dimensions of sociological analysis.

Through discourse and in it, not only are formulated the various verbal strategies that give rise to lasting social situations, but also to situations of power distribution that create relationships of domination, inequality or resistance. Regardless of the discourse, its content gives rise to an extremely variable configuration. Institutional discourses can be long, short and can even be contained in a single expression or statement. In any case, what differentiates a speech from any other grammatical unit is the result of the conditions of utterance (Smith, 1994:96-98).

In discourse / speech, the syntactic reality of language is not important, but the meaning that the speaker / writer assigns to the units of grammatical meaning, this being the act of production that differentiates a discourse from any grammatical expression. In discourse, in addition to decoding the common codes that facilitate communication, we must decode the other code, which is the basis of what is explicitly expressed and which

was produced by the speaker / writer, depending on the communication situation in which it is immersed. The communication situation shapes the speech production because it is within this framework that the discursive meaning is allocated regardless of the presence or absence of the audience / readership. For example, at a press conference held by an educational institution, being a meeting present, the audience are present and can intervene more actively in the discursive changes, while the reader of a newspaper can hardly intervene in the conditions of the semantic and pragmatic configuration. Even so, the audience / readership appears in the speech/ discourse as the (invisible) agent for whom the speech was made.

4. Conclusion

To sum up, from our point of view, in creating an institutional discourse, the aspects that should be taken into account would mainly be communicative competence, embedding socio-cultural competence, which involves paying attention to the context in which the discourse takes the place and to creating social bonds, and strategic competence so as to provide the mechanisms for the interpretation of this particular discourse type and the accurate identification of the intended meaning.

References

1. Mey, J. L. 2001. *Pragmatics. An Introduction*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
2. Mucchielli, A. 1998. *Théorie des processus de la communication*. Paris: Armand Colin.
3. Rus, F. Calin. 2002. *Introducere in stiinta comunicarii si a relatiilor publice (Introduction to the Science of Communication and Public Relations*). Iasi: Institutul European.
4. Salavastru, C. 1999. *Discursul puterii* (*The Discourse of Power*). Iasi: Institutul European.
5. Sell, J. 2007. ”The Sociology of Group Dynamics”. In C. D. Bryant and D. L. Peck (eds.). *21st Century Sociology. A Reference Handbook.* Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications, pp. 171
6. Sen, A. 1977. ”Rational fools: a critique of the behavioural foundations of economic theory” in *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 6 (4), pp. 317-344, available at https://www.jstor.org/stable/2264946 [accessed March 2021]
7. Skinner, Q. 1970. ”Conventions and the Understanding of Speech Acts” in *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 20(79), pp. 118-138, available at https://www.jstor.org/stable/2218084 [accessed March 2021].