



**HAL**  
open science

# Advantages and limitations of text analysis to reveal the strategic action of social actors. The example of Cultural Diversity

Bertrand Cabedoche

► **To cite this version:**

Bertrand Cabedoche. Advantages and limitations of text analysis to reveal the strategic action of social actors. The example of Cultural Diversity. Leif Kampf, Nico Carpentier, Andreas Hepp and all. (ed.). Media Practice and Everyday Agency in Europe. Interventions and Intersections, edition Lumiere, pp. 177-194, 2014. hal-02021680

**HAL Id: hal-02021680**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02021680>**

Submitted on 16 Feb 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## **Advantages and limitations of a text analysis to reveal the strategic action of social actors. The example of *Cultural diversity*.**

Bertrand Cabedoche, professor of information and communication sciences (Gresec), president of the world network Orbicom UNESCO chairs on communication

Among the available methodological tools for Phd students, technics for the analysis of written documents figure prominently. However, the call for this technics was not always so obvious for Information and Communication Sciences. Certainly, during the period of constitution of the discipline in the second half of twentieth century, to go back to the ground - thanks to the return to the original texts and discourses of social actors - allowed to go beyond the excesses of structuralism, in its most radical versions in the 60s: at this period, some leaders of this school neglected this in order to reveal the importance of structures, regardless of the intentions and actions of individuals (Althusser, 1965, Althusser, Balibar, 1968), as recalled by its critics: *'la subjectivité remplace le respect pour l'écrit, parce qu'elle se prétend rigoureuse, parce qu'elle s'affirme 'décodage parfait' . Autant de prétentions abusives'* <sup>1</sup>(Lefebvre, 1969: 3-37).

With the evolution of theories considering the Humain Being as a whole subject, textual analysis is recognized again, as it left its systematically unveiling function: now, it is no longer limited to question how Politic and Ideology infuse uses of words and structure of discourses. Instead of reducing the discourses of social actors to the expression of ideological illusions, this technical method considers seriously claims and skills of ordinary people, and helps us to distinguish the different logics of social actors, thanks to the *Comprehensive sociology* approach inspired by Max Weber, and in the same

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Subjectivity replaces respect for the written word, because it claims to rigorous, because it says itself as 'perfect' decoding. But so many abusive claims! [our translation].

time, *Ethnomethodology* and *Interactionism* born in the United States, (Bonnafous, 2006: 213-227). If environments are defined by *Strategies* linked to structuring system and totalizing discourses, social actors and individuals are working to transform positively their own situation by using *Tactics* (de Certeau, 1980: 62-63).

So, because Information and Communication Sciences are in principle refractory to a general theory which could explain everything, the discipline finally encourages to consider these, thankless but necessary, ways of doing research *in situ* and *pro tempore*, directly calling back to the original text of the actors themselves and in the same time, to the context of their discourses and actions. The approach is relevant, now far beyond the first functionalist restrictive definitions of a content analysis as just a quantitative analysis of the manifest content (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, 1948). Today rehabilitated and widely expanded and improved, allowing access to the '*other side of the mirror*' beyond a first quick reading level, and opening to a critic distance to the illusion of transparency, the range of tools from document analysis is however not enough to scientifically understand the *persuasive action* of social actors. This just offer clues, to be completed by survey methods and perspectives of authors, to really treat hypotheses.

This is especially the situation, when a Phd researcher is facing to progressively integrated terms into the everyday language and, even more, when this terms have been previously validated into diplomatic languages, *e.g.* from international conventions as legal texts proposed by the United Nations Organizations.

In this way, we have already evaluate political limits in social actors discourses of the reference to the *Tangible and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, which led a majority of Unesco states members to the ratification of both the *Convention*

*for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* in november 1972 and the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* in october 2003 (Cabedoche, 2012a). On the one hand, the reference to the *Common Heritage* creates obligations for States to a common property. But on the other hand, the approach reintroduces in parallel a nationalist closure and competitions between countries and governments (*e.g.* Thailand and Cambodia, fighting for the property of a site on their common border) or exclusion and stigmatization, with *e.g.* the belief of a supposed *clash of civilizations* (Huttington, 1997).

Also, we made the same deconstructive work for Unesco from the terminological reference *Interculturality* (Cabedoche, 2013a: 55-64). And this year, we are ending researchs from the *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*, offered by Unesco to States ratification in octobre 2005 (Cabedoche, 2013b and 2013c). This research should be useful for PhD students who seek to identify how tactically, social actors play with the term *cultural diversity*, to defend their own interests.

First, our presentation will remind these conclusions from an analysis of social actors discourses using the term *Diversity*, *e.g.* *France Telecom* (now call *Orange* on telecommunications global markets), during 2005-2010 period. So, we'll begin a first distance with this declarative discourses, from their own omissions and contradictions. Then, we'll put this result in perspective with the general context of *France Telecom* Human resources management. Finally, we'll extense the distance with theoretical issues which invest *cultural diversity*, beyond limits of methods of content analyse.

## **1. An instrumentalizing humanist discourse of Diversity, without real concrete following indicators for action**

Becoming in 2005 one of the first signatories of a french Charter of *Diversity* promoted by the *Institut Montaigne*, *France Telecom (FT)* could then ensure an excellent relay of its discourse in mainstream media. This was due both to institutional links between this Telecommunications Operator and some media groups, and to an awesome pressure maintained by its own Public Relations offices, through the convergence to *diversity* that media are themselves required to perform as economic organizations on the orders of the CSA<sup>2</sup>, even though the term and its uses already revealed its ambiguities (Alemanno Cabedoche, 2011, Cabedoche, 2012b). Now, we would emphasize on institutional variations of the value of *diversity* brought in managerial and media discourses, at least until the public overexposure of *FT* work related suicides (around sixty *FT* employees for three years), with a progressive media stigma of deadly dimension of *FT* management and a growing internal desymbolization of the company at the end of the decade.

The *Charter of diversity* of *Institut Montaigne* was directly the result of French Bébéar report (Bébéar, 2004), itself result of a broader reflection on the European Union level, to make the labor market more responsive and also more open to the employment of marginalized or excluded people. Analyzing the first reports of signatory companies, authors find the term *diversity* as '*le mot phare de ce cru 2005*'<sup>3</sup> (Point, 2006), others speaking in terms of 'fashion effects' about a management of diversity, parallely encouraged and guaranteed by a hyper mediatization particularly since 1999 (Barth, 2007: 287). In 2007, 42% respondents to an European survey reported having implemented policies to promote diversity for over 5 years, 27% since 2002 (Féron, 2008).

For *FT*, a *Performance & Cultural Diversity project* has been launched, managed by the Direction of Communication, supporting a continuously business plan until 2010. The 2007 *FT* report confirmed this promotion of

---

<sup>2</sup> *Conseil Supérieur de l'audiovisuel*, French audiovisual regulation authority

<sup>3</sup> *The headlight word of 2005 vintage* [our translation].

diversity, which discourse reflected the '*social responsibility*' of the company, fighting against every kind of discrimination. As such, *FT* discourse introduced itself to applicants as an '*involved* [human-size company] *for Diversity and Equality*'. Later, the new *2008-2010 employees agreement* showed a strong commitment discourse for insertion of people with disabilities. Similarly, *FT* management discourse included a '*responsible consideration of religions*' and declared a fight against homophobia. *FT* prided itself to be quoted in managerial circles and professional media for its internal promotion of *gender diversity*.

So promoted, *FT* discourse of *Diversity* seems to be part of this humanist impulse that deeply inspired the 2005 UNESCO Convention (Yacoub, 2012), even though, we must also consider this reference in terms of *Cultural diversity* as a part of a business case. *Neo-institutionalist theories* of organizations (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983) effectively use to consider a better performance when it is related to employees learning difference directly in the workplace (Ely, Thomas, 1996), in particular, on multinational market places (Rosenzweig, 1998, Dass, Parker, 1999). Whereas previously, theorists of *Globalization* thought the capitalist system in terms of homogenization from a growing consumption levelling (Fukuyama, 1993), now, the *Theory of resources* lead on-going *glocalized* companies to value what individuals learn from other perspectives, even more than to assimilate differences or just to evaluate (Dass, Parker, 1999).

But very quickly, the discourse of diversity in the workplace has been described as a '*social embellishment*' (Kirby, Erika, Harter, 2003). As a research method, discourse analysis of *FT* really helped us to test the hypothesis, as revealed both from the Said and the the Unsaid too.

First, we noted that this diversity promotion never referred to the legally binding dimension of some of this policies implemented under the name of '*diversity*', suggesting a totally generous commitment, while for some of its aspects, this

was a result of a comminatory legal injunction<sup>4</sup>. The management of Diversity could even appear as an anticipation on binding legal devices (Frederiks, 1994). *FT* company was near silent too, about the issue of its purely economic interest to internally develop Diversity. Perhaps maybe because the postulate of a business case from Diversity is not really demonstrated (Bergen, Soper, Foster, 2002, Jones, Stablein, 2002). But surely, the difficulties of interculturalism in employees mind with a previous merger with the British *Orange* company proves a *threshold effect* Theory, to emphasize on mental blocks after a first failure of this policy (Steinman, 2006) or a hasty discourse of Diversity as a business case (Féron, 2008). On both sides of the Channel, people had built the same stereotyped nationalist disqualifications about the supposed performance of the Other, and consecutively, lived *diversity* more as a vector of confrontation, rather an opportunity for cooperation and synergy (Dameron, Joffre, 2005).

This psychological barrier could have been extended to operational managers too, entangled in terminological confusion between *Difference*, *Discrimination* and *Diversity* from hazardous empirical approaches to resolve daily difficulties on managing diversity (Delattre, Morin, 2006, Féron, 2008: 57-71) and ultimately oppressed with an increased stress! (Semache, 2006). But any reports spoke about these difficulties to manage Diversity, with its progression, stagnation, regression. *FT* discourse was a dithyrambic valorisation of the bold operational policy.

Meanwhile, this official *FT* communicative action on *Diversity* accompanied an inflexible management policy, which did not seem to consider Human Being other than an *adjustment variable*, this explains the appearance in court now for moral harassment of 2005-2010 *FT* CEO Didier Lombard.

---

<sup>4</sup> *I.e.*, French Law of November 17, 2001, expands the obligation to fight against discrimination beyond just discrimination in terms of gender.

## 2. A polysemic discourse on *diversity*, with an oppressive internal management context

During this period effectively, a NEXT plan (*New Experience in Telecommunications*) was established by the executive board, both to compensate for the previous abyssal financial losses related to, on the one hand, the costly acquisition of *Orange* and, on the other hand, risky investments on the digital economy, but also to face up to a triple *big bang* in the world Telecommunications Market, *i.e.* a sudden deregulation; a fierce competition; constant technological ruptures. This *FT* policy ordered managers to encourage, induce, and even force the departure of more than 20,000 employees, through a relentless powering management on workers and a brutal sideliness elimination of '*porteurs de signaux faibles*'<sup>5</sup> workers: those who, physically, psychologically, could not endure the rapid pace multi-specialization management policy from a '*time to move*' injunction<sup>6</sup>; those who, politically, could not accept to become just a coast killer, without any qualms. And when this inhuman managerial policy began to be pointed in the media frontpage from a macabre counting or work related suicides, the communicational response of CEO was first a total denial of human suffering. But in 2010, cornered by journalists instructing a public trial, *FT Executive board* finally admits the hypothesis of an institutional link with the human dramas. But immediately using *Diversity* as a response to the risk of a progressive '*desublimation*' of *FT*: '*Yes, the 22,000 expected departures were stimulated with premiums to managers who succeeded their objective to reduce the size of their teams. But departures were compensated by a bold recruitment policy (7,000), focusing on Cultural Diversity, Integration and Development of the person*'<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> *People with 'weak signs'* [our translation].

<sup>6</sup> The principle which authoritatively forced employees to a total mobility (location, work, responsibility), at least every three years.

<sup>7</sup> Our own summary of official *FT* discourse, from Delphine Ernotte, *Orange France*



In fact, once again, content analysis reveals the ambiguities of using the word *Diversity*. Our own research confirms conclusions from previous analyses of first companies reports, required from the signature of the *Diversity Charter* in 2004-2005, which already denounced the '*wooden tongue*' of the notices (Point, 2006). Since, the managerial discourse of Diversity at *FT* still never was demonstrated by precise figures (except related to gender diversity) to allow concret later verification. Its assertions remained developed in isolation, as a distended decontextualized patchwork, without any workshop monitoring (Féron, 2008). Since 2006, these conclusions were not corrected, when it was ever clear that this period was just '*l'orée d'une harmonisation sociale, assez loin de favoriser une véritable "culture de l'inclusion"*'<sup>8</sup> (Point, 2006). Later, in fact, it was still referred to the demagogy of companies speaking of Diversity, which one just gave to the public what it wanted to hear, but not necessarily translating the discourse into action: '*On est dans la cosmétique, le travestissement, l'alibi*'<sup>9</sup> (Bath, 2007: 281).

To this first critical conclusion, we must add a finding of a hyperbolic convocation of the notion: from 2005 to 2010, *FT* used to stamp the label to any kind of its decisions. The observation of managerial discourse in other companies of this decade was in line with the same call of multiple, floating, and often un-identifiable objects, without clear reference for a comprehensive measure of its induced effects (Barth: 2007: 274, Féron, 2008: 57). At this stage, beyond a sense of familiarity, '*le lecteur ne [savait] finalement pas bien de*

---

executive director, interviewed in 'Les apprentis sorciers', magazine *Envoyé spécial*, french *France 2* TV program, 2010, september 30.

<sup>8</sup> The edge of a social harmonization, very far to foster a real 'culture of inclusion' [our translation].

<sup>9</sup> 'The era is the one of cosmetics, mask, alibi [our translation].

*quelle diversité il s'agit : des métiers, des minorités, des cultures...?'* <sup>10</sup> (Point, 2006: 61 -85).

Among numerous unexpected examples, the affirmation of *Diversity* in *FT* discourse have been associated for example with technological drivers: development of technological applications (IP, Broadband, fixed-mobile convergence) would work '*...[pour faire] reculer les frontières entre les métiers traditionnels [et créer] un champ d'intervention ouvert, celui d'un monde numérique universel et doué d'ubiquité*' <sup>11</sup> (Serveille, Friedel, 2007 : 259-268). Such a boldness to interpret *Diversity* is not rare: the reference was even turned against *FT* when competitors in global markets had been felt offended by an exclusivity arrangement obtained by *FT* to diffuse the new single of singer woman Madonna: such an agreement would deprive consumers of the choice distributor, that is to say ... '*a deprivation of diversity*' <sup>12</sup>. Finally, it was in the name of identity protection that, mobilizing *FT* managers by train, some external consultants used to present the required sacrifices to contain foreign competitors as it was done in the past, ...during the *Battle of Britain* against cultural Nazi leveling ! (Nicolas, Talouit, 2010).

This rhetorical shift is classic: while the arguments called for a deregulation of Telecommunications in the eighties, an amalgam was ever denounced between on the one hand, individual aspirations for autonomy and decentralization which meet social uses of Information and Communication Technologies and on the other hand, the need for a transnational Capital to broken societies from its solidarity structures (Mattelart, Mattelart, Delcourt, 1983: 59, Mattelart, T.,

---

<sup>10</sup> Ultimately, the reader didn't really know what kind of diversity he was told: Trades? Minorities? Cultures? ... [our translation].

<sup>11</sup> To push the boundaries between traditional crafts [and create] a field of intervention, the universal and ubiquitous digital world! [our translation].

<sup>12</sup> PH. Guerrier, 'Promotion de Madonna, France Télécom et Warner Music assignent VirginMega' ['Promotion of Madonna, France Telecom and Warner Music assign VirginMega], *IT Expresso*, 15 novembre 2005, URL : <http://www.itespresso.fr/promotion-de-madonna-france-telecom-et-warner-music-assignent-virginmega-14557.html> (consultation: 2010, september 31).

2007). In the sector of organizational communication analyses, a wide critic literature has ever noted the proposal in 1981 of CNPF<sup>13</sup>, which called its members to produce a social *Imaginary* about '*a corporate citizenship*', when in the same time, the *Imaginary* produced by labor organizations weakened, as their representativity done, too (Le Moëne, 1995). Beyond the single French case, to report actions for *Diversity* in the name of a social responsibility had been analyzed as first a public relations exercise (Hon, Brunner, 2000). So recontextualized, the discourse no longer appears to be a proof of any politically correct action, but as a strategic necessity for the corporate image (Kirby, Harter, 2003). Since 2001 effectively, research conclusions could be this one: if entrepreneurial discourses emphasized the proliferation of initiatives and actions for a better integration of minorities and for *Diversity*, it was mainly '*pour créer ou maintenir une image d'une entreprise responsable, au lieu de décliner de véritables arguments sur l'impact d'une bonne gestion de la diversité sur la performance organisationnelle*'<sup>14</sup> (Bellard, Rüling, 2001). In 2007, improving the brand image was recognized as a priority by 37% of European companies engaged in a policy of diversity in recruitment (Féron, 2007).

This simple and unic displacement in theoretical perspective perfectly demonstrates why reserachers must go beyond the content analysis, to understand all possible sets of actors tactics and theoretical contradictory debates of authors, too. It is not enough to denounce the amalgams (Miège, 2006).

### **3. The need of theoretical schools to enlarge the perspective**

---

<sup>13</sup> French entrepreneurs' Union from 1945 to 1998.

<sup>14</sup> *To create or maintain an image of a responsible company, instead of declining real arguments on the impact of good diversity management on organizational performance* [our translation].

In a previous work on *FT*, we already started our research by analyzing the content, before structuring our thinking in relation to the *French pragmatic sociology* (Cabedoche, 2012c). Such a raise is particularly required when for example, a lexical analysis reportes a so recurring polysemous syntagm, as *Diversity*, even restricted to *Cultural Diversity*, which was mainly called but the *Charter of Diversity* proposed by the *Institut Montaigne* (Barth, 2007 : 280).

From the analysis of legal conventional, media content, *Diversity* could thus mobilize the anthropological, linguistic and historical approach of a lot of researchers (Laulan, 2013 Lenoble-Bart, Mathien, 2011, Mathien, 2013, Oustonoff, 2013 ...). For example, Joseph Yacoub inspired the '*new humanism*' reference of Unesco Director-General of Unesco Irina Bokova (Yacoub, 2012). His perspective was conducted from three surveys from 1947 to 1951 initiated by first Director-General of Unesco Julian Huxley, to expand the scope of the debate on the foundations of Human Rights and recognition of *Diversity* beyond Europe. Sometimes taking a '*relative relaivism*' philosophical way in favor of a *cultural hybridization* (interculturality) (Yacoub, 2012), these works illustrate their documentary wealth and militant advocacy promoting *Diversity* as a principle and, precisely from this, the revaluation Unesco of which we should regret the dispossession of the original intellectual legitimacy by the dominant member states and private institutions for the benefit of the WTO (Cassen, 2003 Dijan, 2005, Maurel, 2009), or the futility in terms of political influence (Courrier, 2005: 55-56). But on a theoretical level, this works could be limited to lament, especially when the Information and Communications Technologies don't realize their alleged promise about *Diversity* (Delmas, 2013), or limited to develop a compassion with social those social actors who promote *Diversity* '*with a great courage*' in response to discrimination (Barth, 2007: 281). Works could be limited too in the perilous way of Prophecy when, for example, Information and Communication Technologies appear now as magic tools by themselves to increase a linguistic sphere (Oustonoff, 2013), or a social one

(Albertini, 2013). Finally, lyrical conclusions could systematically be limited to a pious wish, a principle petition, with aspect of evidence and desperate run for consensus beyond the terminological ambiguities and taboos (Mathien, 2013), as we have already identified from the reflexive sequestration Unesco made on the *New World Information and Communication Order* reference (Cabedoche, 2011). In fact, these publications prove how dramatically insufficient they are, to a reader waiting for a real theoretical implementation of Diversity and a conceptual clarification of challenges and plural strategies mobilizing social actors. Even when it is justified in the case of organizations whose financial logic amplifies needs for contemporary public shows (Barth, 2007: 280), the analysis just on content is still very quickly unsatisfying, disconnected from its both conceptual, theoretical, epistemological foundations, but also from understanding tools about ideological and normative policy issues whose discourses are also mediator.

Conditions for the adoption of legal texts governing *Diversity* as promoted by Unesco, as well as circumventions to concretely implemente *Diversity* and later, difficulties to really assess their operational capability (Courrier, 2005: 54, Dijan, 2005) are already significant of these issues. Thus, the *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* was unanimously adopted by the Paris 31st Session of Unesco General Assembly in 2001, November 2: so, when United States had not yet return to the United Nations specialized Agency. It is only beyond the contents of the text by introducing a historical perspective that one can understand the subsequent refusal of U.S.A, with Israel and Great Britain, to ratify the *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* against the current of all other member states, as a continuity of the traditional rejection of any supranational regulatory authority (Frau-Meigs, 2004).

First, just to give a terminological perspective with other references was used for analyze: the replacement of the *Cultural Exception* - as a more constraining

concept for States as claimed by France and Canada - by *Cultural Diversity* was more than a semantic shift, or an encouraging progression from one concept to another, as some authors believe too much quickly (Mathien, 2013). Because their respective genealogy is fundamentally different (Miege, 2006), others even speak in terms of a *Copernician Revolution* (Musitelli, 2006, Laulan, 2008). This is once again just using academic references – whatever they feel inspired with liberal economics (Pool, 1977, Cowen, 1998 and 2002) and *Cultural Studies* (Fiske, 1987), or with their critical reading (Mattelart, T., 2007), that one can understand the removal in the text of the Convention of some principles of action that *Cultural Diversity* could also refer to: media pluralism, the protection of journalists, the definition of specific monitoring and constraints mechanisms... Of course, the adoption of the Convention represents a major step in the emergence of an International Cultural Law, as it was first analyzed (Anghel, 2008: 65). But beyond the signatories Declaratives, the text becomes really significant only if it is matched with the recognition of a merchant vision and a business culture in favor of particularly of WTO that, writing this text, Unesco conceded under pressure from the United States, Australia and Japan. This was made in total contradiction with the declared objective, (Mattelart, A., 2005). To extend the understanding to the practical application of the text, it is once again referring to the critic economics, from a *Cultural Industries Theory* that one can fully identify the plurality of strategies led both in these industries, and concerning public policy, beyond self-celebration discourses (D’Almeida, Alleman, 2004: 69).

So, it is absolutely with similar theoretical - and not only methodological - tools, that a Phd student can hopefully also understand ideological resonance of *Diversity* in the discourse of actors. *E.g.*, an economic actor, such as *FT*, when we know that emerging issues about intercultural practices have been distributed in three areas: Immigration, International Relations and Intercultural Management (Stoiciu, 2008). The PhD student could do so, in the way of

Tristan Mattelart (Mattelart, T., 2008): first by reading the preliminary findings of its semi-descriptive reading, in perspective with David Harvey proposal. The British anthropologist author analyzes a paradigm shift, from a Fordist accumulation regime, which corresponds with a standardized cultural order, to a regime of flexible accumulation, needing a cultural order that mobilizes the creative potential of *Diversity* (Harvey, 1989). Then, the PhD work could accept the recommendation of Tristan Mattelart for a return to critical reason: on the one hand, against the too enthusiastic *Cultural Studies* readings for the development of a mass culture now carrying Heterogeneity (Hall, 1997); on the other hand, against an anthropology of Syncretism (Clifford, 1988), Creolization (Hannerz 1989) or Hybridization (Appadurai, 1990); or one more time against a Sociology of Self identity Construction, in relation to the plurality of choices resulting from the evolution of global market logic (*High Modernity*) (Giddens 1991) as it is mainly supported by Global media and Communication Technologies (Tomlinson, 1999). All of these theoretical proposal underestimate the significance of hegemonic flow animating these transnational flows (Mattelart, T., 2008). We share this call for a return to a critical reason, personally adding the theoretical perspective of French Pragmatic Sociology revealing '*the new spirit of capitalism*' (Boltanski, Chiapello, 1999). With this contribution, the young researcher has the *project-based City* as a key concept to explain the inflation of *Diversity* discourses. From that meliorative label, each social actor can expect an honorary award, despite a questionable, even hateful, Human Resources policy as it worked with *FT* (Cabedoche, 2012c), or *Renault* and *Disneyland* (Mœglin, 2013).

As we have already concluded in a collective synthesis including our previous work (Bouquillion, Combès, 2011:10), when calling Culture in the sense alternately of anthropology, cultural products and practices, information and communication, and even corporate culture, a social discourse of *Diversity* is

working as a metaphorically naturalizing '*discourse of truth*', even up to speak the language of biodiversity, in order to obtain this result.

However, such objectifying appellations remain inseparable of power systems that promote this and political and economic issues that characterize these terminological constructions (Bouquillion, 2008). Worse! They succeed to enter scientific places when the academy host the interdisciplinary confrontation with the paradoxically leveling overhang, in the one hand, from neo-Fordist engineers, arguing in favor of the mixing caused by Information and Communication Technologies (Rasse, 2013); in the other hand, when researchers promote a General Systems Theory with the same arrogance (Mœglin, 2013).

## Conclusion

To elevate the debate beyond texts, a learner as a researcher should legitimately hesitate to make his deconstruction as a step towards a more moral or political than scientific individual movement, for example if he intends advocating diversity in terms of economical alternative without further distinction, as identified in some works (Dacheux, 2013). At least, we may expect with Pierre Mœglin, researchers take into account the concrete forms in which Diversity is involved the '*enlightened thinking*': conflictual phenomena, multiple ideological issues, uncertainty of their genesis. This is indispensable when convening *Diversity* provides today such a hyperbolic dimension in social actors' discourses.

Effects, even gains, are real, arising from the practical implementation in 2007, march 18th *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Probably just because, to some extent, the irrationality of the phrase does no longer need to be demonstrated, with *Diversity*, carrying



along with its mediation, a systematic range of Imaginaries, in a combinatorial sense of the term<sup>15</sup> and conceptual and ideological bricolages, e.g. about questionable and discussed diversity criteria (Benhamou, Peltier, 2006, Moreau, Peltier, 2011 Denieul, 2012: 123-157). Now, this discussion is no longer sufficient, even if it was helpful. No more with the replacement by the term *Fragmentation* some authors (Kiyindou, 2013) prefer to deny any conceptual claim to *Diversity*, even if it is now defined as a creative and digital *Diversity*.

Certainly, it is regrettable to note that the presentation of this reassuring passport has now become a necessary condition for the entry of social actors in a fundamentally adversarial public debate, especially for managers of organizations (Barth, 2007), but even for a few authors who position themselves in academic deconstruction (Albertini, 2013). On behalf of this '*false pretense*' (Miege, 2006), of this constructed *Diversity* as a totem of modernity in response to the requirements of pragmatic, moral and cognitive legitimacy of powers, the most diverse and variable geometry argumentative ruses are rationally performing, based on the assessment by the social actors according to the evolution of their own interests<sup>16</sup>, from what Information and Communication Sciences are building one of their decrypting programs<sup>17</sup>.

But beyond Experts of inclusion and Pamphleteers against discrimination discourses, the scientific challenge now is to develop a consistent theory, which could be able to provide a relevant frame from three negative aspects of multiculturalism: Differences, Inequalities, Disconnection, usually separately explored (García Canclini, 2004: 314). Because although it may devote mode

---

<sup>15</sup> With Miguel de Aguilera, we've metaphorically compared opacity of discourses promoting *Cultural Diversity* to an *encrypted pornography* that recipients could use to decode alone, based on their own fertile imagination, as clandestine television viewers do, watching without a TV decoder for encrypted movies. Isabelle Barth speaks in terms of a *belief-diversity*, a *legitimation-diversity* and a *resource-diversity* (Barth, 2007: 276).

<sup>16</sup> With regard to the protection of copyright, Pierre Moeglin thus points how juridically, eligible parties both could have an interest in an alliance or to object to providers, depending on the circumstances. Bernard Miege notes that cultural diversity can conceal as well asymmetrical trade agreements as the defense of industries, living away from protection ...

<sup>17</sup> This direction of research provides the program *Internationalization of communication and cultural diversity* that we lead in Gresec laboratory in Grenoble.

effects in the field of organizational management, a reference to *Diversity* is far from laying down a transitory phenomenon, as some authors have ever reported (Novicki, Oustinoff, Wolton, 2008 :9), and as governments, international authorities and social actors demonstrate with the extreme attention every one is focusing now about this theme (Bouquillion, 2008 : 251).

## Bibliographie

*Unless otherwise indicated, the bracketed english translated are made by the author of this book chapter*

- ALBERTINI, Françoise, 2013. 'Penser autrement la Méditerranée contemporaine : quelles voies pour le dialogue interculturel ?', *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [On line], on line 2013, january 1, reading 2013, august 2013. URL : <http://rfsic.revues.org/342>
- ALEMANNI, Sylvie P. CABEDOCHÉ, Bertrand, 2011: 24-40, 'Suicide as the ultimate response to the effects of globalisation. France Télécom, psychosocial risks and communicational implementation of the global workplace', *Intercultural Communication Studies Journal* (International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies). Guangzhou and Macao Polytechnic University (China) and University of Rhode Island, Kingston, USA, Vol. XX, Issue 2, august.
- ALTHUSSER, Louis, 1965: 25-sq. *Pour Marx*. Paris: Maspero (Théorie 1) [*For Marx*, transl. Ben Browster, London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press (Part. 1), 1969].
- ALTHUSSER, Louis, BALIBAR, Étienne, 1968. *Lire le capital*. Paris: Maspero (Théorie 1) [*Reading Capital*, transl. Ben Browster, London: New Left Books (Part. 1) 1970].
- ANGHEL, Laura, 2008: 65-69. 'La convention sur la diversité des expressions culturelles: état des lieux', *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle*, n° 51. <http://hdl.handle.net/2042/24176> DOI: 10.4267/2042/24176
- APPADURAI, Arjun, 1990: 295-310. 'Disjunctive and difference in the global cultural economy', in Mike Featherstone (ed.), *Global Culture. Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity. A Theory Culture and Society Special Issue*. London: Sage, 1990.
- BARTH, Isabelle, 2007: 273-292, 'La face cachée du management de la diversité' in Isabelle Barth, Christophe Falcoz (eds), *Le management de la diversité: enjeux, fondements et pratiques* { *The management of diversity: Issues, Foundations and practices*. Paris, L'Harmattan (Coll. 'Recherches en gestion').
- BEBEAR, Claude Bébéar, 2004. 'Des entreprises aux couleurs de la France' [French colour companies], Rapport remis au Premier Ministre, novembre.
- BENHAMOU, Françoise, PELTIER, Stéphanie, 2006: 313-344. 'Une méthode multicritères d'évaluation de la diversité culturelle. Application à l'édition du livre en France' in Xavier Greffe (ed.), 2006. *Création et diversité au miroir des industries culturelles*.

Paris : La Documentation française.

- BERELSON, Bernard, LAZARFELD, Paul, 1948. *The analysis of communication content*. Chicago and New-York: University of Chicago and Columbia University, Preliminary Draft.
- BERGEN, C. W. Von, SOPER, Barlow, FOSTER Teresa, 2002: 239-251, 'Unintended negative effects of diversity management', *Public Personnel Management*, vol. 31, n°2.
- BOLTANSKI, Luc, CHIAPELLO, Ève (1999). *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. [The new spirit of capitalism], Paris: Gallimart (nrf).
- BONNAFOUS, Simone, 2006: 213-227. 'L'analyse de discours', [The discourse analysis] in Stéphane Olivesi (ed.), *Sciences de l'information et de la communication, Objets, savoirs, discipline*. Grenoble, PUG.
- BOUQUILLION, Philippe, 2008: 251-268, 'La diversité culturelle. Une approche communicationnelle' [Cultural diversity. A communicationnal approach], *Questions de communication*, n° 13.
- CABEDOUCHE, Bertrand, 2011: 56-69. 'Le rapport MacBride, conférence du consensus avant l'heure ? L'expérimentation refoulée d'une médiation politique originale, porteuse d'un espace public sociétal et des valeurs fondatrices de l'UNESCO' [Was the McBride report a consensus conference before the time? The repressed experimentation of an original political mediation leading to a societal public sphere and constituting the core values of Unesco ?] *Les Enjeux de l'information et de la Communication*, 1/2011, [http://w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les\\_enjeux/2011/Cabedoche/index.html](http://w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les_enjeux/2011/Cabedoche/index.html)
- CABEDOUCHE, Bertrand, 2012a: 107-120. 'Documentaire de création et diversité culturelle en Afrique subsaharienne' [Documentary films and cultural diversity in subsaharian Africa], *Études interculturelles*, Université catholique de Lyon, september.
- CABEDOUCHE, Bertrand, 2012b: 38-48, 'Teamplayer : an infernal spiral. France Télécom serves as a painful reminder of the serious risks of organisational restructuring', *Conférence social Media*, Quadriga, University of Applied sciences (Berlin), Issue n° 12, 3 and 4 may.
- CABEDOUCHE, Bertrand, 2012c: 229-240, 'Exploring the foundations and theoretical distancing required for a Phd thesis : an incursion into the backyard of research' in Nico CARPENTIER, Pille PRUULMANN-VENGUFELDT, Richard KILBORN, and all. (ed.), *Critical perspectives on the European mediasphere. The intellectual work of the 2011 European*

- media and communication doctoral summer school*, Ljubljana, Založba FDV, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana Press.
- CABEDOCHÉ, Bertrand, 2013a: 55-64 'Intercultural Journalism', in Fackson Banda (ed.) *Model Curricula for Journalism Education. A compendium of new syllabi*. Paris: Unesco (Unesco Series on Journalism Education).
- CABEDOCHÉ, Bertrand, 2013b, 'Culture du chiffre et responsabilité sociale : le déplacement de la charge de l'incertitude sur le facteur humain à France Télécom' [Figure Culture and social responsibility: the shift of uncertainty burden on the human factor. The example of France Telecom], in Chrystelle Fourier, Valérie Lépine, Fabienne Martin-Juchât (eds.), *Pratiques des acteurs de la communication. Un état des lieux*, Grenoble: PUG (Coll. « Communication, médias »), forthcoming.
- CABEDOCHÉ, Bertrand, 2013c, 'Diversité culturelle et régulation : des convocations terminologiques historiquement et politiquement délicates' [Cultural diversity and regulation: historically and politically sensitive uses of terminology], in *Régulation, diversité et linguistique en Afrique*, Rabat, Orbicom and HACA, Unesco Publications, forthcoming.
- CASSEN, Bernard, 2003, 'Une norme culturelle contre le droit du commerce?' [A cultural norm against trade law], *Le Monde Diplomatique*, septembre.
- CLIFFORD, John, 1998. *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- COURRIER, Yves, 2005, *L'UNESCO sans peine* [Unesco, without efforts], Paris: L'Harmattan.
- COWEN, Tyler, 1998, *In Praise of Commercial culture*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- COWEN, Tyler, 2002. *Creative destruction. How Globalization Is Shaping the World's Cultures*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- DACHEUX, Éric, 2013, 'Le défi des SIC : prendre en compte la pluralité de l'économie pour rendre compte de la diversité culturelle' [Taking into account the plurality of the economy to reflect cultural diversity as a challenge for Information and Communication Sciences], *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [On line], 2 | 2013, le 09 août 2013. URL : <http://rfsic.revues.org/303>
- D'ALMEIDA Francisco, ALLEMAN Marie-Lise, 2004, 'Les industries culturelles des pays du Sud : Enjeux du projet de Convention internationale sur la diversité culturelle'

- [Cultural industries in South countries: Challenges of the draft for an International Convention on Cultural Diversity], Report for Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie et du Haut Conseil de la Francophonie, with Bernard Miège and Dominique Wolton, In *Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie*, [http://www.francophonie.org/IMG/pdf/Industries\\_cult.\\_pays\\_du\\_sud\\_2004.pdf](http://www.francophonie.org/IMG/pdf/Industries_cult._pays_du_sud_2004.pdf), (reading: 2011, september 26).
- DASS, Parshotam, PARKER, Barbara, 1999 : 68-80, 'Strategies for managing human resource diversity : From resistance to Learning', *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 13, n° 2.
- De CERTEAU, Michel, 1980: 62-63. *L'invention du quotidien. Les arts de faire*. Paris: Gallimard, 1990 [*The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall, Berkeley : University of California Press, 1984].
- DELATTRE, Sarah, MORIN, Cédric, 2006: 59-66, 'L'entreprise entre dans la bataille pour la diversité' [Companies begin the battle for diversity], *Liaisons Sociales Magazine*, february.
- DELMAS, Richard, 2013, 'Internet et la diversité, le souci du passage à l'éthique' [Internet and diversity, focus on transition to ethics], *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [On line], 2 | 2013, on line 2013, january 1, reading 2013 august 09. URL : <http://rfsic.revues.org/278>
- DENIEUL, Julien, 2012:129-157. *Concentration éditoriale et bibliodiversité: quels enjeux pour le livre* [Editorial concentration and bibliodiversity. Challenges for books] Paris: L'Harmattan (Coll. 'Questions contemporaines').
- DIJAN, Jean-Michel, 2005, 'Un laboratoire dévitalisé' [A devitalized laboratory], *Le Monde diplomatique*, octobre.
- DIMAGGIO, Paul J., POWELL, Walter W., 1983 : 147-160, 'The iron-cage revisited: institutional Isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational field', *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48.
- ELY, Robin J., THOMAS, David A., 1996 : 79-90, 'Making differences matter: a new paradigm for diversity management', *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 74, n° 5.
- FÉRON, Michel, 2008: 57-71, 'Le management des collectifs de travail en GRH : quels apports pour la gestion de la diversité par les managers opérationnels ?' [The human resources management of collective work: what contributions to diversity management

- by line managers?], *Management & Avenir* 4/2008, n° 18). URL : [www.cairn.info/revue-management-et-avenir-2008-4-page-57.htm](http://www.cairn.info/revue-management-et-avenir-2008-4-page-57.htm). DOI : [10.3917/mav.018.0057](https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.018.0057).
- FISKE, John, 1987, *Television Culture*, London: Routledge.
- FRAU-MEIGS, Divina, 2004: 860-877, 'Le retour des États-Unis au sein de l'Unesco' [The come-back of USA in Unesco], *Annuaire français des relations internationales*, 5.
- FREDERICK, William, C., 1994: 150-164, 'From CSR1 to CRS2. The Maturing of Business-Society Thought', *Business & Society*, Vol. 33., n° 2.
- FUKUYAMA, Francis, 1993, *La Fin de l'histoire et le dernier homme*, Paris: Flammarion. [Translated from Fukuyama, Francis, 1992, *The End of History and the Last Man*, New York, The Free press].
- GARCÍA CANCLINI, Néstor, 2004: 313-334, 'Différents, inégaux ou déconnectés' [Differents, inequals or disconnected], *Fundació CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, núm. 66-67.
- GIDDENS, Anthony, 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Stanford : Stanford University Press.
- HALL, Stuart, 1991: 41-68. 'Old and new identities, old and new ethnicities', in Anthony D. King (ed), *Culture, Globalization and the World-System. Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, (reed. 1997).
- HANNERZ, Ulf, 1989 : 66-75. 'Notes on the Global Ecumene', *Public Culture*, vol. 1, n°2.
- HARVEY, David, 1989, *The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, London, Basil Blackwell.
- HON, Linda Childers, BRUNNER, Brigitta, 2000 : 309-340, 'Diversity Issues and Public Relations', *Journal of Public Relations Research*, Vol. 12, n° 4.
- HUNTINGTON, Samuel P., 1997. *The clash of civilizations and he remaking of World Order*. New-York : Simon and Schuster.
- JONES, Deborah., STABLEIN, Ralph, 2006: 145-166. 'Diversity as resistance, resistance to diversity: Critical theory, post-structuralist perspectives and workplace diversity'. In *Handbook of Workforce Diversity*, eds. Alison M. Konrad, Pushkala Prasad, and Judith K. Pringle. London: Sage.
- KIRBY, Erika L., HARTER, Lynn M., 2003 : 28-49, 'Speaking the language of the bottom-line : The metaphor of "Managing Diversity" ', *Journal of Business Communication*, Vol. 40, n° 1.

- KIYINDOU, Alain, 2013, 'De la diversité à la fracture créative : une autre approche de la fracture numérique' [From diversity to creative divide: an alternative approach to the digital divide], *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [on line], 2, on line 2013, January 01, reading: 2013, August 9. URL : <http://rfsic.revues.org/288>
- LAULAN, Anne-Marie, 2008: 75-77. 'La convention sur la diversité des expressions culturelles' [The convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions], *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle*, n° 51. <http://hdl.handle.net/2042/24178> DOI: 10.4267/2042/24178
- LAULAN, Anne-Marie, 2013, 'Communication et diversité culturelle' [Communication and cultural diversity], *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [On line], 2 | 2013, on line 2013, January 1, reading 2013, August 9. URL : <http://rfsic.revues.org/277>.
- LEFEBVRE, Henri, 1969: 3-37. 'Les paradoxes d'Althusser', [The paradoxes of Althusser], *L'homme et la société*, Vol. 13, n° 13.
- LEFEBVRE, Henri, 1971. *Au-delà du structuralisme* [Beyond structuralism]. Paris: Anthropos.
- LE MÖENNE, Christian, 1995 : 139-165, 'Espace public et entreprise : penser la sphère professionnelle', in Isabelle Pailliant (ed.), *L'espace public et l'emprise de la communication*. Grenoble : PUG.
- LENOBLE-BART, Annie, MATHIEN, Michel (eds), 2011, *Les médias de la diversité culturelle dans les pays latins d'Europe* [Media of cultural diversity in Latin countries of Europe]. Bussels: Bruylant (coll. 'Médias, sociétés et relations internationales').
- MATHIEN, Michel, 2013, 'Diversité culturelle, minorités et médias. Réalité et perspectives', *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [On line], 2 | 2013, on line, 2013, January 1, reading 2013, August 9. URL : <http://rfsic.revues.org/310>
- MATTELART Armand, MATTELART, Michèle, DELCOURT, Xavier, 1983, *La culture contre la démocratie* [Culture against democracy]. Paris : La découverte, (Coll. 'Cahiers Libres', n° 381).
- MATTELART, Armand, 2005, 'Bataille à l'Unesco sur la diversité culturelle' [Unesco struggle about cultural diversity], *Le Monde Diplomatique*, octobre.
- MATTELART, Tristan, 2008: 17-22. 'Les théories de la mondialisation culturelle: des



théories de la diversité' [Theories of cultural globalization as theories of Diversity], *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle*, n° 51.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2042/24168> DOI: 10.4267/2042/24168

MATTELART Tristan, 2011: 23-37, 'La diversité culturelle. Quelques éléments de déconstruction théorique' [Cultural diversity. Some elements of theoretical déconstruction], in Philippe Bouquillion et Yolande Combès, *Diversité et industries culturelles*. Paris : L'Harmattan (Coll. 'Questions contemporaines'. Série : 'Les industries culturelles').

MAUREL, Chloé, 2009: 131-144, 'L'Unesco aujourd'hui' {Unesco, Today}, *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire* 2, n° 102. URL : [www.cairn.info/revue-vingtieme-siecle-revue-d-histoire-2009-2-page-131.htm](http://www.cairn.info/revue-vingtieme-siecle-revue-d-histoire-2009-2-page-131.htm). DOI : [10.3917/ving.102.0131](https://doi.org/10.3917/ving.102.0131).

MIÈGE, Bernard, 2006. 'La question des industries culturelles impliquées par/dans la diversité culturelle', in Actes du colloque Systèmes Informatiques et Gestion de l'Environnement (SIGE), Douala, Cameroun, Les Enjeux de l'Information et de la Communication [en ligne], 2006, mis à jour 14 août 2011. [w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les.../Actes%20de%20Douala-Miege-pp75-81.html](http://w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les.../Actes%20de%20Douala-Miege-pp75-81.html)

MØGLIN, Pierre, 2013, 'Enraciner la critique. La question de la diversité culturelle et de ses enjeux' [Rooting criticism. The issue of cultural diversity and its challenges], in Mattelart Tristan (coord.), 'Contributions aux recherches critiques sur la communication', *Les Enjeux de l'Information et de la Communication*, Supplément 2013, mis en ligne le 09 avril 2013, [Reading 2013, April 30], [w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les\\_enjeux/2013-supplement/04Moeglin/pdf.html](http://w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les_enjeux/2013-supplement/04Moeglin/pdf.html)

URL : [http://w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les\\_enjeux/pageshtml/art2013.html#supplement](http://w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les_enjeux/pageshtml/art2013.html#supplement)

MOREAU, François, PELTIER, Stéphanie, 2011 (octobre), 'La diversité culturelle dans l'industrie du livre en France (2003-2007)' [Cultural diversity in French book industry (2003-2007), Département des études, de la prospective et des statistiques. URL : <http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/culture/deps/2008/pdf/ce-2011-4.pdf>

MUSITELLI, Jean, 2006: 11-22, 'La Convention sur la diversité culturelle: anatomie d'un succès diplomatique' ['The Convention on Cultural Diversity: Anatomy of a diplomatic victory], *Revue Internationale et stratégique*, 62.

NOVICKI, Joanna, OUSTONOFF, Mickaël, PROULX, Serge, 2008 : 9-14, 'Introduction', *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle*, n° 51.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2042/28169> DOI: 10.4267/2042/24169

- OUSTINOFF, Mickaël, 2013, 'La diversité linguistique, enjeu central de la mondialisation' [Linguistic diversity as a central challenge of globalization], *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [On line], 2013, January 1, reading 2013, August 9. URL : <http://rfsic.revues.org/328>
- POINT, Sébastien, 2006 : 61-85, 'La charte de la diversité regards sur le discours des entreprises signataires' [The charter of diversity. Perspectives on signatory companies discourse], *Management & Avenir*, n° 8, february. URL : [www.cairn.info/revue-management-et-avenir-2006-2-page-61.htm](http://www.cairn.info/revue-management-et-avenir-2006-2-page-61.htm). DOI : [10.3917/mav.008.0061](https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.008.0061).
- POOL, Ithiel de Sola, 1977: 142-143, 'The changing flow of television', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 27, n°2.
- ROSENZWEIG, Philip, 1998 : 644-652, 'Managing the new global workforce: Fostering diversity, fostering consistency', *European Management Journal*, Vol. 16, n° 6.
- SEMACHE, Sabrina, 2006. 'La diversité au cœur des équipes : Quels enjeux ? Quelles méthodes de management? Quelle place pour le management intermédiaire? [Diversity in the heart of teams: What issues? What methods of management? What place for middle management?]', *Revue Management & Avenir*, n° 10, october.
- SERVEILLE, Hélène, FRIEDEL, Paul, 2007 : 259-268, 'La recherche à FranceTélécom' [Research in France Telecom], in BARRÉ Rémy, de LAAT, Baastian, THEYS, Jacques (eds), *Management de la recherche, Enjeux et perspectives*, Bruxelles : de Boeck Université, chap. 3, (Coll. 'Méthodes et recherches').
- STEINMAN, Lionel, 2006: 54-56. 'Manager la diversité, Développer ce qui rassemble une équipe, limiter ce qui la divise' {How to Manage diversity, develop what brings a team, and limit what divides}, *Enjeux, Les Échos*, pp. 54-56, février.
- STOICIU, Gina 2008: 33-40. 'L'émergence du domaine d'études de la communication interculturelle' [The emergence of intercultural communication studies], *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle*, n° 51.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2042/24171> DOI: [10.4267/2042/24171](https://doi.org/10.4267/2042/24171)
- TOMLINSON, John, 1999. *Globalization and Culture*, Cambridge : Polity Press.
- YACOUB, Joseph, 2013, *L'humanisme réinventé* [The reinvented Humanism]. Paris: Cerf.

## **Oral scientific communications**

- BELLARD, Erwan, RÜLLING, Charles-Clemens, 2001, "Reflections and projections of

boundaries in the diversity management discourses in the United-States, France and Germany", XVII<sup>e</sup> colloque EGOS, Lyon, juillet.

## **Grey literacy**

DAMERON, Stéphanie, JOFFRE Olivier, 2005 : 51-76, 'Rapport coopératif et diversité culturelle : le cas de la gestion post-fusion Orange-France Télécom Mobiles' [Cooperative Report and cultural diversity: the case of the post-merger management Orange-France Telecom Mobiles]', *Finance Contrôle Stratégie*, vol. 8, n°3.

NICOLAS, Bernard, TALAOUT, Vincent, 2010, *Ils ont failli me tuer* [*They nearly kill me*]. Paris: Flammarion.

Plan

Le triomphe du réalisme photographique

Le glissement au statut d'objet idéologique

L'objectivation de la ...subjectivité assumée

Une critique contre la doxa, finalement ...doxique

Conclusion

Bibliographie

### **Abstract**

Among the methodological tools available Phd student, technical analysis written documents prominently. However, their meeting was not always evident in CIS. Today rehabilitated and widely expanded, improved, allowing access from the other side of the mirror beyond a first reading level, the range is not enough to understand the game players. She often offer clues, to be completed by example by survey techniques and perspectives of authors set to begin truly treat assumptions.

Especially when it reveals even more integrated into everyday language terms that have been validated in almost all states and, therefore, diplomatic language, as is the case of agreements, legal texts value contract proposed by the organizations of the United Nations.

We have already had occasion to state political boundaries of the reference to the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity, which led to the ratification by many states of the Convention of 2001, then 2005. Imposing duties, this reference also and primarily been understood as an instrument of reaffirmation of nationalism.

Here we want to show the same use by social actors in reference to cultural diversity.

## Résumé

Parmi les outils méthodologiques dont dispose le Phd student, les techniques d'analyse des documents écrits figurent en bonne place. Pourtant, leur convocation ne fut pas toujours évidente en SIC. Aujourd'hui réhabilitée et très largement étoffée, améliorée, permettant l'accès de l'autre côté du miroir au-delà d'un premier niveau de lecture, la panoplie ne suffit pas à comprendre les jeux des acteurs. Elle n'offre souvent que des indices, devant être complétés par exemple par des techniques d'enquête et des mises en perspectives d'auteurs, pour commencer à véritablement traiter les hypothèses.

En particulier lorsqu'elle révèle des termes d'autant plus intégrés dans le langage courant qu'ils ont été validés dans la quasi totalité des états et, donc, des langages diplomatiques, comme c'est le cas de conventions, textes juridiques à valeur contractuelle, proposés par les organisations du système des Nations-Unies.

Nous avons déjà eu l'occasion de faire état des limites politiques de la référence au patrimoine matériel et immatériel de l'humanité, ayant donné lieu à la ratification par de nombreux états de la convention de 2001, puis de 2005. Imposant des devoirs, cette référence a aussi et d'abord été comprise comme instrument de réaffirmation des nationalismes.

Nous voulons ici montrer ce même usage par les acteurs sociaux de la référence à la diversité culturelle.