Media Practice and Everyday Agency in Europe

edited by Leif Kramp, Nico Carpentier,
Andreas Hepp, Ilija Tomanić Trivundža,
Hannu Nieminen, Risto Kunelius,
Tobias Olsson, Ebba Sundin
and Richard Kilborn

Table of Contents

SECTION 2: Transformations

SECTION 3: Methods

SECTION 4: THE SOCIAL

PART 2
THE EUROPEAN MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION DOCTORAL SUMMER SCHOOL 2013 AND ITS PARTICIPANTS

Advantages and Limitations of a Text Analysis to Reveal the Strategic Action of Social Actors: The Example of Cultural Diversity

Bertrand Cabedoche

Among the variety of available methodological tools, the techniques for the analysis of written documents figure prominently. However, the demand for these techniques was not always so obvious in Information and Communication Sciences. Certainly, the period of the origins of the discipline, in the second half of twentieth century - thanks to a return to the original texts and discourses of social actors – provided us with opportunities to move beyond the excesses of structuralism, in its most radical versions of the 1960s. During the 1960s, some leaders of the structuralist school neglected some of its inherent problems in order to emphasise the importance of structure, regardless of the intentions and actions of individuals (Althusser, 1965; Althusser and Balibar, 1968). Some of structuralism's critics formulated this problem as follows: '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'[1] (Lefebvre, 1969: 3-37).

With the evolution towards theories that considered the human being as a whole subject, textual analysis was recognised again: In its present form, it is no longer limited to questioning how the use of words and the structure of discourses is infused with politics and ideology. Instead of reducing the discourses of social actors to an expression of ideological illusion, this method now seriously considers the 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 at the same time, ethnomethodology and interactionism, born in the United States (Bonnafous, 2006: 213-227). These approaches allow to increase the emphasis on agency and subjectivity. To use de Certeau's words: If environments are defined by strategies linked to structuring systems and totalising discourses, social actors and individuals work to positively transform their own situation by using tactics (de Certeau, 1980: 62-63).

Because Information and Communication Sciences are in principle refractory to a general theory which could explain everything, the discipline finally encourages researchers to consider these thankless but necessary ways of doing research in situ and pro tempore, directly referring back to the original texts of the actors and at the same time, to the context of their discourses and actions. This approach has proven its relevance, and moves far beyond the first functionalist restrictive definitions of content analysis, simply as a quantitative analysis of the manifest content (Berelson and Lazarsfeld, 1948). Rehabilitated today, and widely expanded and improved, providing access to the 'other side of the mirror' and moving beyond the first, quick, reading level, and producing a critical distance from the illusion of transparency, the range of tools for textual analysis is, however, not enough to scientifically understand the persuasive action of the social actors. Here we, should keep in mind that these textual methods simply offer clues, and need to be accompanied by survey methods and the perspectives of authors, to deal with hypotheses and research questions in a more fundamental way. This is especially the situation when a (PhD) researcher is trying to progressively integrate concepts into everyday language and, even more, when these concepts have been previously validated as diplomatic languages, e.g. legal texts, like international conventions proposed by the United Nations.

In some of our earlier work, we have already evaluated the political limits of social actor discourses in reference to the Tangible and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, which brought a majority of the UNESCO member states to ratify 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, references to common heritage create obligations for states in dealing with a common property. But on the other hand, the approach reintroduces, in parallel, a nationalist closure and competition between countries and governments (e.g. Thailand and Cambodia fighting for the possession of a site on their common border) or exclusion and stigmatisation (e.g. in the belief of a supposed clash of civilisations (Huttington, 1997)). We also did the same deconstructive work for UNESCO, in analysing the concept interculturality (Cabedoche, 2013a: 55-64), and this year, we are finalising our research into the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, offered by UNESCO for ratification by the member states in October 2005 (Cabedoche, 2013b and 2013c). This research should be useful for PhD researchers who seek to identify how social actors tactically play with the term cultural diversity, to defend their own interests.

First, this chapter will review the conclusions from an analysis of social actor discourses using the term diversity, e.g. France Telecom (now called Orange in the telecommunications global markets), during 2005-2010, to il-

lustrate how a particular concept is used by social actors We will begin our analysis of this company's discourses, also by looking at its omissions and contradictions. We will then put this result in perspective through the general context of France Telecom's human resource management. Finally, we will extend the analysis to enrich it with theoretical frameworks that discuss cultural diversity, shifting beyond the limits of the methods of content analysis.

1.   An instrumentalising humanist discourse of diversity

In 2005, France Telecom (FT) became one of the first signatories of the French Diversity Charter promoted by the Institut Montaigne, ensuring itself of excellent mainstream media coverage. This media interest was caused by the institutional links between this telecommunications operator and media groups, and the rather awesome pressure maintained by FT's own public relations offices. This adherence to diversity was linked to the position that media are required to perform as economic organisations on the orders of the CSA[2], even though the term and its uses have already revealed ambiguities (Alemanno and Cabedoche, 2011, Cabedoche, 2012b). As a starting point, we would like to emphasise the existence of institutional variations in the value of diversity triggered by the concepts transfer into managerial and media discourses. Moreover, we should also point to the context of the public exposure of FT work-related suicides (around sixty FT employees in three years), which increasingly produced a media stigma, focussing on the deadly dimension of the FT management and a growing loss of (internal) status of the company at the end of the decade.

The Charter of Diversity of the Institut Montaigne was directly the result of the French Bébéar report (Bébéar, 2004), itself the result of a broader reflection at the European Union level, to make the labour market more responsive and also more open to the employment of marginalised or excluded people. Analysing the first reports of signatory companies, authors find the term diversity as 'le mot phare de ce cru 2005'[3] (Point, 2006); others are speaking in terms of 'fashion effects' about diversity management, which is encouraged, in parallel with, and guaranteed by, a state of hyper-mediatisation, particularly since 1999 (Barth, 2007: 287). To give one piece of statistical data: In 2007, 42% of respondents to a European survey reported having implemented policies to promote diversity for over 5 years, 27% since 2002 (Féron, 2008).

A Performance & Cultural Diversity project was launched for FT, managed by its Direction of Communication. The 2007 FT report confirmed their promotion of diversity, which discourse reflected the 'social responsibility' of the company, fighting against every kind of discrimination. As such, the FT discourse introduced FT to job applicants as an 'involved [human-size company] for Diversity and Equality'. Later, the new 2008-2010 Employees

Agreement showed a strong commitment discourse for the inclusion of people with disabilities. Similarly, FT management discourse included a 'responsible consideration of religions' and declared a fight against homophobia. FT prided itself on being quoted in managerial circles and professional media for its internal promotion of gender diversity.

Promoted like this, the FT discourse of diversity seems to be part of the humanist impulse that deeply inspired the 2005 UNESCO Convention (Yacoub, 2012), although we must also consider this reference in terms of cultural diversity as a part of a business strategy. Neo-institutionalist theories of organisations (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) have argued that a better performance is realised when employees learn to deal with differences directly in the workplace (Ely and Thomas, 1996), in particular, when they are located in multinational market places (Rosenzweig, 1998, Dass and Parker, 1999). Whereas previously theoreticians of globalization thought of the capitalist system in terms of the homogenization by an increasing levelling of consumption (Fukuyama, 1993), now, the Theory of resources leads on-going globalised companies to value what individuals learn from other perspectives, even more than to assimilate differences or to merely evaluate them (Dass and Parker, 1999).

The discourse of diversity in the workplace was very quickly described as a 'social embellishment' (Kirby, Erika and Harter, 2003). As a research method, discourse analysis of FT helped us to test this hypothesis, focussing on both the Said and the Unsaid. First, we noted that this diversity promotion never referred to the legally binding dimension of policies implemented in the name of diversity, suggesting FT's totally voluntary and generous commitment, while for some of its aspects, comminatory legal injunctions[4] did exist. Obviously, the management of diversity can even anticipate binding legal devices (Frederiks, 1994), but here the existing legal framework remained unmentioned.

FT was also almost completely silent about the issue of its purely economic interest in internally developing diversity. Perhaps this is because the argumentation for diversity, from a business perspective, is not fully developed (Bergen, Soper and Foster, 2002; Jones and Stablein, 2002). But surely, in FT's employees' minds, the difficulties of interculturalism combined with a previous merger with the British Orange company, were more closely related to the threshold effect theory, which emphasises mental blocks as the grounds for failure (Steinman, 2006), or for the existence of a hasty discourse on diversity (from a business perspective) (Féron, 2008). On both sides of the Channel, people had built the same stereotyped nationalist critiques on the supposed performance of the Other, and consequently, lived diversity more as a vector of confrontation, rather than an opportunity for cooperation and synergy (Dameron and 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 resolving daily difficulties in managing diversity (Delattre and Morin, 2006; Féron, 2008: 57-71), ultimately resulting in increased stress (Semache, 2006). While reports spoke about these difficulties to manage diversity - suggesting progressions, stagnations and regressions – the FT discourse was a dithyrambic valorisation of a bold operational policy.

Meanwhile, this official FT communicative action on diversity was accompanied an inflexible management policy, which did not seem to consider human beings other than as an adjustment variable, which explains the court appearance of FT CEO Didier Lombard for moral harassment (in 2005-2010).

2. A polysemic discourse on diversity, in an oppressive internal management context

During this 2005-2010 period, a NEXT plan (New Experience in Telecommunications) was effectively 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 in the digital economy, but also to face up to a triple big bang in the world telecommunications market, i.e. a sudden deregulation, fierce competition, and 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 and powerful management that was impacting on workers and led to the brutal elimination of the 'porteurs de signaux faibles'[5]: those who, physically or psychologically, could not endure the rapid pace multi-specialisation management policy of a 'time to move' injunction[6]; but also those who, politically, could not accept to fire large numbers of people without any qualms. When this inhuman managerial policy became headlines in the media, via a macabre count of work-related suicides, the response of FT's CEO was at first a total denial of human suffering. But in 2010, cornered by journalists demanding a public inquiry, the FT executive board finally admitted an institutional link with the human dramas. They immediately used diversity as a response to the risk of a progressive 'desublimation' of FT: 'Yes, the 22,000 expected departures were stimulated with bonuses to managers who succeeded in their objective to reduce the size of their teams. But the departures were compensated by a bold recruitment policy (7,000), focusing on cultural diversity, integration and development of the person'[7].

In fact, once again, content analysis reveals the ambiguities of the usage of the word diversity. Our own research confirm conclusions from previous analyses of company reports, whose production was based on the requirements of the Diversity Charter, which denounced the 'wooden tongue' of the notices

(Point, 2006). The managerial discourse on diversity at FT was never demonstrated by precise figures (except when related to gender diversity), making verification impossible. Its assertions remained developed in isolation, as a distended, decontextualised patchwork, without any monitoring (Féron, 2008). These conclusions have not been corrected since 2006, when it was clear that this period was just 'l'orée d'une harmonisation sociale, assez loin de favoriser une véritable „culture de l'inclusion"'[8] (Point, 2006). Later, in fact, it was still referred to as the demagogy of companies speaking of diversity, which gave the public just what it wanted to hear, but without necessarily translating the discourse into action: 'On est dans la cosmétique, le travestissement, l'alibi'[9] (Bath, 2007: 281).

To this first critical conclusion, we must add that we found the hyperbolic use of the diversity notion: from 2005 to 2010, FT used to stamp the label on any of its decisions. The observation of managerial discourse in other companies in this decade was in line with the same use of multiple, floating, and often un-identifiable objects, without clear reference to 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 quelle diversité il s'agit : des métiers, des minorités, des cultures…?'[10] (Point, 2006: 61 -85).

Among numerous unexpected examples, the affirmation of diversity in FT discourse has been associated with, for example, technological drivers: The 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'[11] (Serveille and Friedel, 2007: 259-268). Such a boldness in interpreting diversity is not rare: the reference was even turned against FT when competitors in global markets felt offended by an exclusive arrangement obtained by FT to distribute pop star Madonna's new single: Such an agreement would deprive consumers of their choice of distributor, that is to say ... 'a deprivation of diversity'[12].

This rhetorical shift is classic: While in the eighties the arguments called for a deregulation of telecommunications, now we can find an amalgam between on the one hand, individual aspirations for autonomy and decentralisation which meet social uses of information and communication technologies (ICTs) and on the other hand, the need for transnational Capital to disconnect societies from their solidarity structures (Mattelart, Mattelart and Delcourt, 1983: 59; Mattelart, 2007). In the sector of organisational communication analyses, critical literature has noted the CNPF proposal in 1981,[13] which called on its members to produce a social imaginary about 'a corporate citizenship', when at the same time, the imaginary produced by labour organisations should be weakened, in combination with their representation (Le Moënne, 1995). Beyond the specificity of the French case, actions for diversity in the name of

social responsibility have been analysed as a public relations exercise (Hon and Brunner, 2000). Recontextualised in this way, the discourse no longer appears to be proof of any politically correct action, but as a strategic necessity for the corporate image (Kirby and Harter, 2003). Since 2001, the research conclusion could be that: If entrepreneurial discourses emphasised 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'[14] (Bellard and Rüling, 2001). In 2007, improving the brand image was recognised as a priority by 37% of European companies engaged in a policy of diversity in recruitment (Féron, 2007).

This simple and unique displacement of perspectives perfectly demonstrates why researchers must go beyond content analysis to understand all possible levels of the actors' tactics, as well as the theoretically contradictory debates of academic authors. In other words, it is not enough to denounce the amalgams (Miège, 2006).

3. The need of schools of theory to enlarge their perspective

In one previous research project on FT, we began our research by analysing the content, before structuring our thinking in relation to French pragmatic sociology (Cabedoche, 2012c). Such a shift from content to theory is particularly required when, for example, a lexical analysis reports a recurring polysemous syntagm such as diversity, even restricted to cultural diversity (as it is in this case framed by the Charter of Diversity proposed by the Institut Montaigne (Barth, 2007 : 280)).

Diversity featured in the anthropological, linguistic and historical approaches of many researchers (Laulan, 2013; Lenoble-Bart and Mathien, 2011; Mathien, 2013; Oustonoff, 2013, ...). For example, Joseph Yacoub (2012) inspired the 'new humanism' reference of UNESCO Director-General of UNESCO Irina Bokova. His perspective was grounded in three surveys, organised from 1947 to 1951, which were initiated by the first Director-General of UNESCO, Julian Huxley, to expand the scope of the debate on the foundations of human rights and the recognition of diversity beyond Europe. Sometimes taking a 'relative relativism' philosophical path in favour of cultural hybridization (interculturality) (Yacoub, 2012), these works illustrate their documentary wealth and militant advocacy in promoting diversity as a principle. For this reason, we should regret the weakening of UNESCO's original intellectual legitimacy by the dominant member states and private institutions, to the benefit of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) (Cassen, 2003; Dijan, 2005;

Maurel, 2009), or UNESCO's futility in terms of political influence (Courrier, 2005: 55-56). On a theoretical level, these works are seen as a lament, especially when ICTs do not realise their alleged promise about diversity (Delmas, 2013), or are limited to developing a compassion with those social actors who promote diversity 'with a great courage' in response to discrimination (Barth, 2007: 281). Works also sometimes contain the perilous way of prophecy when, for example, ICTs appear as magic tools, capable of strengthening a linguistic sphere (Oustonoff, 2013), or a social one (Albertini, 2013) by themselves, disconnected from society. Finally, lyrical conclusions are sometimes systematically limited to a pious wish, a principle petition, with aspects of evidence and a desperate run for consensus beyond the terminological ambiguities and taboos (Mathien, 2013). This process we have already identified when UNESCO went through a reflexive sequestration during (and after) the New World Information and Communication Order period (Cabedoche, 2011). In fact, these publications prove how dramatically insufficient they are, to a reader waiting for a richer theoretical implementation of diversity and a conceptual clarification of challenges and plural strategies mobilising social actors. Even when it is justified, in the case of organisations whose financial logic amplifies the need for contemporary public shows (Barth, 2007: 280), an analysis based only on content remains unsatisfying, disconnected from both its conceptual, theoretical and epistemological foundations, but also from understanding ideological and normative policy issues (whose discourses are also mediated).

Conditions for the adoption of legal texts governing diversity, as promoted by UNESCO, as well as circumventions to concretely implement diversity and later, difficulties to really assess their operational capability (Courrier, 2005: 54, Dijan, 2005) are already significant issues. Even when the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity was unanimously adopted by the Paris 31st Session of UNESCO General Assembly, on November 2, 2001, which was still at a time when the United States had not yet returned to this United Nations' specialized Agency, it is only by looking beyond the contents of the texts, and by introducing a historical (and theoretical) perspective that one can understand the subsequent refusal of the U.S.A (together with Israel and Great Britain), to ratify the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, going against the current of all other member states, as a continuation of their traditional rejection of any supranational regulatory authority (Frau-Meigs, 2004).

To give a terminological perspective of the other references used in the analysis: The replacement of cultural exception - as a more constraining concept claimed by states such as France and Canada - by cultural diversity was more than a semantic shift, or an encouraging progression from one concept to another, as some authors believed far too quickly (Mathien, 2013). Because the respective genealogy of these concepts is fundamentally different (Miège,

2006), others even speak in terms of a Copernician Revolution (Musitelli, 2006, Laulan, 2008). This once again shows the importance of a theoretical framework, whatever the inspiration is - liberal economics (Pool, 1977, Cowen, 1998 and 2002), Cultural Studies (Fiske, 1987), or critical theory (Mattelart, 2007) - to understand the removal from the Convention's text of some principles of action that cultural diversity could also refer to (for instance, media pluralism, the protection of journalists, and 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 legal framework, as was quickly mentioned (Anghel, 2008: 65). But beyond the signatories' declarations, the text becomes significant only if it is matched with the recognition of a merchant vision and business culture, particularly in favour of the WTO, to which, in producing the Convention, UNESCO conceded to, under pressure from the United States, Australia and Japan. This was made in total contradiction to the declared objective (Mattelart, 2005). To extend the understanding to the practical application of the text, it is once again necessary to refer to critical economics and to a cultural industries theory in which one can fully identify the plurality of strategies that allow to move (both relation to these industries, and to public policy) beyond self-celebratory discourses (D'Almeida and Alleman, 2004: 69).

It is absolutely with theoretical - not only methodological - tools, that a researcher can (hopefully) also understand the ideological resonance of diversity in the discourse of actors, for example 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 researcher could do so, in Tristan Mattelart's (2008) way, first by generating preliminary findings, based on a semi-descriptive reading, (also) in line with David Harvey's (1989) proposal. The British anthropologist analysed a paradigm shift from a Fordist accumulation regime, which corresponds with a standardised cultural order, to a regime of flexible accumulation, which requires a cultural order that mobilises the creative potential of diversity. The researcher could then accept the recommendation of Tristan Mattelart for a return to the critical tradition, avoiding the overly enthusiastic versions of Cultural Studies that celebrate the development of a mass culture that carries heterogeneity (Hall, 1997) and the anthropology of syncretism (Clifford, 1988), creolisation (Hannerz, 1989) or hybridisation (Appadurai, 1990), and the sociology of self-identity construction, in relation to the plurality of choices resulting from the evolution of the global market logic (High Modernity - Giddens, 1991) as it is mainly supported by global media and communication technologies (Tomlinson, 1999). All of these theoretical proposals underestimate the significance of the hegemonic flow animating the

transnational flows (Mattelart, 2008). We share Mattelart's call for a return to critical reasoning, adding – on a personal note - the theoretical perspective of French pragmatic sociology, which allows to reveal 'the new spirit of capitalism' (Boltanski, Chiapello, 1999). With this contribution, the 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 with FT (Cabedoche, 2012c), or Renault and Disneyland (Mœglin, 2013).

As was already concluded in a collective synthesis (Bouquillion and Combès, 2011: 10): When defining culture in an anthropological sense, including cultural products and practices, information and communication, and even corporate culture, a social discourse of diversity works as a metaphorically naturalising 'discourse of truth'. However, such objectifying appellations remain inseparable from the power systems that promote these regimes of truth, and from the political and economic issues that characterise these terminological constructions (Bouquillion, 2008). Worse - they sometimes succeed in entering scientific places when academia hosts interdisciplinary confrontations, bringing in, for instance, neo-Fordist engineers (Rasse, 2013) and researchers promoting a General Systems Theory with the same arrogance (Mœglin, 2013).

4.   Conclusion

To elevate the debate beyond texts, a researcher should hesitate to shift their deconstruction in the direction of more moral or political, rather than scientific positions, for example, if they intend advocating diversity in terms of economic alternatives without further distinction, as has been identified in some works (Dacheux, 2013). At least, we may expect, together with Pierre Mœglin, that 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 diversity today provides such a hyperbolic dimension in the discourses of social actors.

The effects, even the gains, arising from the practical implementation on March 18th, 2007, of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, are real. Probably just because of this, to some extent, it is sometimes argued that there no longer a need to demonstrate the irrationality of the diversity concept, which carries (together with its mediation) a systematic range of imaginaries - in a combinatorial sense of the term[15] - and conceptual and ideological bricolages, e.g. questionable and debatable diversity criteria (Benhamou and Peltier, 2006, Moreau and Peltier, 2011 Denieul, 2012: 123-157). Now, this discussion is no longer sufficient, even if it

was ever helpful. No longer satisfied by the replacement of diversity by the term fragmentation, some authors (Kiyindou, 2013) prefer to deny any conceptual claim to diversity, even if is defined as a creative and digital diversity.

Certainly, it is regrettable to note that applying this reassuring picture has now become a necessary condition for the entry of social actors in a fundamentally adversarial public debate, especially for the managers of organisations (Barth, 2007), but even for a few authors who position themselves in the field of academic deconstruction (Albertini, 2013). On behalf of the 'false pretense' (Miège, 2006) of this constructed diversity as a totem of modernity, in response to the requirements of pragmatic, moral and cognitive powers, the most diverse and variable geometry of argumentative ruses is rationally performed, based on an assessment by social actors driven by their own interests[16], sometimes deciphered by Information and Communication Sciences projects[17].

But beyond the work of the experts of inclusion and the pamphleteers against discrimination, the scientific challenge now is to develop a consistent theory, which would be able to provide a relevant framework on three 'negative' aspects of multiculturalism: differences, inequalities, and disconnection, which are usually explored separately (García Canclini, 2004: 314). Although it sometimes might be fashionable to refer to diversity, for instance, in the field of organisational management, references to diversity are no transitory phenomenon, as some authors have reported (Novicki, Oustinoff and Wolton, 2008: 9). As governments, international authorities and social actors demonstrate, everyone is now giving extreme attention to this theme (Bouquillion, 2008: 251).

Notes

1 *Subjectivity replaces respect for the written word, because it claims to be rigorous, because it describes itself as 'perfect' decoding. But there are so many abusive claims!* [our translation].
2 Conseil Supérieur de l'audiovisuel, French audiovisual regulation authority.
3 *The headlight word of the 2005 vintage* [our translation].
4 I.e., The French Law of November 17, 2001, expands the obligation to fight against discrimination beyond gender discrimination.
5 *People with 'signs of weakness'* [our translation].
6 The principle which authoritatively forced employees to a total mobility (location, work, responsibility), at least every three years.
7 Our own summary of the official FT discourse, from Delphine Ernotte, Orange France executive director, interviewed in 'Les apprentis sorciers', magazine Envoyé spécial, French France 2 TV programme, September 30, 2010.
8 *The edge of a social harmonisation, a long way from fostering a real 'culture of inclusion'* [our translation].
9 *The era is one of cosmetics, masks, alibis* [our translation].
10 *Ultimately, the reader didn't really know what kind of diversity was being talked about. Trades? Minorities? Cultures? ...* [our translation].

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

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

13 French Entrepreneurs' Union from 1945 to 1998.

14 *To create or maintain the image of a responsible company, instead of considering real arguments on the impact of good diversity management on organisational performance* [our translation].

15 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 encrypted movies without a TV decoder. Isabelle Barth speaks in terms of a belief-diversity, a legitimation-diversity and a resource-diversity (Barth, 2007: 276).

16 With regard to the protection of copyright, Pierre Moeglin thus points how legally, eligible parties could both have an interest in an alliance or object to providers, depending on the circumstances. Bernard Miège notes that cultural diversity can also conceal asymmetrical trade agreements such as the defence of industries, living away from protection.

17 This direction of research provides the Internationalization of Communication and Cultural Diversity programme that we lead in Gresec laboratory in Grenoble.

References

Unless otherwise indicated, the bracketed English translations are made by the author of this chapter.

Albertini, F. (2013) 'Penser autrement la Méditerranée contemporaine: quelles voies pour le dialogue interculturel?' *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication,* 1.1.2013, http://rfsic.revues.org/342.

Alemanno, S. P./Cabedoche, B. (2011) '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 XX*(2), pp. 24-40.

Althusser, L. (1965): 25-sq. Pour Marx. Paris: Maspero (Théorie 1) [For Marx, transl. Ben Browster, London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press (Part. 1), 1969].

Althusser, L./Balibar, É. (1968) *Lire le capital* [Reading Capital]. Paris: Maspero.

Anghel, L. (2008) 'La convention sur la diversité des expressions culturelles: état des lieux, Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle', nr. ° 51, 65-69, http://hdl.handle.net/2042/24176 DOI: 10.4267/2042/24176.

Appaduraï, A. (1990) 'Disjunctive and difference in the global cultural economy', pp. 295-310 in M. Featherstone (ed.) *Global Culture. Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity. A Theory Culture and Society Special Issue*. London: Sage.

Barth, I. (2007) 'La face cachée du management de la diversité' [The hidden face of diversity management], pp. 273-292 in I. Barth/C. Falcoz (eds) *Le management de la diversité: enjeux, fondements et pratiques*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Bebear, C. (2004) 'Des entreprises aux couleurs de la France' [French colour companies]. Rapport remis au Premier Ministre, November 2004.

Benhamou, F./Peltier, S. (2006) 'Une méthode multicritères d'évaluation de la diversité cultur-elle. Application à l'édition du livre en France' [A multi-criteria evaluation of the cultural diversity method. Application for Book Publishing in France], pp. 313-344 in X. Greffe (ed.) *Création et diversité au miroir des industries culturelles*. Paris: La Documentation française.

Berelson, B./Lazarsfeld, P. (1948) *The analysis of communication content*. Chicago/New York: University of Chicago and Columbia University, Preliminary Draft.

Bergen, C. W.v./Soper, B./Foster, T. (2002): 'Unintended negative effects of diversity manage-ment'. *Public Personnel Management* 31(2): 239-251.

Boltanski, L./Chiapello, È. (1999) *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme* [The new spirit of capitalism]. Paris: Gallimart.

Bonnafous, S. (2006) 'L'analyse de discours' [The discourse analysis], pp. 213-227 in S. Olivesi (ed.) *Sciences de l'information et de la communication. Objets, savoirs, discipline*. Greno-ble: PUG.

Bouquillion, P. (2008) 'La diversité culturelle. Une approche communicationnelle' [Cultural di-versity. A communicational approach]. *Questions de communication* 13: 251-268.

Bouquillion, P./Combès, Y (2011) *Diversité et industries culturelles* [Diversity and cultural indus-tries]. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Cabedoche, B. (2011) 'Le rapport MacBride, conférence du consensus avant l'heure? L'expéri-mentation 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.

Cabedoche, B. (2012a) 'Documentaire de création et diversité culturelle en Afrique subsaharienne' [Documentary films and cultural diversity in subsaharian Africa]. *Études interculturelles*, Université catholique de Lyon, September 2012: 107-120.

Cabedoche, B. (2012b) 'Teamplayer: an infernal spiral. France Télécom serves as a painful re-minder of the serious risks of organisational restructuring'. *Conference social Media, Quad-riga, University of Applied sciences* (Berlin), Issue n° 12, 3 and 4 May: 38-48.

Cabedoche, B. (2012c) 'Exploring the foundations and theoretical distancing required for a Phd thesis : an incursion into the backyard of research', pp. : 229-240 in N. Carpentier et al. (eds.) *Critical perspectives on the European mediasphere. The intellectual work of the 2011 European media and communication doctoral summer school*. Ljubljana: University of Lju-bljana Press.

Cabedoche, B. (2013a) 'Intercultural Journalism', pp. 55-64 in F. Banda (ed.) *Model Curricula for Journalism Education. A compendium of new syllabi*. Paris: UNESCO.

Cabedoche, B. (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 responsibil-ity: the shift of uncertainty burden on the human factor. The example of France Telecom], pp. : 55-64 in C. Fourrier/V. Lépine/F. Martin-Juchat (eds.) *Pratiques des acteurs de la communication. Un état des lieux*. Grenoble: PUG.

Cabedoche, B. (2013c) 'Diversité culturelle et régulation: des convocations terminologiques his-toriquement et politiquement délicates' [Cultural diversity and regulation: historically and politically sensitive uses of terminology], pp. 53-67 in UNESCO (ed.) Reflexions sur les diversites mondiales. Casablanca: Les Editions Maghrébines

Cassen, B. (2003) 'Une norme culturelle contre le droit du commerce?' [A cultural norm against trade law]. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, September 2003: 22.

Clifford, J. (1998) *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Courrier, Y. (2005) *L'UNESCO sans peine* [UNESCO, without efforts]. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Cowen, T. (1998) *In Praise of Commercial Culture.* Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Cowen, Tyler (2002) *Creative Destruction. How Globalization is Shaping the World's Cultures. Princeton*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Dacheux, É. (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* 2|2013, 9.8.2013, http://rfsic.revues.org/303.

D'Almeida F./Alleman, M.-L. (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.

Dass, P./Parker, B. (1999) 'Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to Learning'. *Academy of Management Executive* 13(2): 68-80.

De Certeau, M. (1980) *L'invention du quotidien. Les arts de faire.* [The invention of everyday life]. Paris: Gallimard

Delattre, S./Morin, C. (2006) 'L'entreprise entre dans la bataille pour la diversité' [Companies begin the battle for diversity]. *Liaisons Sociales Magazine*, February 2006: 59-66.

Delmas, R. (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* 2|2013, http://rfsic.revues.org/278.

Denieul, J. (2012) *Concentration éditoriale et bibliodiversité: quels enjeux pour le livre* [Editorial concentration and bibliodiversity. Challenges for books]. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Dijan, J.-M. (2005) 'Un laboratoire dévitalisé' [A devitalized laboratory]. *Le Monde diplomatique*, October 2005: 26.

Dimaggion, P.J./Powell, W.W. (1983) 'The iron-cage revisited: institutional Isomorphism and collective rationality in organisational field'. *American Sociological Review* 48: 147-160.

Ely, R.J./Thomas, D.A. (1996) 'Making differences matter: a new paradigm for diversity management'. *Harvard Business Review* 74(5): 79-90.

Féron, M. (2008) '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(18), DOI: 10.3917/mav.018.0057.

Fiske, J. (1987) *Television Culture*. London: Routledge.

Frau-Meigs, D. (2004) 'Le retour des États-Unis au sein de l'Unesco' [The come-back of USA in UNESCO]. *Annuaire français des relations internationales* 5: 860-877.

Frederick, W.C. (1994) 'From CSR1 to CRS2. The Maturing of Business-Society Thought'. *Business & Society* 33(2): 150-164.

Fukuyama, F. (1993) *La Fin de l'histoire et le dernier homme* [The End of History and the Last Man]. Paris: Flammarion.

García Canclini, N. (2004) 'Différents, inégaux ou déconnectés' [Differents, inequals or disconnected]. *Fundació CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals* 66-67: 313-334.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hall, S. (1991) 'Old and new identities, old and new ethnicities', pp. 41-68 in A.D. King (ed) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System. Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hannerz, U. (1989) 'Notes on the global ecumene'. *Public Culture* l(2): 66-75.

Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. London: Blackwell.

Hon, Linda Childers/Brunner, Brigitta, (2000) 'Diversity Issues and Public Relations'. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 12(4): 309-340.

Huntington, S.P. (1997) *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Jones, D./Stablein, R. (2006) 'Diversity as resistance, resistance to diversity: Critical theory, post-structuralist perspectives and workplace diversity', pp. 145-166 in A.M. Konrad/P. Prasad/J.K. Pringle (eds.) *Handbook of Workforce Diversity*. London: Sage.

Kirby, E.L./Harter, L.M. (2003) 'Speaking the language of the bottom-line: The metaphor of „Managing Diversity"'. *Journal of Business Communication* 40(1): 28-49.

Kiyindou, A. (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* 2, http://rfsic.revues.org/288.

Laulan, A.-M. (2008) 'La convention sur la diversité des expresssions culturelles' [The convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions]. *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle* 51, DOI: 10.4267/2042/24178.

Laulan, A.-M. (2013) 'Communication et diversité culturelle' [Communication and cultural diuversity]. *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* 2|2013, http://rfsic.revues.org/277.

Lefebvre, H. (1969) 'Les paradoxes d'Althusser' [The paradoxes of Althusser]. *L'homme et la société* 13(13): 3-37.

Lefebvre, H. (1971) *Au-delà du structuralisme* [Beyond structuralism]. Paris: Anthropos.

Le Möenne, C. (1995) 'Espace public et entreprise: penser la sphère professionnelle', pp. 139-165 in I. Pailliart (ed.) *L'espace public et l'emprise de la communication*. Grenoble : PUG.

Lenoble-Bart, A./Mathien, M. (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.

Mathien, M. (2013) 'Diversité culturelle, minorités et médias. Réalité et perspectives' [Cultural diversity, minorities and media. Reality and Prospects]. *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* 2|2013, http://rfsic.revues.org/310.

Mattelart A./Mattelart, M./Delcourt, X. (1983) *La culture contre la démocratie* [Culture Against Democracy]. Paris: La découverte.

Mattelart, A. (2005) 'Bataille à l'Unesco sur la diversité culturelle' [Unesco struggle about cultural diversity]. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, October 2005: 26-27.

Mattelart, T. (2008) '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* 51, DOI: 10.4267/2042/24168.

Mattelart T. (2011) ' La diversité culturelle. Quelques éléments de déconstruction théorique' [Cultural diversity. Some elements of theoretical déconstruction], pp. 23-37 in P. Bouquillion/Y. Combès (eds.) *Diversité et industries culturelles*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Maurel, C. (2009) 'L'UNESCO aujourd'hui {UNESCO, Today]. *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire* 2(102), DOI : 10.3917/ving.102.0131.

Miège, B. (2006) 'La question des industries culturelles impliquées par/dans la diversité culturelle'. *Actes du colloque Systèmes Informatiques et Gestion de l'Environnement (SIGE)*, Douala, Cameroun, Les Enjeux de l'Information et de la Communication, w3.u-grenoble3.fr/les.../Actes%20de%20Douala-Miege-pp75-81.html.

Mœglin, P. (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 T. Mattelart (coord.) *Les Enjeux de l'Information et de la Communication*, Supplément 2013, http://lesenjeux-.u-grenoble3.fr/2013-supplement/04Moeglin/04Moeglin.pdf.

Moreau, F./Peltier, S. (2011) '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, October 2011, http://www2.culture.gouv.fr/culture/deps/2008/pdf/ce-2011-4.pdf.

Musitelli, J. (2006) '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: 11-22.

Novicki, J./Oustonoff, M./Proulx, S. (2008) 'Introduction'. *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle* 51, DOI: 10.4267/2042/24169.

Oustinoff, M. (2013) 'La diversité linguistique, enjeu central de la mondialisation' [Linguistic diversity as a central challenge of globalisation]. *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* 1/2013, http://rfsic.revues.org/328.

Point, S. (2006) 'La charte de la diversité regards sur le discours des entreprises signataires' [The charter of diversity. Perspectives on signatory companies discourse]. *Management & Avenir* 8, DOI: 10.3917/mav.008.0061.

Pool, I.d.S. (1977) 'The changing flow of television'. *Journal of Communication* 27(2): 142-143.

Rosenzweig, P. (1998) 'Managing the new global workforce: Fostering diversity, fostering consistency'. *European Management Journal* 16(6): 644-652.

Semache, S. (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* 4(10): 199-211.

Serveille, H./Friedel, P. (2007) 'La recherche à FranceTélécom' [Research in France Telecom], pp. 259-268 in R. Berré/B. de Laat/J. Theys (eds) *Management de la recherche, Enjeux et perspectives*. Bruxelles: de Boeck Université.

Steinman, L. (2006) '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*, February 2006: 54-56.

Stoiciu, G. (2008) 'L'émergence du domaine d'études de la communication interculturelle' [The emergence of intercultural communication studies]. *Hermès. L'épreuve de la diversité culturelle* 51, DOI: 10.4267/2042/24171.

Tomlinson, J. (1999) *Globalization and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Yacoub, J. (2013) *L'humanisme réinventé* [The Reinvented Humanism]. Paris: Cerf.

Oral scientific communications

Bellard, E./Rülling, C.-C. (2001): 'Reflections and projections of boundaries in the diversity management discourses in the United States, France and Germany', XVIIe colloque EGOS, Lyon, July.

Popularizing literature

Dameron, S./Joffre, O. (2005) '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* 8(3): 51-76.

Nicolas, B./Talaouit, V. (2010): *Ils ont failli me tuer* [They nearly kill me]. Paris: Flammarion.

Biography

Bertrand Cabedoche is a professor of information and communication at the University of Grenoble III, in charge of the international development of GRESEC, a well-known French research team in the field of information and communication. He has worked on the representations of the European Union in the main member states' newspapers for Fundesco (Madrid). He has also been working on media discourses on North-South relations since the 1970s. And at the same time, he has been working on the ways the society is constructed when it becomes the subject of public (polemic) debates (for instance in the case of energies or nanotechnologies). Bertrand Cabedoche is presently the Unesco chairholder in international communication and also works as a visiting professor at Antananarivo University (Madagascar), Beirut University (Lebanon) and National Research University Higher School of Economics of Moscow (Russia).

Contact: Bertrand.Cabedoche@u-grenoble3.fr