

Scientific journals on Organizational Communication and their epistemological markings: a comparative study between France and Brazil

DOI: 10.1590/1809-5844201516

Arlette Bouzon

(Université Paul Sabatier –Toulouse3, Department of Information Sciences and Communication, Communication Course. Toulouse – França)

Ivone de Lourdes de Oliveira

(Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais, Faculdade de Comunicação e Artes, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação Social. Belo Horizonte – MG, Brazil)

Abstract

Our goal is to offer an epistemological overview of Organizational Communication from the analysis of two specialized journals on the subject, *Communication & Organisation* of France and *Organicom* of Brazil to develop a comparison between the epistemological and methodological process adopted by those journal articles, and also developed a classification from the epistemological perspective – positivist, interpretative and critical – of the authors. We take as reference the methodological experience developed by Morillon, Aldebert Szafrajzen (2010) in another of his researches which analyzed the keywords, the summary, the methodology and references. With the inventory, we can see the richness of the studied subject, but a fragile epistemological and methodological explanation in our field.

Keywords: Epistemological approaches. Academic journal. Organizational Communication.

Introduction

The authors seek in this article to analyze academic productions of Organizational Communication area in France and in Brazil, taking as empirical object two specialized journals, the only ones from the countries involved, trying to establish a comparative study and to answer two questions:

- Are the scientific journals the “place” of production of a dominant standard in Organizational Communication?
- Would arise a tendency towards standardization of scientific production, which can weaken the capacities of innovation and renewal of our discipline and, more widely, the dynamics of scientific knowledge involved?

For several years, the conditions and procedures for evaluation of scientific research have gone through multiple and profound transformations, due to the increased power of international classifications and bibliometric techniques. The emergence and increasing progression of Quantitative Assessment Scheme (QAS) modifies the landscape of scientific research, affects the work of researchers and transforms the conditions of academic production, revolutionizing the dynamics of scientific knowledge. So, if before publication constituted itself a privileged way of disseminating the results of research in Humanities and Social Sciences, nowadays the presence of sharp QAS leads to an alignment of practices to the hard sciences, making the article published in a scientific journals the almost exclusive way of academic production.

In this context, the power of evaluation focuses on scientific journals, which embodies the legitimacy of a production recognized by experts in the field. Thus, they constitute themselves as a source of update of knowledge and as a means of privileged information about ongoing research, generating a list of publications that serve as a reference for most academic bodies.

The qualified journals acquire the power to set standards and modes of each discipline, for their reference and for their theoretical-methodological positioning, their worldview, their limits,

their paradigms, their themes, their methods. These factors lead to the acceptance or rejection of the articles, determining the value of the research worked and determining those who – by publishing agreement – are worthy of interest or not. So, it is generated a vision of each discipline, which can stand as dominant as it becomes standard setting, since it guides and direct developments.

From this scenario, the article seeks to understand the field of Organizational Communication as a discipline that develops studies on theoretical and methodological approaches expressed in the publications of the two journals analyzed. Starting from the hypothesis that they may influence the advancement of research, determine and/or indicate trends, consolidating and building the field of Communication in the context of organizations.

For that, we adopt a comparative descriptive methodology, which allows to evaluate the place of scientific production in Organizational Communication in the two countries, showing the similarities and differences, with a panoramic structured look, in order to encourage researchers to consider the points that arose in this research, result of post-doctoral stage developed by one of the authors in Toulouse, France.

Two journals under review

The research was developed on the basis of the items that make up the dossier of the two publications on Organizational Communication: *Organicom*, Brazilian journal with ten years of circulation and *Communication & Organisation*, French journal with 23 years of publication, both consolidated as space of scientific production in Brazil and France respectively. We mean by dossier a grouping of articles published in each issue around a theme, set *a priori*, that becomes the guiding process of selection of articles for publication. So each dossier represents the set of reflections on a theme that determines the line of each journal. Hence the importance of analyzing it as setting of theoretical and professional questions valued by the editorial board, indicating trends and development of studies and research on the field searched.

Despite the difference of time of circulation of the two journals, we consider it important to develop our research from them, because we consider them consolidated reference in the field and the only ones that deal with Organizational Communication in their countries of origin.

Founded in 1991, *Communication & Organisation* is a publication of francophone genre devoted to Organizational Communication and recognised by the *Conseil National des Universités* (CNU), through the 71st section (*Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication*), that qualifies the researchers of France. Its first issue was released in 1992 and its periodicity is biannual. International coverage, edited by the laboratory *Médiation, Information, Communication, Art* (Mica), from Université de Bordeaux³, the journals makes room for renowned researchers and young researchers as doctoral students to publish their work and values the rigour of the evaluation process and selection of papers sent¹.

Each issue of the journals carries between six (n. 33, 2008) and 14 papers (n. 35, 2009) and almost all authors are French, but it also counts with the participation of other researchers from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Spain and China. Almost all are professors/researchers and most of them are enlisted in the Information and Communication Sciences².

However, there are texts by authors from other fields, such as Management Sciences in five files, Sociology and Anthropology in two, Psychology, Semiology and Ethnology in a dossier. In almost all editions there are papers of a PhD student and/or a post-doctoral researcher and one or more professionals in activity outside the University.

The journals *Organicom – Revista Brasileira de Comunicação Organizacional e Relações Públicas*, launched in 2004 at Escola de Comunicação e Artes da Universidade de São Paulo (ECA-USP), also has half-yearly circulation and is the first and only Brazilian scientific journal specialized in Organizational Communication

¹ See: <http://communicationorganisation.revues.org/>; <http://mica.u-bordeaux3.fr/>.

² It is important to say that in France the field is recognized as Information and Communication Sciences, unlike Brazil, which the title is Social Communication and is separated from the field of Information Sciences.

and public relations. Each issue consists of thematic dossier of testimony, review and interviews. It became bibliographic reference for students, teachers and researchers in the field and is sorted by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Capes³ – as Qualis National B2 in Applied Social Sciences.

The number of articles in each journals varies from five (numbers 1/2004 and 3/2005) to 14, in the last number n.15, 2011, i.e. on average eight papers. Most authors are Brazilians and 47% of them from São Paulo, which indicates a concentration where the journal is published. The other authors (43%) are distributed in the South and Southeast regions, indicating the absence of texts by researchers from the North and the Northeast States. The participation of foreign teachers amounts to 13% from Latin America, Europe and the United States. Most authors (53%) are entered in the field of Communication, especially in the context of organizations, but there are authors of other knowledge areas: Management Sciences (20%), Philosophy (8%), Semiotics (10%), Health (5%), and Technology (4%).

The most obvious difference between the journals is that the French dossiers are about issues related to Communication and Organization and do not deal with public relations, while the Brazilian ones focus more on issues related to Organizational Communication and interfaces with other knowledge, including public relations. Tables 1 and 2 make it easy to display the contents showing a clear difference.

³ Foundation of Ministério da Educação (MEC – Education Ministry in Brazil) responsible for expanding and consolidating *stricto sensu* graduation (MSC and PhD) in all States of the Federation.

SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION
AND THEIR EPISTEMOLOGICAL MARKINGS:

Table 1 – *Dossiers examined in Communication & Organisation – 2004-2011*

Year	Edition	Dossiers titles
2004	25	Les vallées: sens, territoires et signes (Valleys: meaning, territories and signs)
2004	26	La communication des nouvelles éthiques de l'entreprise: responsabilité sociale, développement durable, mode et <i>design</i> éthiques (The communication of new business ethics: ethical social responsibility, sustainable development, fashion and design)
2005	27	Fidélisation et personnalisation: Les nouvelles formes de relations consommateurs/entreprises (Loyalty and customization: the new forms of relationship consumers/businesses)
2005	28	Coaching et communication (Coaching and communication)
2006	30	Modèles et modélisations, pour quels usages? (Models and modelizations, for what purposes?)
2007	31	Migrations conceptuelles: d'où viennent les concepts de la communication organisationnelle (Conceptual migration: whence the concepts of organizational communication)
2007	32	La ville dans tous les sens (The city in all directions)
2008	33	Conduire le changement organisationnel? Leading organizational change?)
2008	34	Retour sur les images d'organisations (Back on the images of organizations)
2009	35	Repenser la communication dans les organisations publiques (Rethinking communication in public organizations)
2009	36	Pour une approche communicationnelle de l'individu au travail (For a communicative approach of the individual at work)
2010	37	La communication à l'épreuve des mutations économiques (The test of economic change communication)
2010	38	Management de l'évaluation et communication (Management of the evaluation and communication)
2011	39	Les applications de la sémiotique à la communication des organisations (Applications of semiotics to communication of organizations)
2011	40	Âges et générations: la communication revisite ses publics (Ages and generations: communication revisits its public)

Table 2 – *Dossiers examined in Organicom – 2004-2012*

Year	Edition	Dossiers titles
2004	1	Comunicação e mudança cultural nas organizações (Communication and cultural change in the organizations)
2005	2	Avaliação e mensuração em comunicação organizacional (Evaluation and measurement in organizational communication)
2005	3	Comunicação digital (Digital communication)
2006	4	Comunicação pública e governamental (Public and governmental communication)
2006	5	Relações públicas: campo acadêmico e profissional (Public relations: academic and professional field)
2007	6	Comunicação de risco e crise: prevenção e gerenciamento (Risk and crisis communication: prevention and management)
2007	7	Identidade, marca e gestão da reputação corporativa (Identity, brand and corporate reputation management)
2008	8	Ética e comunicação organizacional (Ethics and organizational communication)
2008	9	Discurso institucional, linguagem e retórica (Institutional discourse, language and rhetoric)
2009	10/11	Comunicação Organizacional e relações públicas: pesquisa, reprodução, aplicação (Organizational communication and public relations: search, reproduction, application)
2010	12	Ouvidoria e comunicação (Ombudsman and communication)
2010	13	Comunicação, marketing e produção cultural (Communication, marketing and cultural production)
2011	14	<i>Lobby</i> , relações governamentais, democracia (Lobby, government relations, democracy)
2011	15	Comunicação e esporte: pesquisa, marketing e mídia (Communication and sport: research, marketing, and Media)

Methodological approach

We tried to order the diversity of articles, elaborating a classification from the epistemological stance⁴ of the authors and of published articles. We analyze the summary, the methodology and the theoretical foundation of each paper to understand in which paradigmatic current – positivist, interpretive and critical (BURELL; MORGAN, 1979) and (GIROUX; DEMERS, 1998) the authors of the papers are based on text production. To analyze the selected content, we adopted a methodological grid centered on the development of the diversity of the themes from the keywords that authors selected (MORILLON, ALDEBERT; SZAFRAJZEN, 2010)⁵.

The keywords reveal the ties that the researcher tries to weave with the scientific community of the studied field. The analysis of abstracts has enabled us to identify the subjects treated by the researchers at a given moment, and to recognize the complexity of our universe “scientific community”. The grid is inspired by American categories proposed by the Humanities and Social Sciences (ALVESSON; DEETZ, 1996; DEETZ, 1993; HARDY; CLEGG, 1997; GIROUX; MARROQUIN, 2005; KOENIG, 2006; PUTNAM, 1982; MORGAN; BURRELL, 1979). Heavily criticized at the time, Morgan’s matrix (1979) is based on two assumptions: the nature of the Social Sciences (objective or subjective) and science (radical change or adjustment). This matrix ended in four sociological paradigms: functional, interpretative, radical humanist and radical structuralist.

We use the matrix version crafted by Giroux & Demers (1998), which brings together the last two paradigms – radical change and adjustment – under the name of critics that reflects the recent theoretical developments. Therefore, we work with the

⁴ According to Mucchielli (2006, p.15 and 17), “the researcher’s epistemological stance matches his *a priori* knowledge about science in general and about the nature of scientific knowledge (...). The epistemological stance of the researcher implements certain forms of theories”.

⁵ They, previously, conducted a similar analysis, aiming to establish comparison among management science, information and communication sciences).

epistemological paradigms, interpretive and critical functionalist, because we consider them the major. Some researchers in our field, such as Fauré & Bouzon (2010), share this matrix.

The *corpus* of this research was composed of dossiers from 15 numbers of the two journals published in the period from 2004 to 2011, selected as the reflection of the academic community in the field of Organizational Communication. From each issue, we analysed the total of 131 articles. As the *Communication & Organisation* has more time of circulation, the selected issues were from the number 25 to 40 and from *Organicom*, from the first to number 17 (tables 1 and 2). We bet on selecting the same publication period in an attempt to avoid distortions regarding analysis of the themes in the files and to understand their scope and the maturation of the field. This period seemed acceptable to us, because it allowed comparisons and recognition of practices and developments of theoretical questions addressed at different times.

The selected categories for analysis of the two journals were: theme of each journal/dossier, date, number of papers, each paper title, status of authors, paper type-inventory, case study, documentary research, reflection, testimony or presentation of search results –, definitions and/or problematic significant terms found in text and nature of references.

The peaceful co-existence of different epistemological approaches

The three epistemological approaches selected – positivist/functionalist, interpretive and critical – correspond to a particular vision of the Organization and of the Communication and structure the conclusions arising from them. However, care must be taken when placing them in opposition and in reducing confrontations, not to create a new “war of paradigms”, echoing the expression by Gérard Koenig (2006).

A functionalist approach

Associated with the positivist paradigm and also known as “ballistics vision of communication”, the functionalist approach is present in the files of each journal analysed in the countries.

32% in *Communication & Organisation* and 26% in *Organicom*. This approach deals with social reality as a real phenomenon, “ontological principle”, existence of the notes and/or performs outside the subject; “principle of objectivity”, operation determined by laws that lead to success “principle of the universe connected”; and the search for the best solution, the ideal “principle of minimum action”.

One of the postulates of this school is the notion of determinism found in telegraph Communication model⁶, often cited by authors who maintain an instrumental Communication proposal, which is based on the imposition of laws and technical schemes to recipient. According to this paradigm, individuals are products of the environment and respond to stimuli. The organization is a concrete structure in which the Communication becomes a tangible substance that moves in a downward and lateral, upward, associated with a support. Communication is supposedly the one that solves problems, rational and instrumental (MUCCHIELLI; GUIVARCH, 1998).

Messages, “vectors of information”, are seen as physical forms that have spatial-temporal positions and exist independently of the sender and the recipient. Therefore, for functionalist researchers, the essence of Communication lies in the transmission of messages, information, and in the study of the effects of Communication channels, considered as a tool or technique.

In this scenario, the Communication in the organization is appreciated as an integrator, i.e. susceptible to guide behaviors. It considers Communication as an artifact, or control instrument of persuasion, conceived as an adjustment variable in an organization, that can be bounded by physical borders, as a *container* (PUTNAM, 1982).

The authors of the papers studied that are based on such an approach give preference to the links with the management and the study of consequences (expected or not) by the organization, anchored by procedures essentially hypothetical-deductive, privileging

⁶ Published by Claude R. Shannon and Warren Weaver (1948), it is simple linear model of communication, in which this is reduced to the transmission of a message.

quantitative methodologies and statistics. We observed that approximately 15% of the researchers in the French journal and 36% in the Brazilian journal take borrowed elements of the positivist paradigm, but they associate them to reflections within the critical or interpretive paradigms, constituting a “positivism built” (GIROD-SÉVILLE; PERRET, 1999, p.31).

An interpretative approach in growth

The interpretative paradigm, very recognized in the theories of organizations since the end of the 1970s, considers the collective as a result of the subjective experiences of their members. The school has an interpretative vision on the world and demand(s) an in-depth understanding of the phenomena. The organization is conceived as a socially constituted reality, an emerging and inter-subjective creation in a symbolic space built for signs where the actors reinvent reality, continuously, through actions of Communication.

Communication is not simply an organizational activity, but it creates, legitimizes and recreates the social structures that make up the organization node, thus becoming “Organizing Communication”. According to the works of Linda Putnam (1982) or Karl E. Weick (1989) regularly cited by French authors, the interpretative vision, highlighted in papers, implies a particular way of conceiving the organizational structure, which is opposed to the objectivism inherent to functionalists works and proposes a vision of an organization that is doing itself all the time, in constant construction.

The privileged methodological procedure is empirical, following an inductive reasoning based on qualitative data (practically systematic interviews) or in surveys, called understanding, ethnographic and hermeneutics, aiming at the understanding of the actors – the organization and its stakeholders – and the processes of collective and individual meanings.

The presence of this approach is smaller in papers analyzed in the French journal (21% of papers). In the Brazilian journal, many

authors argue theoretically in the interpretative paradigm (56% of papers). In the journal *Communication & Organisation*, some works claim the “constructivist” notion doing explicitly reference to the work of Alex Mucchielli (2006) and adopting a systemic approach. We realize in many texts of the *Organicom* journal, the reflective and questioning stance of the authors in relation to the Organization and the Communication. They conceive the organization as a space of interaction and the Communication as a process that involves the organization and its relationship with society.

A critical approach: a school that is stated

The critical paradigm emerges in France in the 1970s and is developed from 1980 (GOLSORKHI; HUAULT; LECA, 2009). Defined by Max Horkheimer in 1930, as an attitude characterized by a “total distrust in the eyes of the standards of conduct that the social life as organized, provides the individual” (RENAULT; SINTOMER, 2003, p.8). Its legitimacy has grown significantly in France since 1995. In Brazil, this paradigm is beginning to be recognized in the field of Communication in the late 1980s and only in 1990 becomes an epistemological dimension of reach and researchers use it as a perspective on their researches and studies.

This approach considers the organization as a place of domination, in which power relations are asymmetric. It puts in check the contemporary capitalism and it is characterized by the critique of social discourse. In addition, the approach encompasses the ideas related to managerial ideology –limiting and controller –, denounces the hegemonic practices and the struggle for power, and analyzes the places of conflict and abuse caused by economic, social and cultural inequality in the organizational environment. Enhances endurance, emancipation and tries to deconstruct the elements of a culture of submission, seeking to reveal the strategies of manipulation. The work carried out within this perspective relating malaise, suffering at work, stress or harassment (MORILLON; BOUZON; COOREN, 2009).

Regarding Communication, this paradigm questions its instrumental use and recognizes the interaction as an engaged Communicational process that someone else performs, in a community of meanings and not a neutral process of message transmission. The research is of qualitative character, focusing on the subject; denounces the control set up by dominant group the strategic place of the Communication used to hide the alternative representations. The corresponding papers to this perspective base on authors such as Jürgen Habermas, Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu and others. The empirical studies are still rare, probably because of the questioning of the established order.

The critical school presents growth in France and the analysis developed led us to realize that the same happens in papers published in the journal *Communication & Organisation*, as 47% of all papers had the critical approach as a reference. In the Brazilian journal, the critical perspective represents 18%. Although the Brazilian researchers reference authors of this paradigm, at the time of the empirical analysis, overused and sometimes interpretative approach, functionalist. Most of the articles studied that shares with this perspective opts for literature review.

We can point out that the paradigms studied coexist peacefully in a mosaic in the works analyzed, showing that there is a place for each one of them (BOUZON, 2006), and that the complementarities are evident. The journals dossiers analysis indicates us no intention of authors in explaining their epistemological approach and that the characteristics of the functionalist perspective, interpretative and criticism are still mixed in papers, especially in Brazil. In this context, the Organizational Communication seems to accommodate an explanatory pluralism, which, in addition to oppositions, reveals itself as a source of innovation. Table 3 shows the epistemological grounds found in articles.

Table 3 – Epistemological basis of the texts examined

Journal	Positivistic approach (%)	Interpretative approach (%)	Critical approach (%)
<i>Communication & Organisation</i>	32,00	21,00	56,00
<i>Organicom</i>	26,00	56,00	18,00

As already mentioned, most authors color their texts with various paradigmatic systems –choice of some principles and several concepts – and even use multiple paradigms in the same text, “giving the idea of what one might call an arranged epistemological position” (GIROD-SÉVILLE; PERRET 1999, p.31). Despite strong criticism from Alex Mucchielli (2000) that the researcher should be aware of their benchmarks, because, otherwise, it makes him/her prisoner of his/her unconscious mental schemes and can bring inconsistent problematic, it seems to us that this diversity is a wealth of our constitutive disciplinary field, allowing for a balanced and healthy collaboration among various positions, a better insertion in the real and a sharper understanding of social facts.

Questions appeared in the process. The first is that the choice of an epistemological basis of a research is complex and delicate, as it requires the understanding of how the author structures his/her knowledge and the academic trend which he/she refers. The second is that the qualitative assessment, the only one that allows us to appreciate the originality and innovation of a research, cannot be replaced and, last, encourage plurality of approaches, methods and objects for research to work an evolved design of science, which contributes to clarify the possible choices and to invent new ones.

Diversity of themes and references: an issue to understand

The research allowed us to identify that the topics covered by the journal *Communication & Organisation* are related, in

a increasing way with economic news organizations and that the *Organicom* covers a variety of topics such as evaluation and measurement in Organizational Communication, Digital Communication, Public Communication, Ethics in Organizations, Organizational Ombudsman's Speeches, Lobbying and Communication in Sport. This variety can demonstrate the lack of an editorial line, and can also show the subject of the moment or highlight the richness of plurality of our thematic field.

In this study, the bibliography is not conceived as a simple stack of references, but rather as forming a full view of the state of research meanings. In addition, it stresses the importance of the author referenced, indicating the place he/she occupies in the scientific community. Accordingly, references expressed in articles leads us to know the contributions that sustain our scientific production and have an idea what academic works reflect.

In the French journal there is an increasingly strong presence of references from the list of the CNU – Conseil Nacional des Universités (National University Council) –, 71st section of some papers in foreign language, essentially anglophone 9.37%. The research showed that there is a weak mobilization of French works, both in the field of Communication and expertise, Organizational Communication and the co-citation between the members of the field is quantitatively weak, representing on average 18.40%.

In the analysis of the Brazilian journal, we observe high use of foreign authors from different fields of knowledge, especially management 43%. References mobilized are much smaller and the use of co-citation of authors of our specialty is 6% and of authors of Communication 21%. These data show the timidity of French and Brazilian authors in the area of Organizational Communication to benefit from the production of colleagues in order to move, enlarge or question conceptual theoretical developed and analyzed by contributing directly to the constitution of our country.

Table 4 – References in journals reviewed

References	Communication & Organisation	Organicom
Number of references	2.431	1.525
0 to 10 references per paper (%)	1	50,0
11 to 20 references per paper (%)	58,0	37,0
21 to 35 references per paper (%)	41,0	13,0
References from Information and Communication Sciences (%)	19,25	---
References from Communication Sciences (%)	---	21,0
References from foreign authors (%)	9,37	43,0*

*Includes American and French references.

The result of the research in that item leads us to question our academic practices in accordance with the principles established by Mumby and Stohl (1996). For them, we need researchers to promote our discipline, we support in a journal to share common principles and make the co-citations. Only in this way, we can have advances in the consolidation of epistemological Organizational Communication.

Final considerations

The work done authorizes us to recognize the place of research in Organizational Communication in both countries, with a panoramic and structured look, allowing us to draw a current scenario and see the stage in which we find ourselves. The epistemological paradigms do not appear dissected in the texts and, the artificial classification of fundamentals, little mobilized in the works studied, can mask the connivance of scientific practices and the fecundity of the researches developed. However, the description/explanation (positivist paradigm) and the understanding (interpretative paradigm) appear as the two

complementary sides of the analysis of the same phenomenon, the same seized on critical vision. However, the three perspectives – interpretative, critical and functionalist – appear shared by researchers on both sides of the Atlantic.

Another issue that arises in the process is that the discipline of Organizational Communication as a whole flows then polidoxic, i.e., shared between different *doxas*, each having freedom to express its worldview without being qualified as dogmatic. In addition to this realization of cross-pollination, our study allowed to relativize the effects of the intensification of transnational circulation of knowledge and of the references about the Organizational Communication and Communication Sciences, which always remain loaded with local and national settings.

The research tells us, the coexistence with various practices of research presentations and studies. While some articles are in a clearly prospects, others sail between several paradigmatic systems based on various principles and concepts, adopting an epistemological position built, as it is practiced in other disciplines such as Sociology and Management Sciences.

The papers analyzed highlight a multitude of concepts, Communication and Organizational definitions, varying considerably from one author to another or from one search to another. Through this brief note of *science doing itself*, the different approaches chosen seem to us to be more complementary than rivals, as they clarify organizational complex phenomena, sometimes unpublished, but always renewed. We also believe the power of work assessment in Organizational Communication, delegated by the Quantitative Assessment Scheme (QAS), initially feared, does not result in standardization of scientific production; it does not weaken the capacities of innovation and renewal of the disciplinary field and contributes to the dynamics of scientific knowledge.

We faced difficulties connected to different cultural practices, the wide variety of works and the absence of explicit indications about the epistemological choices. On the other hand, in addition to the diversity and complementarity of approaches that are

mutually prolific, our specialty seems to feed itself on border searches, and, paradoxically, very little work in our area.

In addition to these findings, our analysis shows that in the French case, inflation of references mobilized in English, from a wide range of scientific journals, should be weighted by the fact that the authors cited are often the same. They benefit, sometimes, of the fashion effect in research themes and the “Matthew effect”, coined by Robert Merton⁷ (1968) the co-citation among members of the discipline is quantitatively anemic both in France and in Brazil.

From the drawn scenario and the framework of studies developed on Organizational Communication in both countries, we have the following questions so they can instigate further discussions and lead to other quests.

Would it be the lack of co-citation and the lack of referencing the Communication effect of elegance or collective modesty among researchers or, more fundamentally, the brand of a disciplinary production judged relatively poor by own members?

If the bibliography is a support for later works, what will be the future of Communication Sciences if our thoughts are not taken up, discussed and deepened by the researchers of our specialty?

Can the format “paper” stimulate researchers to focus on tools and methods that adapt more easily its proposal, condemning the researcher to a field reduced to a synthetic objective, suppressing the nuances of the results, the questions, the doubts, the false leads and the mistakes that characterize the scientific conduct?

Another question that the research brings us is that if the bibliometric evaluation of the impact and quality of academic production is based on citations of scientific papers and that the consideration of a limited number of papers in the only journal

⁷ The *Matthew Effect* means using mechanisms to increase advantage over others. Refers to a phrase from the Gospel of Matthew: “For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance. But whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath”. The American sociologist tried to show how scientists and most recognized universities maintained its dominant position in the world of research.

specialized Organizational Communication in each country does not allow a generalization of conclusions reached, we hope that this research can contribute to the questioning of the structuring logic of our disciplinary field.

References

ALVESSON, Mats; DEETZ, Stanley. Critical theory and postmodernism approaches to organizational studies. In: CLEGG, Stewart; HARDY, Cynthia (Eds). **Handbook of organizational studies**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1996. p.191-217.

BOUZON, Arlette. **Etudier la communication organisationnelle: champs, concepts, perspectives**. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006.

BURRELL, Gibson; MORGAN, Gareth. **Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis: elements of the sociology of corporate life** London: Heineman, 1979.

DEETZ, Stanley. Describing differences in approaches to organization science: rethinking Burrell and Morgan and their legacy. In: DESROSIÈRES, Alain. **La politique des grands nombres: histoire de la raison statistique**. Paris: La Découverte, 1993.

FAURÉ, Bertrand; BOUZON, Arlette. French approaches to the performative properties of language at work: an overview. **Management Communication Quarterly**, v. 24, n. 4, p.620-626, 2010.

GIROD-SÉVILLE, Martine; PERRET Véronique. Fondements épistémologiques de la recherche. In: THIÉTART, Raymond-Alain et al. **Méthodes de recherche en management**. Paris: Dunod, 1999. p.13-33.

GIROUX, Nicole; DEMERS, Christiane. Communication organisationnelle et stratégie. **Management international**, v. 2, n. 2, p.17-32, 1998.

GIROUX, Nicole; MARROQUIN, Lisette. L'approche narrative des organisations. **Revue Française de Gestion**, n. 159, p.15-42, 2005/6.

GOLSORKHI, Damon; HUAULT, Isabelle; LECA, Bernard. **Les études critiques en management: une perspective française**. Québec: Presses Universitaires de Laval, 2009.

SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION
AND THEIR EPISTEMOLOGICAL MARKINGS:

HARDY, Cynthia; CLEGG, Stewart. Relatively without relativism: reflexivity in post-paradigm organization studies. **British Journal of Management**, special issue, v. 8, S5-S17, jun. 1997.

KOENIG, Gérard. Théories mode d'emploi. **Revue Française de Gestion**, n.160, p.9-27, jan. 2006.

MERTON, Robert. The Matthew effect in Science. **Science**. Vol.159, jan.1968. p.56-63.

MORILLON, Laurent; ALDEBERT, Bénédicte; SZAFRAJZEN, Barbara. Pour une lecture croisée des approches et usages des recherches sur la communication des organisations en sciences de l'information et de la communication, et en sciences de gestion. In: CONGRÈS SFSIC, XVII, Dijon, 23-26 jul 2010. **Anais...** Paris: SFSIC, 2010.

MORILLON, Laurent; BOUZON, Arlette; COOREN, François. Pour une approche communicationnelle de l'individu au travail. **Communication & Organisation**, n. 36, p.8-19, 2009.

MUCCHIELLI, Alex. Deux mondes constructivistes pour le diagnostic des communications organisationnelles. **Communication et organisation**, n. 30, 2. sem. 2006.

_____. **La nouvelle communication: épistémologie des sciences de l'information-communication**. Paris: Armand Colin, 2000.

MUCCHIELLI, Alex; GUIVARCH, J. **Nouvelles méthodes d'étude des communications**. Paris: Armand Colin, 1998.

MUMBY, Dennis K.; STOHL, Cynthia. Disciplining organizational communication studies. **Management Communication Quarterly**, v. 10, n.1, p.50-75, 1996.

PONTILLE, David; TORNAY, Didier. Revues qui comptent, revues qu'on compte: produire des classements en économie et gestion. **Revue de la régulation**, n. 8, 2. sem. 2010a. Disponível em: <<http://regulation.revues.org/8881>>. Acesso em: 01 maio 2013.

_____. The controversial policies of journal ratings: evaluating social sciences and humanities. **Research Evaluation**, v. 19, n. 5, p.347-360, 2010b.

ARLETTE BOUZON
IVONE DE LOURDES DE OLIVEIRA

PUTNAM, Linda L. Paradigms of organizational communication research: an overview and synthesis. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, n. 46, p.192-206, 1982.

RENAULT, Emmanuel; SINTOMER, Yves. *Où en est la théorie critique?* Paris: La Découverte, 2003.

SHANNON, Claude E; WARREN, Weaver. Théorie mathématique de la communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, v. 27, p.379-423, 623-656, jul-out. 1948.

WEICK, Karl E. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.

_____. *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison Westley, 1969.

Arlette Bouzon

PhD from Université Celsa-Paris IV – Sorbonne, France. Member of the Laboratoire d'Études et de Recherches Appliquées en Sciences Sociales (Lerass). Professor of the Under-graduate Program in Communication at the Department of Science of Information and Communication, Université Paul Sabatier. She directs the activities of the research group "Organicom", and of the thematic section Communication and Strategy, of the European Communication Research and Education Association (Ecrea). She is the author of the book *Etudier la communication organisationnelle: champs, concepts, perspectives*. Email: arlette.bouzon@iut-tlse3.fr

Ivone de Lourdes Oliveira

PhD from Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). Professor of the Graduate Program in Social Communication at the School of Communication and Arts, PUC-MG. She directs the activities of the research group "Communication in the organizations context: theoretical and conceptual aspects". Member of the Advisory Board of the Abrapcorp – Brazilian Association of Researchers in Communication and Public Relations. Co-author of the book *O que é comunicação estratégica nas organizações?* Co-organizer of the works: *Interfaces e tendências da comunicação no contexto das organizações*; *Propostas Conceituais para a Comunicação no contexto organizacional*; *A Comunicação na Gestão da Sustentabilidade das organizações*; *Redes Sociais, Organização, Comunicação e Discurso, Organização, Comunicação*. Email: ivonepucmg@gmail.com

Received on: 07.27.2014

Accepted on: 12.05.2014