

A reflexive methodology for de-westernizing the subfield of Latin American Organizational Communication

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-58442022110en>

Consuelo Vásquezⁱ

📄 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3904-9878>

Roberto Burgueñoⁱⁱ

📄 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9452-0039>

Gabriela Rabello de Limaⁱ

📄 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0756-6480>

Marcela Marques de Queirozⁱⁱⁱ

📄 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8247-1548>

ⁱ(Université du Québec à Montréal, Faculté de Communication, Montréal – QC, Canada).

ⁱⁱ(Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Facultad de Ingeniería y Negocios Guadalupe Victoria. Baja California, Mexico).

ⁱⁱⁱ(Université de Montréal, École de Santé Publique de l'Université de Montréal, Montréal - QC, Canada).

Abstract

This paper aims to develop a reflexive methodology to explore the production of knowledge of the subfield of Organizational Communication research, considering the contextual, institutional, and cultural realities of the Latin American region. For this purpose, responding to the recent calls to de-westernized Communication, this paper adopted a “bottom-up” approach, which favors the realities experienced by Latin American Organizational Communication researchers and scholars. The

proposed methodology provides a model that can serve as an example to de-westernize knowledge production in related fields.

Keywords: Organizational Communication. Latin America. De-Westernizing. Methodology.

Introduction

In recent years, Organizational Communication¹ (OC) studies in Latin America have shown signs of expansion and transformation (KAPLÚN, 2012). Such signs, as contextualized in this research, might be perceived having the following features: (i) the development of new communication models that correspond to the changing landscape of Latin American organizations (DUARTE, 2002; MEDINA, 2005); (ii) the increased distinction between the academic areas of Journalism and Public Relations (SILVESTREIN; GODOI; RIBEIRO, 2007); (iii) the emergence of associations, conferences and interest groups about OC in Latin American (VÁSQUEZ; MARROQUÍN, 2016); and (iv) the development of empirical studies in OC anchored in the context of the Latin American region (VÁSQUEZ; MARROQUÍN; ANGEL, 2018).

Even with these signs, few studies have been documented and analyzed concerning the characteristics of Latin American OC - with the exception of the works by Angel (2013), Angel, Marroquín and Vásquez (2017), Guillen and Espinosa (2014), Kunsch (2011) and Orjuela (2016). According to Vásquez, Marroquín, and Angel (2018), documenting this emerging subfield of communication studies is necessary for the development of Latin American traditions on OC. As Sanabria, Castillo, and Sanchez (2020, p. 205, our translation) point out, regarding Latin American organization studies, “it is necessary to develop a knowledge base [in this area] that highlights the regional dynamics of organizations and the different views on the subject (...) a question that has not yet been developed, despite its importance”.

This article is a part of a larger research project², which contributes to the development of this knowledge base, through a methodological approach. That is, it seeks to develop validation criteria, based on heuristic tools and models, for data collection and analysis of the subfield of OC based on the historical, economic and social contexts of the Latin American region. This work is based on the construction of a reflexive methodology that adopts a “bottom-up” approach, which considers the realities experienced by OC Latin American researchers and scholars. This proposal falls within the so-called de-westernization of the communication field

1 In this article, we define OC as an academic subfield of the field of Communication studies that generates knowledge regarding the processes of communication both internal and external in and about organizations (whether in the private, public, third sector or civil society). In Latin America, the subfield of OC includes corporate communication, business communication, public relations, strategic communication, institutional communication, and public affairs (REDLACO, 2018).

2 The project “*Mapeando la comunicación organizacional en América Latina*” (Mapping OC in Latin America, freely translated) is coordinated by Consuelo Vásquez Donoso, professor at the Université du Québec à Montréal. The research team is composed by Professors Lisette Marroquín (Universidad de Costa Rica), Griselda Guillén and María Jesús Montoya (Universidad Autónoma de Baja California), as well as students Gabriela Rabello de Lima (Université du Québec à Montréal) and Marcela Marques de Queiroz (Université de Montréal).

(ENGHEL; BECERRA, 2018; WAISBORD; MELLADO, 2014), which invites us to reflect on the general conditions of intellectual production and to propose an epistemic change that resists the dominance of ideas imported from the Global North. As Enghel and Becerra (2018; p.111, our emphasis) point out, only in this way will it be possible “resituating Latin America in international communication theory by foregrounding *situated approaches generated in the region*”. Even though some works have been carried out following this orientation, methodological proposals have been scarcer (OCAÑA; LÓPEZ; CONEDO, 2018; SMITH, 2000). Therefore, the importance of this approach lies in possibility of contributing to the academy proposing a reflexive and critical methodological approach, situating the Southern thinking.

Given the above, we will seek, in the following sections of this article, to present the reflexive methodological proposal used in this work, highlighting, first, its fundamentals. We will then present the theoretical framework on which our proposal is based, as well as the methodological instrument we developed. In the final considerations, we will discuss the challenges and limits of a reflexive methodology to de-westernize the OC subfield.

Fundamentals of a reflexive methodology

The methodological perspective that we propose in this article assumes the existence of a close relationship between knowledge and the way it is produced (CALAS; SMIRCICH, 1992). This implies attending to the linguistic, social, political, and theoretical elements that participate in the process of knowledge development. Alvesson and Sköldbberg (2017) suggest that the researchers adopt a critical stance in relation to what is taken for granted, while ensuring that the results of their work can generate knowledge that broadens alternatives and provides opportunities for reflection, rather than seeking absolute truths, in a given field of knowledge.

According to these authors, a reflexive methodology has two main characteristics, which are interpretation and reflection (or reflexivity). The first recognizes that all references to empirical reality are the result of interpretations. Thus, the assumption that observations, interviews, statistics, and other empirical data are simple representations of reality is rejected. Research, as well as its results, are socially constructed processes through the negotiation of meanings. Therefore, it is important to identify the theoretical assumptions, the language used, and the researchers’ previous perceptions as an important part of their interpretative process. The second characteristic corresponds to reflection and recognizes the participation in the research process of different actors such as the researcher, the community involved in the research, as well as society, cultural and intellectual traditions, and different narratives. Alvesson and Sköldbberg (2017, p.13) define reflection as “the interpretation of interpretation”, which is practically translated into the researcher’s self-reflective and critical work on their own interpretive process.

With this, Alvesson and Sköldbberg (2017) propose four guidelines to be taken into consideration when conducting a reflexive methodology: (i) use research techniques in a

systematic and rigorous manner; (ii) recognize the primacy of interpretation and therefore mobilize hermeneutics in the process; (iii) verify the political and ideological character of the research; and (iv) reflect on the problems of authority and representation throughout the research process, which implies questioning the researcher's arguments of authority, as well as questioning and inquiring about the reliable reproduction of reality. These guidelines invite researchers to remain vigilant and not fall into the trap of seeking an absolute truth, which often implies a research model abstracted from the social and political context in which the research is developed (ALVESSON; SKÖLDBERG, 2017). The reflexive methodology, proposed by these authors, offers an epistemic framework for a critical self-reflection of the research process.

However, what this proposal does not address, and what seems fundamental when adopting a critical-reflexive stance, is understanding how the hegemonic character of knowledge production have been dictated by the Global North: research processes, criteria of scientific validity, diffusion models, and locus of enunciation. Recognizing this epistemic domination and questioning it are key elements of a reflexive methodology that seeks to de-westernize a disciplinary field, which in our case corresponds to the subfield of OC, and that values an ecology of knowledge (SANTOS, 2011). There have been several initiatives to de-westernize Communication, such as the special issue published in *Communication Theory*, edited by Enghel and Becerra (2018). These authors criticize the domination of ideas imported from the West to the "rest of the world," inviting us to reflect on the general conditions of intellectual production and propose an epistemic change in the field. Waisbord and Mellado (2014) identify four dimensions or foci of attention of this epistemic change. They are as follows: (i) the object of study; (ii) the empirical material; (iii) the analytical references; and (iv) the academic cultures.

In this paper, we address this last dimension, which involves examining how the norms and practices that prevail in the academic cultures of the Global North determine the expectations of OC research around the world, in order to question them and propose alternatives that correspond to different regional realities such as Latin America. Thus, it is necessary to situate the research in the cultural context of production and to self-reflect on the research process. The focus is then on the production of knowledge "from the bottom up", i.e., from researchers' practices and their work experiences, which are situated in a historical, sociocultural and political context. To do so, it is necessary to rethink not only the epistemological bases of research, but also the methods by which this knowledge is produced. The present work does not seek to propose a single method, as it would be contradictory with a reflexive methodology, but rather propose a particular methodological initiative in the subfield of Latin American OC and, from there, suggest methodological possibilities of studies for other areas.

In summary, the reflexive methodology is based on three main premises: (i) the research is socially constructed through the negotiation of meaning; (ii) the context in which the research takes place is the background of interpretation of the reflexive process; and (iii) hegemonic Northern and Eurocentric traditions have historically defined, institutionalized, and legitimized what can be considered as a valid research model to the other regions of the world.

These premises, as guiding elements, invite us to pay attention to the political, epistemological, and socioeconomic components that are part of the production of knowledge from the South. This means attending to the tensions and power dynamics at play in the search for recognition of different fields of knowledge that can generate new ways of analyzing phenomena and meet local specificities (SANTOS, 2011).

A reflexive methodology to document the Latin American academic production of OC

The premises for the methodological construction of the instrument were built through three literature reviews: (i) studies on the researchers' working conditions; (ii) Latin American OC; and (iii) Latin American critical perspectives.

Researchers' working conditions

This first theoretical foundation addresses issues about academic labor and institutional environment. According to the International Labor Organization (1981), the teaching profession is considered one of the most stressful, compared to others. For example, studies by Costa *et al.* (2013) and Silva (2015) point out the prevalence of musculoskeletal and psychological disorders in Brazilian teachers, such as Burnout Syndrome, framing them as a population at risk for this disorder. According to Dejours (1991), work is never neutral with regard to health, and can favor both health and disease.

Regarding the research work conditions, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) state that work has been less encouraged by the curiosity of the researchers themselves and more by market demands, which directly influences the degree of satisfaction of these professionals. Besides the issue of the commodification of academic work, the increasing of neoliberal logics and discourse in the academic environment has intensified the precarization and flexibilization of work, promoting individualism and workers' suffering (ASHCRAFT, 2017; COLADO, 2003; DAVIES; BANSEL, 2010).

Gender inequalities are also present in academic work. According to official data from UNESCO (2018), less than 30% of researchers worldwide are women. Munévar (2004) points out that structural problems shape the power and gender relations, which permeate society and are reflected in universities – spaces in which these relations are demarcated from the way men and women participate in the university to the fields of knowledge. Spitzack and Carter (1987) use the expression “womanless communication” to designate the exclusion of women from communication studies. According to the authors, for a long-time, academia's attention was focused on men, who, historically, were more present in these domains. Despite the growing presence of women in the field of communication research (MARTINS, 2018), attention to the gender cut-off is essential regarding the academic production in communication by Brazilian

researchers. Women still find themselves in unequal situations compared to men in terms of promotions, salaries, and work-family reconciliation (ANDRADE; SOBREIRA, 2013).

OC in Latin America

Regarding Latin American OC, we identify the main characteristics of this subfield of knowledge in the academic context. Knowledge production on OC in Latin America has been mainly addressed from a regional perspective (ANGEL, 2013; ANGEL; MARROQUÍN; VÁSQUEZ, 2017; GARCÍA-MACÍAS; ORDUÑO MENDOZA; FORTANELL TREJO, 2018; VÁSQUEZ; MARROQUÍN; ANGEL, 2018), as well as from national bibliometric studies as, for example, the studies by Guillén and Espinoza (2014) concerning Mexico, and Kunsch (2011) addressing the case of Brazil.

Concerning OC, these studies, although scarce, offer important contributions to define research trends, theoretical perspectives, methods and identify the contexts that contribute to the definition of a subfield of Latin American OC (ANGEL, 2013). One of the important conclusions of these studies is the predominance of a functionalist-systemic view in Latin America, which can be explained by the strong pragmatic orientation that has characterized the study of OC in the region. Vásquez, Marroquín and Angel (2018) state that there is, however, the presence of some “alternative” pragmatic studies that share the emancipatory agenda of the Latin American critical school of communication, as well as some interpretative studies on the topic. These bibliometric studies also highlight the professional orientation towards OC in Latin America academic production of knowledge, which is accompanied by a strong interest in applied research. Angel, Marroquín, and Vásquez (2017) point out that the conditions of poverty and inequality in Latin America have promoted the development of prescriptive research and contributions to practical activities. Thus, the socioeconomic and political conditions in Latin America encourage us to emphasize the social relevance of OC research. For example, in Brazil, studies coming from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (BALDISSERA, 2009), as well as the Federal University of Minas Gerais (HENRIQUES; SILVA, 2014; MARQUES, 2013), collaborate with the overcoming of an instrumental perspective of the OC subfield.

In sum, the pragmatic orientation of Latin American research in OC and its professional approach linked to applied studies lead us to identify some characteristics of a Latin American perspective of OC based on praxis. According to Vásquez, Marroquín and Angel (2018), this emphasis on praxis, defined as “local improvisations and innovations, situated to be tested to solve specific problems and needs” (BELTRÁN, 2016, p. 158, our translation), is orienting Latin American research towards understanding OC as practices and lenses for social change, in which the role of researchers becomes key. Let us note, for example, the studies developed by Henriques (2017) and Henriques and Silva (2014), which address organizational communication in the context of collective actions. This makes it possible to identify a

theoretical, methodological, and regional problem-solving capacity that show a Latin American approach to OC and, therefore, its own research and work agenda.

Latin American critical perspectives

When it comes to the decolonial perspectives that permeate critical orientations in communication studies, the theoretical discussion follows in the footsteps of the Latin American critical view of communication (BOHOSLAVSKY, 2015; MARQUES DE MELO, 1999; NAVARRO, 1999; SANTOS, 2011; VILLANUEVA, 2016). Themes such as methodological hybridization, the ethical and political role of the researcher, as well as their role as an agent of social change, participate in the construction of Latin American OC.

As Navarro (1999) notes, studying a normative field of knowledge from a Latin American perspective expands and reinforces the rupture of scientific colonialism, both in the field of theoretical knowledge and in institutional actions. This rupture, in some way, contributes to an epistemological construction of the scientific making of the field. Regarding communication, the literature highlights that since the mid-1974s, European and American knowledge and orientations were opposing the empirical evidence of the field in the Latin American region. (BOHOSLAVSKY, 2015; NAVARRO, 1999). In a similar way, Santos (2011) states that from instruments of intercultural validation of local knowledge, such as the ones proposed by Navarro (1999), it will be possible to break with the domination of the hierarchy of scientific knowledge of European or North American orientations that often exclude the knowledge from the South.

In other words, based on the understanding of Bohoslavsky (2015), Navarro (1999) and Santos (2011), we reinforce the idea that identifying voices from the Latin American region of the OC field will contribute to the establishment of new methodologies that meet regional specificities. This will also provide an opportunity to legitimize a OC field in Latin America, which is still poorly mapped, as mentioned in the previous section.

The methodological instrument

Articulating these three theoretical bases, we built an online questionnaire, elaborating questions that corresponded with the dimensions and variables detected in the theoretical framework (Chart 1). The survey was later forwarded to Latin American researchers in the subfield of OC and Public Relations. The instrument had 8 sections and a total of 101 questions. The sections of the questionnaire were divided as follows: (i) personal and work information; (ii) about the researchers' training; (iii) about the definition of OC; (iv) about Latin American OC perspective; (v) about their research in OC; (vi) about the dissemination of these researches in OC; (vii) about teaching OC; and (viii) about the researchers' current working conditions. The following chart presents the theoretical matrix that served as the basis for developing the instrument.

Table 1 - Methodological matrix for questionnaire development

Research matrix		
Concepts and Theories	Dimensions	Variables
Academic knowledge production: this includes academics' work product, research and pedagogy, as well as their working conditions.	Types of production and means of dissemination	Research papers, essays, interviews, lectures, case studies, opinion articles, manuals, etc.
	Context of production	Funded or unfunded research, national/international collaboration, institutional support, co-citations, etc. courses taught, degree, research center, the existence of a body in the academic unit that arbitrates research, etc.
	Output evaluation measures	Institutional requirements, etc.
	Work conditions	Work conditions
OC - considered as an academic subfield of Communication	OC themes (Angel; Marroquín; Vásquez, 2017)	New technologies, reputation, social responsibility/sustainability, strategic communication/political communication, advertising and marketing, public relations, Dircom, organizational culture, corporate communication
	OC metaphors (Putnam; Phillips; Chapman, 1986; Angel; Marroquín; Vásquez, 2017)	Conduit, lens, network, performance, symbol, voice, discourse
	OC discourses (Deetz, 2001; Angel; Marroquín; Vásquez, 2017)	Normative, interpretative, critical, dialogical, constitutive
	OC status: institutionality, peer recognition, etc (Bourdieu, 1984)	Teaching level (graduate, master's), specific discipline, research in the subfield, member of a OC association

Latin American perspective	Latin American communication studies critical tradition	
	Characteristics of the LA tradition in OC (Marques de Melo, 1999; Vásquez; Marroquín; Angel, 2018)	Theoretical blending, Methodological hybridization, positioning, consideration of extra-national or regional (LA) dimensions; ethical and political role of the researcher as a change agent, orientation to practice
	Locus of enunciation (Villanueva, 2016)	
	National (local) and contemporary particularities (Navarro, 1999)	
	Epistemologies of the South (Santos, 2011)	Local knowledge, epistemicide, multiculturalism, cultural appropriation/domination
Research's main goals <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To map the production of academic knowledge on OC in Latin America. 2. To establish scientific criteria and analytical frameworks that correspond to the reality of the context of academic knowledge production on OC in Latin America. 3. To explore the thesis that there is a Latin American OC perspective. 		

Source: created by the authors.

With regard to the validation and application of the survey, it was first developed in Spanish and then translated into Portuguese. Thereafter, two validations of the instrument were performed, the statistical validation (Cronbach's alpha: 0.992), and the peer review. Seven reviewers from four Latin American countries evaluated the instrument by answering the survey, in both languages. They commented about their general understandings, readability, and average response time, validating eligibility criteria of this tool.

In October 2019 the survey was emailed to 276 Latin American researchers, from 79 universities and 23 associations in the region. The paid-access QuestionPro platform was used to create the online questionnaire, to which we had access for a period of four months (from October 2019 to January 2020).

In the beginning, 50 researchers responded the questionnaire, making it possible to validate 42 responses for a preliminary data analysis, which allowed us to better validate the consistency of the survey. Due to the low diversity of Latin American countries (based on the information obtained in the directory that was compiled for the survey submission) and a significant percentage of unfinished surveys, we decided to simplify the survey and change the communication strategy for the contact with the researchers.

Thus, the questionnaire was applied again: in this phase, we received a total of 66 responses, of which 31 could be validated³. After compiling the two phases into a database, 81 responses were obtained, which were used for the analysis by integrating the database and Cronbach's alpha. A result of 0.922 was obtained, which remains high for the group of questions with similar responses and focused on the perspectives of OC. Still, an alpha above 0.70 was maintained for the rest of the sections, which validates the integrated instrument.

The sample covered 14 countries, 10 of which were representative in terms of the response of their researchers. For North America (Mexico) 28.4% of responses were obtained, Central America and the Caribbean (Costa Rica, Cuba and Dominican Republic) 7.4% and South America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay and Venezuela) 59.3%. The other 04 countries from where it was not possible to collect representative information represented 4.9% of the survey and were registered under the title others. It should also be noted that two of the countries with the greatest number of academics in OC are Mexico and Brazil, for which there were significant percentages of responses (28.40% and 24.79%, respectively).

Regarding gender, the sample was predominantly female (73%), followed by male (27%). As main results, 76.54% of the participants who responded to the survey stated that they had some job stability with a full-time position in their workplace. With regard to this point, the remainder represented 14.81% who pointed out that they work part-time and 8.64% by variable hours. Still, 54.3% of the sample pointed out to work in a public institution while 45.7% pointed out they work in a private institution. With regard to educational qualifications, 44.4% of the sample stated that they have a doctor's degree, followed by 39.5% with a master's degree, 11.1% with a post-doctorate, 2.5% with a bachelor's degree, and a sample of 2.5% who preferred not to answer. In terms of research, just over half of the sample (54.32%) is part of an OC research group, which is in line with the percentage in the question about research projects in organizational communication for which they are responsible. This tells us that experience in coordinating research projects is only half of the sample obtained.

Finally, let us note that the research group is currently doing the data analysis with the intention of publishing the results⁴. Furthermore, let us recall that the objective of this article focuses on the development and discussion of a reflexive methodology to study the production of knowledge in the academic subfield of OC in Latin America. Therefore, it was not intended to analyze the data, but rather, reflect on the advantages, limits and challenges related to the development of this type of methodology in the subfield of OC studies, what we do in the following section.

3 Of this sample, 29 participants fully completed the survey and 2 completed it in such a way that the data could be validated and used in this study.

4 In this regard, we currently have two papers under preparation and or review on this subject. The first paper sets trends by geographical areas in relation to the definition of OC and Latin American perspectives. A second focuses on the cases of Mexico and Brazil, seeking to compare the conditions of work, research development, and dissemination of Latin American OC academic production.

Final Considerations

The fundamentals of a reflexive methodology hinges around researchers' self-reflective and critical work of their own interpretive process (ALVESSON; SKÖLDBERG, 2017). In this article, we identified three guidelines: (i) research is socially constructed through the negotiation of meanings; (ii) the context in which the research is situated is the backdrop of interpretation of the reflexive process; and (iii) hegemonic Northern and Eurocentric traditions have historically defined, institutionalized, and legitimized what can be considered as a valid research model to the other regions of the world. In these final considerations, we discuss these points in relation to the design and application of the instrument presented in this article.

First, we should note that the research we are developing is part of a political will to de-westernize the subfield of OC, which comes with an ideological stance that seeks to denounce the academic cultures of the Global North and, more specifically, the way they determine the expectations of OC research in Latin America. Questioning this epistemic domination (SANTOS, 2011), proposing alternatives is part of our research agenda, which is translated, for example, into the conceptual categories that inform the survey presented in this article. By choosing working conditions, OC in Latin America, and Latin American perspectives on Communication as the axes of the conceptual framework, and mainly defining them in terms of the critical and Latin American literature (see chart 01), we perform a gesture that is at the same time theoretical, methodological, and political. By highlighting these categories, we are at the same time obscuring others (including those coming from the Global North): making these processes of visibilization/invisibilization explicit, as well as the political and ideological character of research, is a central part of a reflexive methodology. Alvesson and Sköldbberg (2017) also suggest crossing several epistemological perspectives to reflexively construct the object of study and preserve the complexity of the researched phenomenon.

Second, we highlight the problems of authority and representation that arise during the research process. This implies, as mentioned, questioning our arguments of authority, as well as the way in which we represented the realities we study. Regarding the first point, we note the ambition of our research project, seeking to map the academic production of OC in Latin America, develop scientific validation criteria that take Latin American realities into account, and explore the thesis of a Latin American perspective of OC. Attempting to achieve these goals through the development and implementation of a survey presents several challenges, including the difficulty to obtain a representative sample of Latin American countries. We first faced the lack of systematization and information about Latin American OC researchers: establishing the survey population involved creating a directory through Latin American university websites, conferences, and our networks, leading to a biased and partial result. This problem had repercussions in the dissemination of the survey, as we were not able to reach all of the contacts in the directory. Moreover, we noted the low response from some countries in

the first mailing of the survey. Consequently, it was necessary the design of a second phase of distribution of the survey.

Besides the technical issues related to the representativeness of the sample, these practical obstacles in the application of the survey are indicative of the challenge of covering the Latin American region, not only in quantitative but also in qualitative terms. The diversity of modes of production of OC knowledge in the region is evident not only among countries, but also within each country, province, and institution. It is difficult to capture the details and nuances of these singularities through a survey. A reflexive methodology invites us to cultivate methodological humility to account for the performativity of our methods in the construction of reality, which will always be partial, fragmented and disordered (LAW; SINGLETON, 2005). The recognition of this partiality also allows us to consider other research methods (interviews with academics and bibliometric analysis) in the next stages of the project.

As a final consideration, we highlight the understanding of the hegemonic character of knowledge production, which, as mentioned, has been historically and systematically instituted by and for the Global North. Our proposal is to shift the locus of enunciation of knowledge production about OC to Latin America (VILLANUEVA, 2016). However, our research project focuses on academic production and considers OC as an academic subfield of knowledge. By privileging this focus, our research project participates in perpetuating the hegemony of scientific knowledge and instituting universities as the privileged place for knowledge generation. It excludes the practical knowledge often dismissed by academicist standards, and does not include the knowledge coming from other Latin American organizations (e.g. government, business, civil society organizations, social movements) and actors.

As Santos (2005) mentions, universities (including those from the South) and the academics who work in them collaborate with the hegemonic colonialism of the Global North by reproducing the discourses and logics of science and excellence. Reflecting on these power dynamics, recognizing them, and seeking ways of resistance and transformation is part of the reflections to which a reflexive methodology invites us. If our main intention is to de-westernize the subfield of OC, we understand that this also requires de-westernizing our institutions and ourselves.

References

- ALVESSON, M.; SKÖLDBERG, K. **Reflexive methodology**: new vistas for qualitative research. Londres: SAGE Publications, 2017.
- ANDRADE, C.; SOBREIRA, R. M. C. Igualdade de género no exercício da profissão de Relações Públicas: estudo exploratório com estudantes de comunicação organizacional. **Exedra: Revista Científica**, n. 7, p. 41-50, 2013.
- ASHCRAFT, K. L. 'Submissi' ANGEL, A. Los "campos" de la comunicación organizacional: Perspectivas Latinoamericanas y Norteamericanas. **Filo de Palabra**, n. 15, p. 9-26, 2013.

- ANGEL, A.; MARROQUÍN, L.; VÁSQUEZ, C. O campo da comunicação organizacional na América Latina: uma revisão crítica de sua produção intelectual acadêmica. **Organicom**, v. 14, n. 26, p. 273-289, 2017.
- on' to the rule of excellence: ordinary affect and precarious resistance in the labor of organization and management studies. **Organization**, v. 24, n. 1, p. 36-58, 2017.
- BALDISSERA, R. Comunicação Organizacional na perspectiva da complexidade. **Organicom**, v.6, n. 10-11, p. 115-120, 2009.
- BELTRÁN, L. R. Adiós a Aristóteles: la comunicación “horizontal”. **Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias de La Comunicación**, v. 12, n. 23, p.136-158, 2016.
- BOHOSLAVSKY, E. América Latina (1950-1989): perspectivas desde la historia comparada. **Quinto Sol**, v. 19, n. 1, p. 1-3, 2015.
- BOURDIEU, P. **Cuestiones de sociología**. Madrid: Itsmo, 1984.
- CALAS, M. B.; SMIRCICH, L. Re-writing gender into organizational theorizing: directions from feminist perspectives. In: REEDS, M. HUGHES, M. (ed.). **Rethinking organization: new directions in organization theory and Analysis**. Londres: SAGE Publications, 1992.
- COLADO, E. I. Capitalismo académico y globalización: la universidad reinventada. **Educación & Sociedade**, v. 24, n. 84, p. 1059-1067, 2003.
- COSTA, L. S. T.; GIL-MONTE, P. R.; POSSOBON, R. D. F.; AMBROSANO, G. M. B. Prevalência da Síndrome de Burnout em uma amostra de professores universitários brasileiros. **Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica**, v. 26, n. 4, p. 636-642, 2013.
- DAVIES, B.; BANSEL, P. Governmentality and academic work: shaping the hearts and minds of academic workers. **Journal of Curriculum Theorizing**, v. 26, n. 3, p. 5-20, 2010.
- DEETZ, S. Conceptual foundations. In: JABLIN, F.; PUTNAM, L. L. (ed.). **The new handbook of organizational communication**. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2001.
- DEJOURS, C. Normalidade, trabalho e cidadania. **Cadernos do CRP**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 13-17, 1991.
- DUARTE, G. A. L. Convergencia global y comunicación organizacional en México. Apuntes diagnósticos. **Revista Latina de Comunicación Social**, v. 5, n. 52, p. 1-11, 2002.
- ENGHEL, F.; BECERRA, M. Here and there: (re)situating Latin America in International Communication Theory. **Communication Theory**, v. 28, n. 2, p. 111-130, 2018.
- GARCÍA-MACÍAS, A.; ORDUÑO MENDOZA, S.; FORTANELL TREJO, B. El Entramado Temático de la Comunicación Organizacional: nitidez, cohesión y posicionamiento en la red conceptual de las publicaciones sobre comunicación en el SciELO Citation Index. **Anuario de Investigación de la Comunicación CONEICC**, n. XXV, p. 95-107, 2018.
- GUILLEN, G.; ESPINOSA, S. En busca del desenredos de la comunicación organizacional. **Razón y Palabra**, v. 87, n. 18, p. 109-130, 2014.
- HENRIQUES, M. S. **Comunicação e estratégias de mobilização social**. Autêntica, 2017.
- HENRIQUES, M. S.; SILVA, D. R. Vulnerabilidade dos públicos frente a práticas abusivas de comunicação empregadas por organizações: limitações para o monitoramento civil. **Comunicação e Sociedade**, v. 26, p. 162-176, 2014.

- KAPLÚN, G. Lo emergente y lo resistente en la comunicación organizacional. **Diálogos de la Comunicación**, n. 8, p. 1-23, 2012.
- KUNSCH, M. M. K. Comunicação Organizacional e Relações Públicas: perspectivas dos estudos latino-americanos. **Revista Internacional de Relaciones Públicas**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 69-96, 2011.
- LAW, J.; SINGLETON, V. Object lessons. **Organization**, v. 12, n. 3, p. 331-355, 2005.
- MARQUES, A. C. S. Três bases estéticas e comunicacionais da política: cenas de dissenso, criação do comum e modos de resistência. **Revista Contracampo**, n. 26, p. 126-145, 2013.
- MARQUES DE MELO, J. Paradigmas da escola latino-americana de comunicação. **Revista Latina de Comunicación Social**, n. 19, p. 1-11, 1999.
- MARTINS, V. S. Encontros potenciais: a pesquisa em Comunicação e as abordagens feministas e sobre as mulheres, de 2005–2014. **Verso e Reverso**, v. 32, n. 79, p. 83-94, 2018.
- MEDINA, H. S. Comunicación organizacional: matrices teóricas y enfoques comunicativos. **Revista Latina de Comunicación Social**, v. 8, n. 60, p. 1-13, 2005.
- MUNÉVAR, D. I. **Poder y género en el trabajo académico**. Considerandos para reconocer sus intersecciones desde la reflexividad. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2004.
- NAVARRO, R. F. La investigación de la comunicación en América Latina: condiciones y perspectivas para el siglo XXI. **Oficios Terrestres**, n. 56, p. 52-67, 1999.
- OCAÑA, A. O; LÓPEZ, M. I. A; CONEDO, Z. P; Metodología ‘otra’ en la investigación social, humana y educativa. El hacer decolonial como proceso decolonizante. **FAIA**, v. 7, n. 30, 2018
- ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DU TRAVAIL. **Emploi et conditions de travail des enseignants**. Genebra: Bureau International du Travail, 1981.
- ORJUELA, S. P. Comunicación Organizacional. Teoría y Estudios. 2016, 254f. Tese (Doutorado em Comunicação) – Departamento de Comunicação Audiovisual y Publicidad, Universidad de Málaga, Espanha, 2016.
- PUTNAM, L. L.; PHILLIPS, N.; CHAPMAN, P. Metaphors of communication and organization. In: CLEGG, S. R.; HARDY, C.; NORD, W. R. (ed.). **Managing organizations: current issues**. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1999. p. 125-158.
- REDLACO. **Escuchando nuestras voces: Perspectivas Latinoamericanas en comunicación organizacional**. 2018. Available at: https://assets.website-files.com/5fd7ed4085db845dc6637d90/5fd7edac0ef39834759aef1c_Publicacion%201%20MANIFIESTO%20SCUCHANDO%20NUESTRAS%20VOCES.pdf. Access on: 20 may 2022.
- SANABRIA, P. E.; CASTILLO, C. A.; SÁNCHEZ, J. D. J. Análisis de la productividad académica sobre estudios organizaciones en Latinoamérica (2009-2019). **Revista Guillermo de Ockham**, v. 18, n. 2, p. 205–221, 2020.
- SANTOS, B. S. Epistemologías del Sur. **Revista Internacional de Filosofía Iberoamericana y Teoría Social, Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana**, n. 54, p. 17-39, 2011.
- SILVA, E. P. Adoecimento e sofrimento de professores universitários: dimensões afetivas e ético-políticas. **Psicologia: Teoria e Prática**, v. 17, n. 1, p. 61-71, 2015.
- SILVESTRIN, C. B.; GODOI, E.; RIBEIRO, A. Comunicación, lenguaje y comunicación organizacional. **Signo y pensamiento**, v. 26, n. 51, p. 26-37, 2007.

SLAUGHTER, S.; LESLIE, L. L. **Academic capitalism**: politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university. [s.l.]: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

SMITH, L. T. Kaupapa Maori research. In: BATTISTE, M. (ed.). Reclaiming indigenous voice and visión. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000. p. 225-247

SPITZACK, C.; CARTER, K. Women in communication studies: a typology for revision. **Quarterly Journal of Speech**, v. 73, n. 4, p. 401-423, 1987.

UNESCO. Sustainable development goals: women in science. 2018. Available at: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/womeninscience>. Access on: 10 sep. 2020.

VÁSQUEZ, C.; MARROQUÍN, L. Forum introduction: organizational communication in spanish-speaking Latin American countries. **Management Communication Quarterly**, v. 30, n. 2, p. 245-248, 2016.

VÁSQUEZ, C.; MARROQUÍN, L.; ANGEL, A. In search of a latin american approach to organizational communication: a critical review of scholarship (2010-2014). **Communication Theory**, v. 28, n. 2, p. 155-179, 2018.

VILLANUEVA, E. T. La comunicación en clave latinoamericana. **Chasqui. Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicación**, n. 132, p. 23-36, 2016.

WAISBORD, S.; MELLADO, C. De-westernizing Communication studies: a reassessment. **Communication Theory**, v. 24, n. 4, p. 361-372, 2014.

About the authors

Consuelo Vásquez

Full Professor of Organizational Communication in the Department of Social and Public Communication at the Université du Québec à Montréal. Her research interests include ethnography, the communicative constitution of organizations, and epistemologies of the South. She coordinates the research project “*Mapeando la Comunicación Organizacional en América Latina*” (Mapping Latin America Organizational Communication). She is co-founder of the Groupe de recherche sur la communication organisante (RECOR) and the Red Latinoamericana de Investigación en Comunicación Organizacional (RedLAcO). E-mail: vasquez.consuelo@uqam.ca.

Roberto BURGUEÑO

Full Professor at the Guadalupe Victoria College of Engineering and Business, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California (UABC), Mexico. His research interests include micro-entrepreneurial behavior, regional development and industrial economics. He is coordinator and faculty member of the Entrepreneurial Development Department at UABC, also in charge of the Yunus-UABC Center. E-mail: burgueor@uabc.edu.mx.

Gabriela Rabello de Lima

Master's student in Communication at Université du Québec à Montréal. She holds a bachelor's degree in Administration from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Her research interests include political communication, regionalism and organizational communication, with a focus on gender and decolonial studies. She is currently a researcher member of the Groupe de Recherche sur la Communication Organisée (RECOR) and the Red Latinoamericana de Investigación en Comunicación Organizacional (RedLAcO). E-mail: rabello_de_lima.gabriela@courrier.uqam.ca.

Marcela Marques de Queiroz

Master's student in Public Health at the School of Public Health (ESPUM), Université de Montreal. She has a degree in Psychology from the Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB). Her research interests include work psychology and worker health, with a focus on sex and gender studies. She is currently an intern at the Institute of Public Health in Quebec (INSPQ). E-mail: mm.queiroz1@gmail.com.

Authors' contribution

Consuelo Vásquez was responsible for the coordination of the project and for its fundraising. Roberto Burgueño acted in the coordination and methodological construction. Consuelo Vásquez, Gabriela Rabello de Lima and Marcela Marques de Queiroz actively participated in the conceptualization of the research, data analysis and treatment, besides the writing process of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Editorial data

Received on: 05/04/2021

Accepted on: 05/11/2022

Editor: Maria Ataíde Malcher

Editorial assistant: Weverton Raiol

This is an Open Access paper published under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial license (CC-BY-NC), which permits its use, distribution and reproduction in any media, with no restrictions, provided there are no commercial purposes and the original work.

