

Odile Riondet in communication horizon

Ștefan Vlăduțescu

University of Craiova, 13 A. I. Cuza Street, 200585, Craiova, Romania

E-mail address: stefan.vladutescu1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study radiographies the scientific contribution of Professor Odile Riondet in communication domain. It is ascertained that the standard R. T. Craig, of the "seven major traditions" of "communication field theory", is inapplicable. The method that is used is the axis of segregation of problems after expressed ideational. It emerges that Odile Riondet, an advocate of SIC (Sciences de l'information et communication), is positioned by default in "communication science". It results that she has meritorious contributions to communication epistemology, communication ethics, communication philosophy and communication anthropology. It is concluded that in the communication horizon, Odile Riondet can be remembered as outstanding specialist of the "communication anthropology" axis.

Keywords: communication epistemology; communication ethics; communication anthropology

1. INTRODUCTION

To reach the field of communication, we must stand in the communication horizon. This position induces subsequently a structured looking, up and away. The communicational looking is, in fact, both a vision of the field of communication, and one of communication itself, as science, theory and practice. The presence of the researcher in the communication horizon is not a wandering. Each researcher is living his story of relationship with communication by installation of milestones, of "stars", of visions, concepts, constructs and theories.

In the study "Communication Theory as a Field" (1999), Robert T. Craig states that "seven major traditions" have established this "field of communication theory": rhetorical, semiotic, phenomenological, cybernetic, socio-psychological, sociocultural and critical (Craig RT, 1999, pp. 159-161) (opinion is then iterated in Craig R.T., & Muller HL (2007). "Theories of Communication: Readings Across Traditions"). This article ("Communication theory as a field") was awarded by the International Communication Association as the best article in the communication field. At its center lies the intention to unify the theories of communication in a meta-model, on the course of the "seven major traditions". In our opinion, the study is exceptional; it was and remains today in part useful to the organization of the communication field. However, it induces a rigid perspective that, although targeting, however it does not allow the unification of communication theory space. We found:

1. That some traditions are not traditions, because a tradition is establishing at least two generations of intellectual: in the 1940s, when communication is defined "per se" tradition had only Rhetorics (a strong tradition) and Semiotics (a weak tradition) ;
2. That some of the traditions are not sustainable for communication, because they have not tradition neither for themselves: for example, Cybernetics was formed in 1948, i.e. simultaneously with communication as a discipline, as well as Social Psychology; So they had not their tradition that to induce in communication;
3. Certain traditions records as communication field a zone of concerns that does not take account of preparadigmatic evolution and, further, paradigmatic of communication. For example, Rhetoric and Semiotics are retained as communication traditions, although they can be evaluated only as provider of ideas, theories and concepts preparadigmatic communication;
4. As well for the delimitation of a nation or a people, the selves whose targeting qualification / classification must be wondering in what the tradition fall; communication specialists know, principle, where they are in the communication field; in the same vein, the question is, for example, who is they part of the cybernetics tradition of the communication; we do not think anyone considered as belonging to this.

Although at the time of accreditation, the Craig traditions standard was welcome, today it turns out rigid: it does not permit the development, growth, renewal, because it brings everything from the past. In the communication field, in addition to traditions are recorded spontaneous phenomena and theories, unconventional, non-traditional and emerging phenomena and theories, relatively unexpected and unexplained.

The Craig standard was taken into valuable works of Stephen W. Littlejohn and Karen A. Foss (2011, tenth edition) and F. A. Giffin (2011, eighth edition) or fundamental encyclopedias, W. Donsbach (2008), S. W. Littlejohn and K. A. Foss (2009), W. F. Eadie (2009).

Our point of view is that a flexible standard of radiography and catagraphy of communication field is axiologyzation standard of communication field. In communication we record 15 axes: communication ontology, communication epistemology, communication methodology, communication axiology, communication history, communication psychology, communication sociology, communication anthropology, communication hermeneutics, communication praxeology, communication ethics, communication logics, communication ecology, communication philosophy, communication law. On each axis are registered connected strings vibrating alive and concrete. On hard axis (communication ontology, communication epistemology, communication methodology, communication axiology) the vibration is extended, instead, on soft axes (communication history, communication psychology, communication sociology, communication anthropology, communication hermeneutics, communication praxeology, communication ethics, communication logics, communication ecology, communication philosophy, communication law) the vibration and number of strings are extended. Our perspective, of axiologyzation standard, solves some of the Craig standard issues. Primordial, our standard allows each researcher to enroll on an axis that usually represents a specialization in the discipline of communication (The axes standard we present in the book "Ontology of Human Communication", in course of issue at LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, Saarbrücken.)

2. A RADIOGRAPHY OF THE PRESENCE IN COMMUNICATION HORIZON

It would be difficult to frame Professor Odile Riondet contribution in one or more of the traditions Craig standard. Attached of the axes standard we will emphasize in relation to this, communicational positioning and Odile Riondet scientific contribution in the communication field.

First of all, Odile Riondet, according to the Franco-Swiss orientation, consider communication within SIC (Sciences de l'information et communication), see (Riondet O., 2007c), (Riondet O., 2009b), (Riondet O. 2010b), (Riondet O., 2011d).

Basically, investigative spirit is placed in "le champ general de SIC" (Riondet O., 2007c). In the English language, on the communication space there is a large and discrete rupture. It is generated by the location of the two "membranes" of communication, two great intellectual armies: "communication science" (C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, D.R. Roskos-Ewoldsen, J. O. Greene, B. R. Bursell, J. K. Burgoon etc.) and "communication theory" (S. V. Littlejohn, K. A. Foss, R. T. Craig and others). For Odile Riondet this major onto-epistemological issue is solved: as part of the SCI, communication is in the center of a science.

In the O. Riondet's conception, science is „définir par son objet, ses méthodes, ses concepts, son regard, son éthique, sa finalité, mais aussi par la confrontation de tous ces éléments dans une communauté qui a son histoire" (Riondet O., 2007b). Projecting the definition elements on the range axes, results some interesting elements. Generally, ontology is the object domain ("objet", "concepts" in Riondet's definition), is the domain of conceptual organized knowledge; it is the picture of existences. Epistemology looks the knowing subject in relation to the known object, with the possibility, efficiency and limits of knowledge. Methodology is the set of methods of scientific investigative system ("méthodes" as marks O. Riondet). If we think about any looking is by default value, we can retain the "regard" from the definition as a statement of axiology (value and evaluation). The definition radiography and "éthique": this is part of communication ethics axis. The phrase "sa finalité" leads us to the practical aspect of communication: communication praxeology axis.

We interpret "communauté" as the scientific community of communication: court that authenticates, legitimates and accredits. Alongside the issue (thematic, ideational, solving methods), the community sets the coordinates system of the current paradigm of communication: Variable Geometry-Constructive-Transactional Paradigm, P3.

There is a science of communication and "sciences de l'information", says Riondet (Riondet O., 2007a).

Odile Riondet's obvious propensity is, between the hard axis, to the communication epistemology, and of the soft axes, to the communication anthropology ("anthropologie de la communication"). On Riondet finds the existence of three "dimensions épistémologiques": "Nous distinguons ici trois dimensions: celle des configurations épistémologiques (les différentes articulations de méthode, concepts, auteurs, champs d'applications caractéristiques d'une discipline), les représentations de la science des chercheurs (du positivisme le plus strict à toutes les formes d'herméneutique) et les anthropologies ou représentations de l'homme sous-jacentes, qui jouent souvent le rôle de présupposé ou d'hypothèse" (Riondet O., 2011d). As seen, at O. Riondet we deal with an extended epistemology presiding also in areas of ontology, methodology, hermeneutics, and anthropology. From the perspective of the movement in the "communication et religion" field (Riondet O., 2011d), the solution is correct, because religion does not allow a clear segregation between the ontological-epistemological-axiological-hermeneutic anthropology: creator of the world set picture of existence, the limits of knowledge, values, interpretation and rites, and no one can change them. In connection, it

speaks of “l'épistémologie actuelle” (Rindet O., 2009b) and about three interpretations of “épistémologie des (N)TIC”: “definition de la science”, “comme manière que les SIC ont de faire de la science” and “théorie de la connaissance” (Rindet O., 2007d). Also, it is insisting on “culture épistémologique plus ou moins explicite” (Rindet O., 2004).

Communication ethics axis is consolidated by examining “La question éthique dans les technologies de l'information ” (Rindet O., 2010c și Rindet O., 2007c) and revealing of ethic aspects of communicational thoughts of Jurgen Habermas (Rindet O., 2009c).

Hermeneutics opening is confirmed by thorough study "Interpretation, comprehension et construction scientifique de la connaissance" (Rindet O., 2010a). Her hermeneutic approach is based on W. Dilthey (explanation-understanding ratio), N. Whitehead (perception-interpretation relationship), P. Ricoeur (the idea of recognition) and U. Eco (limits interpretation).

Of the communication philosophy axis, the Odile Rindet's researches are marked by revealing the connection between "les SIC et la philosophie" (Rindet O., 2010b), the link "communication et les philosophies de la connaissance" (Rindet O., 2003) and existence of "concepts philosophiques dans le SIC" (Rindet O., 1999).

Although she has meritorious contributions on several axes of the communication standard, Odile Rindet is, above all, a remarkable anthropologist of communication, of culture (Beciu, Camelia, Drăgan, Ioan, Popescu, Dana, Rindet, Odile, 2009a). Suitable for their major relevance and originality are on this line three ideas. First is memorable "hypothèse anthropologique" that issue: “un être humain travaille sur lui-même, c'est bénéfique, les relations aux autres ne menacent en rien la découverte de lui-même, mais y aident” (Rindet O., 2011c). The second idea consists of clarification of the meanings of "anthropologie de la communication" ["faits de la communication, analyser des notions d'anthropologie (le mythe, le rite)" and "les images de l'homme "] (lecture at the University of Craiova, April 10, 2012). The third idea consists in revealing philosophical anchoring of communication anthropology: “cette discipline a aussi un soubassement philosophique” (lecture at the University of Craiova, April 10, 2012).

Outside the axial research area of communication, we highlight notable contributions concerning the report communication-religion (Rindet O., 2011b), (Rindet O., 2008), organizational communication (Rindet O., 2011a) and archive and library information (Rindet O., 2008).

3. CONCLUSION

The radiography of presence of Odile Rindet in communication horizon indicates a specialist in communication domain with a solid philosophical basis (aside great philosophers such as Im. Kant, P. Ricoeur, E. Levinas, M. Foucault, we find quoted Constantin Noica and Lucian Blaga), with an extensive communicational culture and a thinking capable of exquisite and original inferences.

As it turned out, has revealing achievements in many segments of communication science. We find that, first of all, Odile Rindet can be retained as a specialist in communication anthropology, aside Dell Hymes (1972), B. C. Agrawal (1985), D. Spitulnik (1994), S. Allen (1994), Y. Winkin (2001), P. Lardellier (2002), Nicolae Panea (2003), E. W. Rothenbuhler, Mihai Coman (2005), F. Osorio (2005), Vintilă Mihăilescu (2007), Stefan Bratosin (2001), Stefan Bratosin (2007), Mădălina Moraru (2009), Florica Iuhaș (2011, 2012), C. Bălăceanu Stolnici (2012).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was partially supported by the grant number 33C/2014, awarded in the internal grant competition of the University of Craiova.

References

- [1] Craig, R. T., *Communication theory* 9(2) (1999) 119-161.
- [2] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 14 (2014) 7-17.
- [3] Craig R. T., Muller H. L. (2007). *Theorizing Communication: Readings Across Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- [4] Sebastian Kot, Janusz Grabara, Michal Kolcun, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* (15) (2014) 1-6.
- [5] Bălăceanu Stolnici, C. (2012). *Comunicarea umană. Considerații antropologice*. Analele Universității din Craiova. Comunicare. Media.
- [6] Agrawal, B. C. (1985). *Anthropological methods for communication research*. New Delhi: Concept.
- [7] Spitulnik D. (1994). *Anthropology and Mass Media*. Annual Review of Anthropology.
- [8] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 14 (2014) 33-41.
- [9] Allen S. (1994) (Ed.), *Media Anthropology*. Westport: Bergin-Garvey Publisher.
- [10] Panea N. (2003). *Gramatica funerarului*. Craiova: Scrisul Românesc.
- [11] Ștefan Vlăduțescu, *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 3(10) (2013).
- [12] Osorio F. (2007). *Proposal for Mass Media Anthropology*. In E. W. Rothenbuhler & M. Coman (Eds.), *Media Anthropology*. London: Sage.
- [13] Mihăilescu V. (2007). *Antropologie. Cinci introduceri*. Iași: Editura Polirom.
- [14] Moraru M. (2009). *Media și publicitate*. București: Editura Nemira.
- [15] A. T. Costaru, I. Avram, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 13 (2013) 79-88.
- [16] Boudon S. (2007). *La concertation dans le paradigme du mythe*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- [17] Iuhăș (2012). *Univers ceremonial și mass-media*. București: Ars Docendi.
- [18] Griffin E. A. (2011). *A First Look at Communication Theory*. (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- [19] Lardellier P. (2002). *Théorie du lien rituel. Anthropologie et communication*. Paris: l'Harmattan.
- [20] Littlejohn S. W., Foss K. A. (2009) (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- [21] Littlejohn S. W., Foss K. A. (2011). *Theories of Human Communication*. (10th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- [22] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 14 (2014) 33-41.
- [23] Riondet O. (1999). *Les concepts philosophiques dans les SIC*. Congrès de philosophie de Besançon.
- [24] Riondet O. (2003). *Communication et philosophies de la connaissance*. Premier Congrès international de la Société française des sciences de l'information et de la communication, Bucarest, 2003. Available at: http://archiveSIC.ccsd.cnrs.fr/documents/archives0/00/00/05/23/index_f.html
- [25] Riondet O. (2004). *Les représentations épistémologiques des documentalistes en France*. Colloque Sciences, médias et société. École normale supérieure de lettres et sciences humaines, Lyon, 15-17 juin 2004. Disponibil: http://sciences-medias.ens-lsh.fr/article.php?id_article=55
- [26] B. Ślusarczyk, A. Broniszewska, Entrepreneurship of Women in Poland and the EU – Quantitative Analysis. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*.
- [27] S. Chirimbu, A. Dejica-Carțiș, E. Savu (2014). *What skills do foreign languages teachers need in the 21st century? An intercultural configuration*. Professional Communication and Translation Studies.
- [28] J. Tabor, Place of Non-formal Education in the Career Building Process. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*.
- [29] Riondet O. (2007a). *Validation et pertinence de l'information*. Thema –t'IC. Rencontre université professionnels de l'Université de Strasbourg.
- [30] Riondet O. (2007b). *Le journalisme à travers deux sites d'archives ouvertes*. Revue Communication, Canada, 2007.
- [32] Riondet O. (2007c). *Les éthiques du Sommet mondial pour la société de l'information (SMSI)*. Colloque Étique de la société de l'information, Strasbourg, juin 2007.
- [33] Riondet O. (2007d). *Essai de définition d'une épistémologie des (N)TIC*. In Le réseau pensant. Dijon: presses universitaires de Dijon.
- [34] Riondet O. (2008a). *Communication and religion*. Revista română de comunicare, 13.
- [35] Riondet O. (2009). *Applications de la notion de servuction en bibliothèques publiques*. In *Fondements de la communication des organisations, Confrontations et pratiques internationales*. București: Editura Tritonic.
- [36] Beci, Camelia, Drăgan Ioan, Popescu Dana, Riondet O. (2009a) (Eds.). *Communication de la culture, culture de la communication*. București: comunicare.ro.
- [37] Song Zhaoxun, *Journal of International Communication* 3 (2007) 010.
- [38] Riondet O. (2009b). *L'influence des représentations religieuses du monde sur l'innovation*. International conference *Promoting innovation through Education, Culture and Communication*, 6-7 novembre 2009, Ecole nationale de sciences politiques SNSPA, București, Romania. Available: http://archivesic.ccsd.cnrs.fr/sic_00619159/fr/.

- [39] Riondet O. (2009c). *Permanențe și evoluții în gândirea lui Jürgen Habermas*. Jurnalism și comunicare, 1-2.
- [40] Spiridon M. (2004). *Les dilemmes de l'identité aux confins de l'Europe: le cas roumain*. l'Harmattan.
- [41] Riondet O. (2010a). *Interprétation, compréhension et construction scientifique de la connaissance*. In A. Petitat (Ed.), *La pluralité interprétative*. Paris : L'Harmattan.
- [42] Riondet O. (2010b). *Les SIC et la philosophie*. 17^{ème} Congrès de la Société française des sciences de l'information et de la communication, *Au cœur et aux lisières des SIC*, Dijon, juin 2010.
- [43] Riondet O. (2010c). *La question éthique dans les technologies de l'information*. In J. Bel & T. Kuhnle (Eds.), *Technique et éthique : le défi de la culture et la nature*. Les cahiers du Littoral, I, 7.
- [44] Spiridon M., *World Literature Studies* 4 (2013) 3-10.
- [45] Riondet O. (2011a). *Les grandes tendances de la communication des organisations en France*. Conférence franco-maghrébine. *Métiers et recherches en communication territoriale et publique*. Université Mentouri-Constantine, Alger, 4-5 mai 2011.
- [46] Riondet O. (2011b). *Une lecture communicationnelle des textes de la doctrine sociale de l'Église*. Colloque *Management et religion*, USC Strasbourg, 1er septembre 2011.
- [47] Riondet O. (2011c). *Percevoir l'altérité, se sentir autre. L'altérité à travers trois philosophes français : Michel Foucault, Emmanuel Levinas et Paul Ricoeur*. Colloque trilatéral France-Roumanie-États-Unis, *Identité et communication interculturelle*. École de sciences politiques (SNSPA), Bucarest, 25-27 septembre 2011.
- [48] Riondet O. (2011d). *Les dimensions épistémologiques du champ communication et religion*. Journée d'étude, Journée Org & Co, *Communication, organisation et religion*, 25 novembre 2011, Paris.
- [49] Rothenbuhler E. Y. & Coman M. (1995). *Media Anthropology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [50] Winkin Y. (2001). *Anthropologie de la communication*. (2nd ed). Paris: Seuil.
- [51] Coman M. (2005). *Pour une anthropologie des médias*. PUG.
- [52] Coman M., *Journalism Studies* 1(1) (2000) 35-56.
- [53] Hymowitz D. (1977). *Reinventing Anthropology*. University of Michigan Press.
- [54] Jason L. Powell, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 16(2) (2014) 17-33.
- [55] Jason L. Powell, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 17(1) (2014) 1-60.
- [56] Tomáš Hes, Anna Poledňáková, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 2 (2013) 18-31.
- [57] Andrzej Borowski, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 3 (2013) 46-53.

- [58] Donovan A. McFarlane, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 4 (2013) 35-44.
- [59] Paul Bukuluki, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 5 (2013) 27-44.
- [60] Kinga Dziwańska, *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 7 (2013) 96-112.

(Received 16 July 2014; accepted 23 July 2014)

RETRACTED