Honing and Framing Ourselves
(Extreme Subjectivity and Organizing)

Sławomir Magala

ERIM REPORT SERIES RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT	
ERIM Report Series reference number	ERS-2004-076-ORG
Publication	August 2004
Number of pages	24
Email address corresponding author	S.Magala@fbk.eur.nl
Address	Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM)
	Rotterdam School of Management / Rotterdam School of Economics
	Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
	P.O.Box 1738
	3000 DR Rotterdam, The Netherlands
	Phone: +31 10 408 1182
	Fax: +31 10 408 9640
	Email: info@erim.eur.nl
	Internet: www.erim.eur.nl

Bibliographic data and classifications of all the ERIM reports are also available on the ERIM website:
www.erim.eur.nl

ERASMUS RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT

REPORT SERIES
RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA AND CLASSIFICATIONS		
Abstract	The present backlash of neo-neopositivism has been academically justified either with a biological or evolutionary ideologies. How did academic intellectuals respond? First, by developing a concept of professional self-identity and institutional peer-control and making it independent of empirical and third-party verification Both these concepts are purely formal and allow for an autonomous self-regulation of a professional community minimizing external influences. Honing ourselves is about the self-reflection of the academic intellectuals who are caught in the networks and hierarchies of the emergent industrial, academic and public organizations Second, by continuous critical re-engineering of the Enlightenment project in the post-communist, post-liberal, complex world on the edge of chaos, in which the retreat of the state and the emergence of complex networks has diminished the role of national culture as the basic frame and blueprint for socialization. Third, by an attempt to form a democratic community of academic citizens. Will a loose collection of researchers and teachers ever rise to the level of principled citizens of a scientific community?	
Library of Congress Classification (LCC)	5001-6182	Business
	5546-5548.6	Office Organization and Management
	HD 5951+	Industrial sociology
Journal of Economic Literature (JEL)	M	Business Administration and Business Economics
	M 10	Business Administration: general
	L 2	Firm Objectives, Organization and Behaviour
	Z 1	Cultural economics
European Business Schools Library Group (EBSLG)	85 A	Business General
	100B	Organization Theory (general)
	240 B	Information Systems Management
	80 H	Social aspects of culture and society
Gemeenschappelijke Onderwerpsontsluiting (GOO)		
Classification GOO	85.00	Bedrijfskunde, Organisatiekunde: algemeen
	85.05	Management organisatie: algemeen
	85.08	Organisatiesociologie, organisatiepsychologie
	85.08	Organisatiesociologie, organisatiepsychologie
Keywords GOO	Bedrijfskunde / Bedrijfseconomie	
	Organisatieleer, informatietechnologie, prestatiebeoordeling	
	Globalisatie, Nationale identiteit, Sociale netwerken, Academici, Paradigma's	
Free keywords	Framing, subjectivity, evolutionism, self-regulation of professional communities, qualitative research paradigm, democratizing professions	

Sławomir Magala
Erasmus University Rotterdam
S.Magala@fbk.eur.nl

Honing and Framing Ourselves
(Extreme Subjectivity and Organizing)

The present backlash of neo-neopositivism has been academically justified either with a biological or evolutionary ideologies. Socio-biological (Wilson's "consilience"), cognitive (Chomsky), and evolutionary (Piaget,Kuhn,Popper) visions of mutability of scientific knowledge have moulded the paradigmatic ideologies of the institutional world of science. Meanwhile, a neoliberal regime in social production of knowledge has replaced the main frames in which scientific theories are constructed (Mirowski's "cyberscience", Fuller's "philosophical history of science"). How did academic intellectuals respond?

First, by developing a concept of professional self-identity and institutional peer-control and making it independent of empirical and third-party verification Both these concepts are purely formal and allow for an autonomous self-regulation of a professional community minimizing external influences. ***Honing ourselves* is about the self-reflection of the academic intellectuals who are caught in the networks and hierarchies of the emergent industrial, academic and public organizations** and work out new, post-organizational identities for individuals, who owe their loyalties to a profession and view institutions as "parking lots" for their personalities. Popper and Kuhn, Fuller and Mirowski, Ossowski and Podgórecki, Archer and Ritzer can be read as successive stages of the honing of professional self-image against the grain of the institutional framing and against the frame of an increasing professionalization of the academic knowledge production.

Second, by continuous critical re-engineering of the Enlightenment project in the post-communist, post-liberal, complex world on the edge of chaos, in which the retreat of the state and the emergence of complex networks has diminished the role of national culture as the basic frame and blueprint for socialization. Sense-making activities are anchored within the professional academic community, whose culture becomes cosmopolitan and is neutralized within cosmopolitan professional networks. A long march of the qualitative schools of thought in social sciences and the humanities (and many parallel long marches of different divisions) is being presented as a case in point of a gradual honing of extreme subjectivity (individual sensemaking) within the objectifying frames of institutions and ideologies (institutional framing).

Third, by an attempt to form a democratic community of academic citizens. Will a loose collection of researchers and teachers ever rise to the level of principled citizens of a scientific community? Will the answer the call for a civic sociology "by which we mean fieldwork located not only in sociology, but in extended, enriched, cultivated social science embracing all the disciplines" appealing to "educationists, sociologists, political scientists, clinical practitioners in psychology and medicine, nurses, communications and media specialists, cultural studies workers, and a score of other assorted disciplines"?(Denzin, Lincoln, 2003, 635-6)

1. Communities of academic "framing"

Social production of knowledge is being justified with ideologies stressing objectivity and superiority of a dominant mode of academic research. Academically institutionalized research has been traditionally justified with positivist and neopositivist ideologies, which corresponded to its socially privileged position and helped to cover ideological and political choices(cf. Amadae, 2003). However, since the Popper-Kuhn debate the focus of socially acceptable justifications has shifted towards the biological, especially evolutionary ones. Kuhn's vision of a historical struggle for the "survival of the paradigms" provoked Popper's response in "Objective Knowledge" (Popper,1972, Kuhn,1961), but subsequent socio-biological (E.O. Wilson's "consilience", cf. Wilson,1999), evolutionary (Pomper and Shaw,2002, Aldrich, 2003) and cognitive (Chomsky's semantics of generative grammar, Wierzbicka's comparative semantics, Searle's logic of speech acts, cf. Chomsky, 1972, 1975, Wierzbicka,1999, Searle, 1979, 1995) arguments for a transformational philosophy of knowledge have contributed to the establishment of change rather than stability as the dominant image of knowledge development in professional communities of practice (cf. Podgórecki,1997).

Communities of practice, which are relevant for the social production of knowledge (and their institutionalization undergoes a continuous change), become polarized in a number of ways. One of the most visible distinctions is between the representatives of the qualitative methodologies (in favor of "understanding" and "interpreting" human actions) and the ones devoted to the quantitative approach (in favor of "explaining" understood as tracing of causal connections). They become polarized between research networks tending to structure themselves after natural sciences (cognitive psychologists or sociologists leaning towards biology or micro-level of social interaction, cf. Collins, 2004) and those which tend to side with the humanities (organizational scientists inspired by psychoanalysis and philosophy, cf. Marion,1999, Juarrero, 1999, Sanbomatsu, 2004). They also became divided between groups of those researchers, who responded to the requirements of business community – helping managers coordinating increasingly complex and changeable organizations, and groups of those who responded to the requirements of an academic benchmarking – tacitly assuming their research will trickle down to handbooks, toolkits and popular applications. They broke into those communities of academic practice, which stress teaching and living contact with students as the core of professional competence and those, which claim that only the highest standards of research ranking secure recognition and prestige. They are splitting into groups, which favor psychological level of explanations of organizational behavior and those, which focus on sociological theories of interpersonal processes. There are many more dividing lines, all of which influence the working definitions of professional identity of members of academic communities and have consequences for their career paths. Needless to say, these contunous divisions and distinctions also contribute to the self-identizing of academic professionals and their subsequent clustering in different networks, associations, organizations, networks and around publications or regular events (e.g. annual conferences).

All these clustering processes divide professional communities into loose associations of mutually neutral, friendly or hostile networks competing for organizational power

and crystallizing around universities, research centers, consulting companies or schools of business. Let us quote but a few examples from a relatively narrow area of social psychological and sociological research into organizational identity. There is little overlap between literature lists enclosed in, let us say, "Social Identity Processes" (Capozza, Brown,2000) on the one hand, and "Organizations in Depth: the Psychoanalysis of Organizations" (Gabriel,1999), between "Face to Face" (Turner,2002) and "Struggling with the Demon: Perspectives on Individual and Organizational Inquiry" (Kets de Vries,2001), between "Making Sense of the Organizations" (Weick, 2001) and March's "The Pursuit of Organizational Intelligence" (March, 1999).

When Popper and Kuhn exchanged views on philosophy and history of science (the first public debate took place in 1965), thus initiating a self-reflective debate of members of all research communities, they were still debating in a shadow of a universal neo-positivist model of a single scientific rationality. Popper has corrected this model trying to make it more realistic (with the theory of falsificationism) and to account for evolutionary change (with evolutionary theory of objective knowledge), but could not agree to the view that paradigms were not won or lost because of logical arguments in a peer dialogue (and – consequently – to a view that causes for their endurance or decline had to be found in sociological an historical contingencies rather than in the evolution of scientific rationality analyzed by logicians and philosophers of science). Popper defended the view that rationality has found its historical embodiment in a scientific community, which tried to acquire a "truer" description and understanding of reality "out there" and refused to trade truth on the market for paradigmatic communities. Truth should not be decided by a vote, even if the best and the brightest, united by the principle of peer control (very convincingly criticized by S.Fuller, cf. Fuller,2000) do the voting. If historians of science and sociologists of academic communities are the only reliable suppliers of credible reports on fate of particular paradigms, which depends on a relative power of some peer networks (as Kuhn suggested), then no single professional identity can acquire a privileged status a priori, on purely logical grounds, independently of a socio-historical context. Can scientific communities function properly in view of such relativism?

Communities certainly continued to function in spite of the fact that the Popper-Kuhn debate ceased to raise emotions (philosophical issues remained intellectually divisive, but socially isolated from the unimpeded institutional flourishing of scientific expertise in all its clusters) and became a chapter in the history and philosophy of science. Academic communities prospered in terms of membership and output, but methodological wars did not add up to a single clash of any two rival views. Various professional identities continued (and still continue) to coexist. A methodological cold war between neopositivists and representatives of all other paradigms has been suspended (we are all evolutionary scientists now, the neopositivist wall between quantitative and qualitative methodologies has not broken down but is deemed less relevant) and replaced by a more localized disorder and methodological skirmishes between coexisting paradigms. "In science, speciation is specialization" say Conant and Haugeland and add that Kuhn tended to downplay the polemic against sir Karl R. Popper in his later writings and claimed that their views on evolutionary nature of "normal science" had been much closer than generally perceived at the time. They correctly observe that: "Kuhn spells out and emphasizes the analogy, barely hinted at in the closing pages of *Structure*, between scientific progress and evolutionary

biological development. In elaborating this theme, he plays down his original picture, which had periods of normal science within a single area of research punctuated by occasional cataclysmic revolutions, and introduces in its place a new picture, which has periods of development within a coherent tradition divided occasionally by periods of 'speciation' into two distinct traditions with somewhat different areas of research. To be sure, the possibility remains that one of the resulting traditions may eventually stagnate and die out, in which case we have, in effect, the older structure of revolution and replacement. But at least as often in the history of science, both successors, neither quite like their common ancestor, flourish as new scientific 'specialties'. In science, speciation is specialization."(Conant, Haugeland, 2000, 3)

This means that professional self-identity is institutionally guaranteed (formal conditions of membership, which appear "universal" acknowledgment of merit) but peer-control allows for a far-reaching specialization (content conditions of membership, which become increasingly complex and diversified). A single ideal type of professional and organizational identity has long been gone, dual (social psychologist and HRM specialist) and multiple (sociologist, economist, theoretician of organizational change and consultant of public authorities) identities became a commonplace in organized science. Institutional identities (anchored in tenured positions) started sharing social space with portfolio and project identities and the problem of group and inter-group inclusion and exclusion (and temporary membership) increasingly finds its way to organizational agendas. To identify oneself with a group and to be identified as a member by the others offers a script, which does not have to be accepted as a whole by all performers, but offers a number of shades of graded evaluation and inclusion. Exclusion is a negative possibility, which looms large on the horizon of power struggles. If a member of a scientific or scholarly community reveals his or her paradigmatic "software", which turns out to be different from the one expected and tolerated by the group, and with which he or she attempts to identify – a rejection is in the wings. The reason why this negative aspect of identizing has been relatively neglected is in the dynamics of the post WWII growth of scientific communities. Elite institutions may crowd hybrid identities out – but there are enough new institutions to offer a chance of professional development. Moreover, non-academic sponsors (public authorities, business corporations, media) do not have to follow narrowly defined academic hierarchies in choosing their intellectual authorities. Nevertheless, social scientists in general and organizational scientists in particular should play a more active role in reminding all embedded members of professional communities that "in dreams begin responsibilities". In other words, they should be focusing attention of all members of respective communities on consequences of their identities for inclusiveness and thus also for the shaping of attitude towards the others, who may be excluded from their communities, groups and organizations. One of the ways in which they could be doing so has been pointed out by Geert Hofstede, who has introduced the concept of "cultural software" of individual minds emerging as a result of socializing influences of an individual's environment and individual's response to them. Honing ourselves begins with the adjustement and development of a "cultural software" in numerous interactions channeled by institutional frameworks. In a sense, we are all being "framed", we are all searching for "frames of reference", and the dominant feature of the present "framing" processes is that they are increasingly linked to professional and elective communities rather than traditional and "inheritable" ones.

2. Cultural frames and academic niches

Geert Hofstede's popular version of "Culture's Consequences"(1980), namely "Cultures and Organizations"(1991) has two subtitles: "Software of the Mind" and "Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival"(Hofstede,1991). Both of them are significant since they signal two major influences exerted by the Dutch engineer and social psychologist on the entire field of organizational sciences and managerial consulting, especially from the point of his compelling vision of the making and honing of individual and collective identities.

The first subtitle stresses Hofstede's fundamental assumption; namely the one that all identities individuals design, assemble and employ in their activities are composed of elements acquired during their socialization. This assumption is followed by another one, which assigns a privileged status to the "national" hue of individual cultural identities. Since the abovementioned socialization is to a large extent conducted by smaller and larger institutions and organizations coordinated by nation states (a dominant form of organization in the past two centuries), all components of individual identities are tinted. Nation-states maintain and manage cultural heritage, protect and codify national languages prefabricating the building blocks of individual identities. Differences between two components of individual identity from different national cultures are not necessarily immediately "visible" (as would be differences in language or folk dances), but have to be detected, investigated and reconstructed. They can be plotted on a model of national culture, which has four (later five) dimensions. These dimensions are relevant for shaping individual's interactions and for the choice of organizational forms. They have consequences for a preferred design of organizations within a given nation state and for the performance of individuals socialized within national culture. If, for instance, individuals have been socialized in a low power distance culture characteristic for a given nation-state, they are likely to believe that superiors and subordinates should consider each other as existentially equal. They are supposed to treat that organizational hierarchies, which assign them unequal roles, as useful fictions, which can and should be changed, and that the asymmetry of power and influence should be addressed, for instance, by managers consulting their subordinates before making decisions, which will influence everybody. If, to the contrary, an individual has been socialized in a large power distance culture, those forms of management, which require consulting subordinates, will not work, since employees will expect to be told what to do by their superiors, who are supposed to "know better". In the case of academic communities, the fact that research has been increasingly organized in large bureaucratic corporate and public laboratories, projects and institutions, has contributed to the socialization of researchers into emergent – non-academic roles (and, more significantly, re-definition of their responsibilities).

Hofstede quotes approvingly a similar conclusion drawn from a comparative study of a French multinational in France, in the USA and in the Netherlands. The author of this study, Philippe d'Iribarne, attributes a much more vivid emotional experience of hierarchical differences in France (as compared to the USA or to the Netherlands) to a difference in national tradition. In France, this tradition follows a "logic of honor", which regulates the relations between essentially unequal social strata or classes. In the other two countries, this national tradition follows a "logic of contract", which

regulates the relations between essentially equal partners in specified exchanges.(cf. d'Iribarne,1989) When discussing consequences of small and large power distance, Hofstede quotes d'Iribarne on strongly emotional character of boss-subordinate relations (both when bosses are admired and when they are despised) and adds: "This quote confirms the polarization in France between dependence and counter-dependence versus authority persons which I found to be so characteristic of large power distance countries in general."(Hofstede,1991,36)

What matters is that following the logic of honor, we take inequalities between interacting parties for granted, while following the logic of contract – we assume their equality. This assumption serves its primary purpose – to provide a frame of reference for embedding the most salient differences between two cultural softwares – very well. It does, however, have the less attractive side. What Hofstede does not predict, and development of research institutions prompts us to do, is that the ideology of egalitarian contract can serve as a much better justification of non-ethical conduct than an ideology based on a "logic of honor". Professionalization of academic knowledge production apparently recognizes an equal status of all researchers, but in practice bars them from expressing their moral concerns as "unprofessional", while at the same time exempting peer control mechanisms from critical examination and granting them a blank check of professional approval. Hofstede then introduces the next four dimensions (individualism/collectivism, femininity/masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long term/short term orientation), which can allow to distinguish between national cultures, and generates hypotheses about consequences of any given national culture's positioning in a five-dimensional space, but assumes that institutions and organizations within a national society do not deviate from national norm and in particular, that their managerial elites do not acquire supranational characteristics (an assumption, which comparative sociologists of culture tend to question, cf. Lamont and Thevenot, 2000) .

The theoretical construct of Hofstede, a model of national culture as a collective programming ("software") of an individual mind, is justified theoretically by postulating a connection between a position of a national culture in Hofstede's theoretical five-dimensional space and a "visible" cluster of organizational designs and individual behavior on the one hand and "invisible" core values and beliefs on the other. Thus what we are explaining are different organizational designs (e.g. more or less rigid hierarchies) and different organizational behavior (e.g. measured in average efficiency, productivity, innovativeness, etc.). What we are explaining different organizational designs and individual behaviors with? With values and beliefs in clusters and rankings tinted by national socialization, which we managed to capture and compare thanks to the theoretical concept of "dimensions" of a national or organizational culture. The five-dimensional space of dimensions of national or organizational culture is a scientific "net": by finding out what the core values and beliefs in a given national culture are, we are able to predict "culture's consequences" – i.e. organizational forms, which will best "fit" individuals with this particular cultural software in their heads, or expected types of individual behavior, which will fit some organizational forms better than the others. The sequence can be reversed: by gathering data on dominant organizational forms and dominant types of behavior in a given country or organization, we can reconstruct values and beliefs (which are more difficult to investigate than behavior and artifacts). In a famous and succinct definition, which, together with a robust set of empirically confirmed predictions,

allowed a new sub-discipline of organizational sciences, namely the cross-cultural or intercultural management, to emerge and establish itself in academic environment, Hofstede summed the role of cultural dimensions up in the following way:

"The main cultural differences among nations lie in values. Systematic differences exist (…) with regard to values about power and inequality, with regard to relationship between the individual and the group, with regard to the social roles expected from men and women, with respect to ways of dealing with the uncertainties in life, and with respect to whether one is mainly preoccupied with the future or with the past and present."(Hofstede,1991,236)

Let us notice that there is clearly a recognition of a privileged status of a national as opposed to a professional (especially managerialist and cosmopolitan) components of identity understood as a personal "cultural software". **The second subtitle of "Cultures and Organizations" stresses the necessity for individuals with different cultural software to cooperate and facilitate survival of increasingly complex and networked societies (still dominated by nation states) and organizations (again, it is assumed that they are more heavily biased by their national background than by their cosmopolitan, managerialist, generational, gender or other influences, but it is also recognized that they have no other choice but to cooperate with the others).** Instead of remaining prisoners of our identities, suggests hopefully Hofstede, we should be able to see them as flexible and mutable, thus helping social and cultural evolution with our self-reflexive input. We should reflect on our own identities, compare them to identities of the others, try to defuse predictable conflicts and dampen shocks - ultimately working out a common design for more desirable organizations and for less lethal identities – suitable for tolerant and cooperating individuals. The second subtitle thus refers to a potential pragmatic application for theoretical knowledge about a link between core values of national and organizational cultures and individual and collective constructs – to the role of examined "identities" in facilitating or impeding cross-cultural cooperation.

Hofstede notices that acceptance of his framework for recognizing and dealing with cross-cultural differences is heavily biased towards the "universalist, individualist Western values" as testified, for instance, by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (an artificial construct, imposed by the coalition of the strongest nation-states on the rest of the world) and its acceptance by the intergovernmental and other international organizations. Nevertheless, he thinks that it offers a good starting point for further negotiations: "Increasing the respect for human rights is a worthwhile goal for a multicultural world". (ibid.,245)

Criticism of Hofstede's theoretical framework has been increasingly focused on the following characteristics of his approach:

a) An in-built western bias present not only in constructing a general four-dimensional model with those dimensions, which can be discerned from the western point of view, but also in having exclusively western researchers (either from Western Europe or from the USA) gather and process empirical data. If any local culture contained dimensions, which were salient for individual identities but "invisible" and "unplottable" in four-dimensional cultural space "made in the West", they got disregarded (e.g. high context vs

low-context or shame vs. guilt dimensions), thus continuing the colonial tradition of imposing a single model of culture and rationality on all cultural communities, oblivious to the fact that "more marginal regions in the world are not simply producers of data for the theory mills of the North"(Appadurai,2001,5). Identities are an indigenous product and should be studied by researchers familiar with local cultural softwares (Roberts, Boyacigiller,1984). Multicultural world requires self-reflective examination of cultural bias and going beyond a "sophisticated stereotyping" (Osland, Bird, 2000). This argument hold water even if we modify Hofestede's approach and admit non-national cultural softwares as components of professional identity of academic researchers. They would still be defined in terms of "western" rationality ideals and institutional developments;

b) An in-built static and conservative nature of the model, which presupposes a relative stability of core values and beliefs in national culture (which, again, is based on a tacit assumption that local traditions will continue to be transferred and preserved as they used to be, not as they might be in rapidly chainging elecxtronic communication rituals) making it impossible to trace and report changes brought about by the development of countercultural values and beliefs around sub-national identities (age, gender, race, profession, virtual community) and by the advancing supra-state processes of regional and global integration due to political, economic and cultural (mass media and multi-media related) processes. Therborn's "audio-visual Americanization" and the increased popularity of English as a second language among European high school students are cases in point (Therborn, 1995), as are studies demonstrating respondents identifying with age or gender communities rather than with the national ones (cf. Gooderham, Nordhaug, 2002). Integration and institutional harmonization on regional and global scale and a rapid growth of communication technologies might, according to these critics, have brought about accelerated cultural convergence, not necessarily along national lines (cf. also Joinson,2003);

"Findings from a new research based on a sample of students at leading European business schools indicate a significant convergence of national values. The four value dimensions of Hofstede were used as the basis of the research. The findings show a number of important differences between male and female students, raising the question whether divisions of gender are more important than those of country. Italian and Swedish women, for example, may have more in common with each other than their fellow males."(Gooderham, Nordhaug, 2002).

One might add that a population of MBA students is perhaps already so standardized that their national background has been pushed back in their identities constructed with future global assignments and multinational employers in mind, and so more convincing arguments are needed to question Hofstede's framework, but the argument about convergence along gender or age lines requires more serious attention Identities are being constructed in changing circumstances (e.g. more professional roles open to women) and with broader frames of reference due to the integration processes (international careers, positions in supranational organizations and networks), national

frames either do not hold or hold for a shorter period of time and in a more limited range of contexts. Here, professional identities would be considered as subject to more frequent and deeper mutations than would otherwise be assumed, especially from the point of a generational exchange of academic communities;

c) An in-build methodological bias, which is linked to the choice of an attitude-survey questionnaire as the basic source of data, which can be questioned on a number of levels, including the suitability for culture study and reliability of respondents (cf. Tayeb,1996), the influence of occupational, professional or organizational culture (McSweeney,2002) and the "zipping" up of sub-dimensions (Boski,2003). For instance, when investigating the uncertainty avoidance dimension, and comparing the results of House's "Globe" project studies with the results of studies replicating Hofstedian approach, we find that either the Greeks emerge as the least uncertainty avoiding nation (Hofstede) or the Swiss (House). According to some researchers, if the Hofstedian dimension is methodologically "unzipped", we discover clustering together of three themes; a degree of closing of individual mind (is one open to new ideas and a challenge of progress or does one prefer to stick to the tested, more "conservative" ones), an individual "escape from freedom" (avoiding situations, which call for initiative and creativity or actively pursuing them) and an internalization of organizational culture (does it contain many detailed checklists and rules or is it more flexible and open in characterizing the objectives). Which theme do we focus on? Second, we have to distinguish two perspectives: whether respondents try to avoid uncertainty with respect to goals and leave means less strictly structured or the other way round (this explains the extremely different classification of Greeks and Swiss in Hofstedian and Housian studies, who are placed either very high or very low on uncertainty avoidance scale). Another variant of the same criticism is provided by those researchers, who question Hofstede's assignment of a position along the individualism-collectivism dimension to a particular link to a willingness to either compete or collaborate:

"Contrary to commonly shared beliefs, certain aspects of collectivism are positively related to entrepreneurship, and some individualistic tendencies help intensifying cooperation. Also, values, more than the norms, seem to mostly affect behaviors." (Ferrara, Roberson, 2004).

The first author is an Italian female researcher, a professor of the University of Parthenone in Naples, who wrote the abovementioned paper together with her US colleague. Her critical remarks on the influence of a national culture's positioning along the individualism-collectivism dimension remind us how strong the ideology assuming a pro-market economy influence of a Protestant religion is and how blind does it make us to a number of important Catholic contributions to the development of both modern market economy (Paccioli has been a Catholic monk) and the governance of nation-state and international systems (church bureaucracy has certainly been the model for all other bureaucracies – political, industrial and cultural).

Finally, investigating values and beliefs with attitude surveys researchers have problems with distinguishing between reality and desirability (values actually referred to and operationalized by respondents into norms or counternorms in real life situation versus values they see fit to declare, but not necessarily to follow, especially in some circumstances). "A true understanding of the logic of another culture includes comprehension of the relationships among values and how values relate to one another in a given context"(Osland, Bird,2000,70). And further they introduce the concept of "value trumping" to describe a conscious decision to revise the hierarchy of values in a given context:

"Schemas reflect the underlying reality of cultural values. For example, people working for U.S. managers who have a relaxed and casual style and who openly share information and provide opportunities to make independent decisions will learn specific scripts for managing in this fashion. The configuration of values embedded in this management style consists of informality, honesty, equality and individualism. At some point, however, these same managers may withhold information about a sensitive personnel situation because privacy, fairness, and legal concerns would trump honesty and equality in this context. This trumping action explains why the constellation of values related to specific schema is hierarchical."(ibid.,71)

Identities are played with and values promoted and demoted in individual and collective identities and there are reasons to assume that these processes are much more frequent and widespread than ever before.(6) This argument is especially salient with respect to the academic professional communities, which are to a large extent based on tacit loyalties and only partly explicit choices. Let us quote a case in point. Professors of medicine of Dutch universities, who otherwise constitute part of the academic community of some universities and appear in togas for festivities, swiftly wavered their academic status in order to become reclassified as "medical specialists" when the latter turned out to command higher salaries from the government that "academic staff". They have re-hired themselves, but through the deans, who re-engineered themselves as managers of "medical center, inc." and negotiated their services for the university (which coincided with the job descriptions they had before). As of the present writing, professors of business management consider doing the same, regarding the profitability of market for managerial education and disregarding their colleagues, whose specializations can only survive when financed by benevolent public authorities, and not by a selective profit-seeking business companies (they may, however, be prevented from doing so by a turning tide in public attitudes towards elitist earnings of top experts and managers).

Hofstede dealt with some criticism leveled against him both in the latest edition of his fundamental study "Culture's Consequences" (Hofstede, 2001) and in articles with refutation of counterarguments (cf. Hofstede,2002). In spite of the increasing criticism of his theoretical framework, it is still the most widely acknowledged, accepted, improved upon and used approach towards studying, classifying and managing cross-cultural differences in sciences of organization as practiced in schools of business, which share all the biases Hofstede has been charged with. Even those critics, who conclude that Hofstedian "paradigm does not cope well with the intricacy, diversity, richness and dynamism of culture" and that "the field calls for fresh air and new visions" (Fang,2003,367), still add that "Geert Hofstede is a great scholar of our times, he has been inspiring us to catch up and move on."(ibid.,368) Some of these

Hofstedian biases are gradually coming under critical fire – not only in Hofstede's writings – and are presently being questioned as a result of a self-reflective critique of critical representatives of academic communities. In other words, the representatives of the academic communities are ready to re-frame and re-engineer their (our) identities, responding to what is perceived as too narrow, local, exclusive and evolutionarily "obsolete" identity. How does this re-engineering or re-inventing of an identity proceed?

Among others, by differentiation along different lines: in case of the academic professions there are numerous possibilities of differentiating between teaching versus research specialization, applied versus "core" research, "pure" versus "mixed" approach with respect either to branches of knowledge or methodology or both. Professional identity of an academic researcher is being "unzipped" and recombined anew. "Unzipping" the theoretical concepts of dimensions and tracing context-bound changes in the ranking of values should contribute to a better understanding of individual and organizational identizing. The self-critical "unzipping" of Hofstedian dimensions, interestingly enough, is mostly undertaken by researchers who identify with his framework (Boski, Ferrara) and by the representatives of the older academic disciplines involved in the analyses of business management. Hence critical economists, who study science as an "outcome of an interactive network of cognitively challenged agents" and ask "what will happen to the university once research and teaching are spun off as separate privatized self-contained endeavors?" (Mirowski, Sent, 2002,58) Hence critical sociologists, who study the "macdonaldization of science" and "the globalization of nothing" (Ritzer,2004). Hence critical studies in recent history and philosophy of science, whose authors trace the influence of political ideologies and institutional governance structures in shaping contemporary science during the Cold War (Fuller,2000). Hence sociologists who are critical of the domination of rational choice theory in social sciences (Archer,2000). In all these areas, as in cross-cultural management studies, there is a growing awareness that socializing into identities has been individualized and "privatized" among new, different agencies, none of which can compensate for the loss of an overall "social capital" and of an interpretative context and all of which contribute to its destruction:

"Rational choice theory and neoliberalism, when applied to the public and private sphere, have stressed the need for definition and measurement of individualized outcome indicators. Such an approach promotes models and predictions of action that increasingly become defined by what they can measure. As we have already suggested, such an approach, which prioritizes instrumental rationality above anything else, individualizes, isolates and insulates decisions and actions from a social and historical context. More importantly, it must miss those key aspects of individual and collective action that cannot be measured. The worth of education provided by teacher becomes distilled into the measurable outcome of pupil exam performance, with little reference to the nature of the pupil-teacher interaction that is at the heart of learning. Absent from this conception of teaching and learning is an understanding of the ways in which values and meanings are embedded in education and define individual and communal relationships and personal well-being (…) thus undermining the collective nature of society"(Archer, 2000, 15)

3. Organizational career as temporary "parking lot" for personality

The main change in contemporary processes of identizing, as compared to the mid-20th century, is a slow erosion of a stable pattern of socialization and linear career pathing. Our culturally determined softwares are not "produced" in four major "chunks" – at the socializing assembly lines of family, school, work place and political sphere. There are a number of processes, which undermine the smooth transition through these phases of identity formation and disrupt a mutual reinforcement of identities under the protective shield of nation-state and its specialized bureaucracies. For instance, families change, shrink and limit interactions between family members, who pursue their different trajectories, with children leaving their parents at an early age. Popularity of "walkman" or of a personal, mobile phone illustrates the separation of these trajectories even if children stay in the same household. Technology contributes to the evolution of family interactions. Walkman, an invention designed to protect the others from audio environment of a single listener, became an instrument of individualizing consumption of cultural contents at the family level, further isolating family members from one another, as each family member was free to isolate himself or herself from the rest of the family in listening to a different radio station or a different compact disc.

When Paul Leinberger and Bruce Tucker undertook a study of professional careers of children of "organization men" (who, in turn, have been interviewed by William H. Whyte, Jr in the mid-fifties, cf. Whyte,1956), they were struck by the fact that in spite of extremely divergent professional careers, hippie or yuppie lifestyles and other differences, all of them (interviewed more than thirty years later, in the second half of the 1980ies) have been extremely individualistic. However, their extreme individualism and strong belief in developing one's unique subjectivity did not prevent their values from coinciding. They were all individualists in the same way, which means their <u>social character</u> ("nexus in which individual personalities meet social structure" – as the authors define it) was unique, certainly different from the one found during studies of their parents. Moreover, it has also been rapidly, radically changing. In other words, in spite of the diversity of life stories and professional records, in spite of the "children of organization man's" strong belief in extreme subjectivity and individualism – they all shared the same values; different from the values of their parents' generation, but present in their own. Leinberger and Tucker linked the concept of a social character to the formative influences exerted by social changes in contemporary societies. They introduced the concept of the rhythm of social change interacting with the biological rhythm of individual life and claimed that a set of circumstances and generational experiences set generations off against one another by influencing the context in which life course was plotted and psychological tasks for each age group were being determined:

"Because of changing historical circumstances, various milestones of the life-course – age at marriage, at entry into the work force, at birth of the first child, and at retirement – have all been subject to wide fluctuations down through the centuries, producing widely varying life courses in different epochs.(…) Many baby-boomers are said to have prolonged their adolescence by staying in school well into their twenties and even their thirties, to have married late, and to have delayed childbearing. Such rhetoric often implies abnormal psychological or social

development, though it should be obvious that this is the normal life course for this generation."(Leniberger, Tucker, 1991, 8)

Underlying this theoretical concept of a social character is the assumption that social change, an inevitable and ubiquitous component of contemporary social life, re-arranges the organizational forms, in which individuals grow, learn and work, which leads to a different social character acquiring an evolutionary advantage above the one, which had been dominating before. The influences are mutual – an appearance of a new generation with a different social character modifies organizations, in which members of this generation interact, thus reinforcing the processes of change and accelerating them. Thus values and beliefs, even if remain similar to the values and beliefs of the former generation, acquire new hue, new shades of meaning, or are being redefined in new contexts – undergoing an evolutionary change (as the authors aptly sum it up in one of their chapter titles: "Personal Artifice: From the Self-Made Man to the Man-Made Self"). It may also mean that evolving human societies may run a risk of a serious "mismatch" between social character and the organizational infrastructure of society, resulting in crises of structural unemployment, declining growth of material welfare and increasing social conflicts. It would be interesting to speculate if the present phase of "individualization" in contemporary societies reflects one of the new, emergent evolutionary strategies of human societies – namely the one replacing a collective attempt at a large-scale revolutionary re-engineering of political and economic systems, which had broken down at the end of the past century, with a version of "piecemeal social engineering" as Popper called it looking for an alternative to the totalitarian consequences of Marxian socialist utopia in the hands of Lenin and Stalin (in "Open Society and Its Enemies"). Can we identify some characteristics of actual and potential identities linked to this individualized project of social change?

What the abovementioned authors wrote about the 1970ies and 1980ies life-stories of children of "corporate" career managers of the late 1950ies could be applied to the academic institutions as well. In the 1950ies there were, roughly speaking, basically two main institutional frameworks for academic researchers; the universities and the corporate labs. This distinction has become blurred in the later years but many new distinctions and divisions emerged. There is a certain affinity between increasingly complex and differentiated academic identities (linked to the divisions of labor among academic disciplines and paradigms) on the one hand, and the components of cultural software, which individuals acquire during their socialization and acculturation, for instance in their socialization in to "organization men" or "post-organization men". Hofstede's choice of a national culture has been perfectly justified in view of the dominant role played by nation-state as the governance frame for most socializing agencies (families, schools, firms and institutions, etc.) and the state's national legitimation of power and authority (the retreat of the state has become pronounced only in the 1980ies, after his theory had been formed). However, perhaps the present phase of individualization of social life in general and in the professional work organization in particular, has resulted in a shift in nation state's ranking among other socializing and acculturating, i.e. identity-shaping agencies. Leinberger and Tucker also note a certain affinity between academic identities of the period, in which Whyte was conducting his studies (early fifties) and an over-socialized concept of a "fit" member of "modern" society:

"Based on social science's dream of a unified, exact science of man and inspired by the work of the human relations school of managerial theorists, the major propositions of the social ethic are "a belief in group as the source of creativity; a belief in 'belongingness' as the ultimate need of the individual; and a belief in the application of science to achieve belongingness. Thus was ushered in the era of the team player and the good guy, of family togetherness and the airtight security risk, of the well-rounded personality and the yes-man, of the happy homemaker and the well-adjusted child."(ibid.,10)

Both authors then contrast the concept of "individualism" as applied by Whyte in his studies of the parent generation to the one they have been using when describing their children. According to them, for Whyte individualism as he perceived it in talking to his respondents, was a counterbalancing factor, which compensated too perfect integration in an organizational world and allowed socialized individuals to resist the "big brother" – like attempts of an organization to extend the control of their lives. For them, as they described the reality of their own and other children's lives, individualism was much more **privatized and psychologically redefined** – and less linked to the organizational community as the stable and ever-present frame of reference (thus – by the same token - cleared of much of its earlier political and social significance):

"For the organization offspring (…) individualism became synonymous with individuality and with the cultivation of the private self.(…) As the organization offspring came of age in the sixties and seventies, they were exhorted to find themselves or create themselves. They undertook the task with fervor, as self-expression, self-fulfillment, self-assertion, self-actualization, self-understanding, self-acceptance and any number of other *self* compounds found their way into everyday language and life."(ibid.11-12)

Let us note that Hofstede's dimensions, while remaining unchanged, can mean something different to individuals, who are plotted on – for instance – individualism – collectivism scale (some critics would also object to the representative nature of individual rendering of a national cultural trait). Asked questions about individualism, respondents will confirm their belief in the value of individualism in 1956 and in 1990. However, they will mean two different individualisms in two different institutional contexts and with different consequences for one's entire life-cycle. This baby-boom generation's long march through the organizations, studied by reconstructing their life stories and employment records, has produced unique pattern of their career paths. The latter have been reconstructed by following children of 175 of the original "organization men". "Children" (who belong to baby-boomers born roughly between 1946 and 1956, and were thus about 40 years old at the time of interviewing) demonstrated consistent attempts to enact the individualized self-fulfillment scenario in various organizations and institutions. Obviously, they could not make use of their parents' generation frame of reference – a stable promotional structure within a single corporate bureaucracy, which would allow them to measure their progress along the corporate "ladder" designed for climbing by selected members of every young cohort of employees. They could not, because the accelerated change and frequent crises in modern economy confronted them with takeovers, buyouts, restructurings, mergers and shake-downs, while the emergence of organizational networks replacing hierarchical structures and proliferation of

temporary jobs and projects replacing tenured employment increased their stress and further isolated them from their peers in professional settings and roles.

Their identity has thus been shaped by their experiences in trying to realize the ideal of a self-fulfilling self and influenced by their failures to see this ideal embodied in their personal files with professional track records. Pursuing temporary inter-organizational platforms or networks, they had not developed a loyalty to specific company or institution, although they developed a strong belief in instrumental value of organizations in general without translating this belief into a life-time commitment to a specific organization. Venturing to a risky prediction about the possible results of this generational "school of life" in trying to fit their changing individualized personalities into the professional jobs within changing organizations, Leinberger and Tucker predict that in organizations with:

"permeable boundaries, shifting nodes of power, and relational systems in which stability is continually deferred (…) one's identity is defined less by job description, as in the old bureaucratic ideal, than by one's relation at any given moment to groups and people inside and outside the organization whose identities are similarly shifting."(ibid.,350)

Needless to say, the present academic researcher and teacher, linked to a university position, but networked in research, consulting and media projects and platforms, has less stable frame of reference for his or her identity forming than was the case fifty or even thirty years ago and only slowly did the long march of qualitative schools of thought and the interpretive approaches in social science begin to make us aware of these changed conditions for individual and collective sense-making, framing and identizing. However, once it got going, the results were a slowly accumulating "revisionist" literature, whose authors question professional frames of reference but remind us that extravagances of postmodernism in exploiting the "hyperbolic dogmas of anti-empiricism"(cf. Zammito,2004, Wallerstein, 2004) – theory-ladeness, underdetermination and incommensurability are not justified in their radical form and are no substitute for empirical inquiry in social sciences and in the humanities.

4. Honing extreme subjectivity – organizing modest solidarity

Accelerated mutability of cultural softwares, growing independence of individual identity constructs from organizational embedding and increasing complexity and flexibility of emergent forms of networks and global corporations, where individuals park their personalities rather than embed them, raised many questions about the limits of flexibility and rapid change. Will the system hold if flexibility and mutability increase (parking for days or hours rather than months)? Will individuals still be able to "frame" themselves or loose any bearings? Paradigmatic conflicts threaten the academic community (how can non-academic sponsors and clients distinguish between rival claims, if both secure recognition and accreditation?) and lower the autonomy of such organizational forms as universities (which become dependent on paid research assignments and commercial "edutainment" programs for survival). Extreme individualism coupled with ubiquitous hyper-interconnectivity (cellular phones, internet, cf. Mitchell, 2003) threatens stability of families, lowers commensurability of educational systems, dissolves solidarity indispensable for

community maintenance and partitions professional solidarity into increasingly smaller and less predictable clusters. Some theoreticians of organizations claim that inventing the possible scenarios for potentially more efficient organizational forms we should account for the design and management of stable communities for "life maintenance", whose forerunners should be seen among pre-industrial guilds or labor unions of the 19th century. While small, agile companies engage in global search for partners in extended networks, needs of individuals who form nods in those networks have to be taken care of – allowing them to focus on tasks at hand ("organizations of this sort could, in addition to providing for material needs, also become a locus for social, educational and recreational activities", cf. Laubacher, Malone, et al., 2004). Will this re-engineering intervention into the evolving organizational forms be enough to preserve the minimum levels of solidarity?

Let us examine the characteristics of the present <u>evolutionary</u> stage of the most broadly present forms of <u>identizing</u> in order to answer this question.

First, the idea of self-development, as accepted by the baby boom generation, reflects an increasingly subjective (collective frameworks being questioned) and autonomous (social control being weakened) interpretation of the processes of identizing. After salvation of soul as a legitimate project of individual "career pathing" (a cultural ideal introduced by Christianity), cultural evolution of secularized ideal pointed towards a salvation understood as a fulfillment of creative talents (including cognitive gifts, which allowed humans to pursue scientific research and worship Reason instead of God, while at the same time acquiring professional skills). This secularized ideal of the Enlightenment has been slowly turning into a watered down, individualized mass consumption based version, according to which a quality time is achieved with the experience of an individualized lifestyle (including the individualized consumption of cultural contents supplied by globally networked multimedia). In the particular case of professional academics, this evolutionary shift can be traced at the level of a university, which has been founded upon the assumption that a study of the revelation clearly allows to construct the temple of knowledge, in which theology (study of God) is aided by practical study of law, medicine and languages. Evolution of experimental and theoretical research methods resulted in a restructuring of human knowledge, exemplified in the French grand encyclopaedia, composed of the entries provided by professional scientists, scholars and philosophers, who did not need God as a hypothesis, and thus divided human knowledge into bureaucratic departments collecting data and producing theories on various aspects of material world and human culture. The present stage of evolution of academic communities allows us to notice the new emergent complex systems, much more flexible and complex, decentralized and networked, though still labeled as "universities" and still developing specializations for researchers and teachers in large, networked bureaucracies. However, identities become extremely individualized (honing them we multiply academic specializations) and some of them even go virtual (a transition of scientific periodicals towards the online mode of dissemination). Rituals of academic solidarity (promoting Ph.D.'s, opening an academic year, installing full professors, bestowing doctorat honoris causa, etc.) and institutional interactions with public authorities and business companies do not prevent growing atomization of academic communities and a decline in professional solidarity. Individualized identities of academics and their subcommunities leave little room for broader professional and institutional solidarities.

Second, organizational career, separated from a single company and a single upward mobility ladder, **becomes an ongoing performance** with changing co-actors for changing audiences. After climbing up the ladder in the course of a professional life - cycle, a sequence of incommensurable performances follows, not necessarily with a tenure in sight. How much solidarity can a professional "performer" express? Certainly not enough to sustain trade unions, whose importance, especially in knowledge-intensive organizations has been declining and not enough to limit some managerial practices, which increase job insecurity and tighten managerial control. Honing ourselves, we have simultaneously opened a way for a more finely tuned, honed set of managerial controls, which operates with individualized, tailor-made motivational campaigns, personalized employee benefit cafeterias, customized psychological contracts and differentiated pay scales or benefit packages. Increasing competition between cooperating employees has also contributed to a decreased experience of solidarity. Remedies are sought – but they are often sought in increasing individual rationality in work-related social contexts at the expense of the collective and solidarity enhancing procedures, as is the case, for instance, with the concept of cultural intelligence, which like its predecessor, the concept of an emotional intelligence, is perceived as a minor "correction" of a model for rational decision making:

"We proposed and discussed a conceptual framework that integrates cognition, motivation, and behaviour in the workplace. Another important aspect of our work is in drawing together of cognition and motivation, two areas within psychology that are most often considered as separate and independent in spite of the pioneering efforts of psychologists, such as Bandura and Locke, and cross-cultural psychologists, such as Berry and Triandis"(Earley, Ang,2003, 312).

Needless to say, neither the concept of emotional intelligence nor the concept of cultural intelligence allow us to notice and study power processes inherent in organizational structures and ideological discourses within the organization, since it is tacitly assumed that employees should be aided in reconciling themselves with the existing power structure and with obedience to managerial authority.

Third, new marginal classes emerge, and because of the dismantling of the welfare state (which is one of the consequences of the retreat of a nation-state), they are increasingly exposed to unemployment and global competition. Members of these classes remain citizens (unless they strive for citizenship – in which case the success of their struggle is not a foregone conclusion). They can express themselves but they cannot get their share of income and power. The spectacle of consumption can be accessed – but safety of a job and social security of a wage level cannot. Their increased consumption of multimedia images does not substitute for the loss of a chance for acquiring an identity they wanted to achieve (since they were socialized into the expectations based on a previous generation's pattern of identizing). Some sociologists diagnose their situation by drawing analogy with the observations made by Walter Benjamin with respect to the 1930ies in Germany and re-engineered in contemporary social sciences as a result of the popularity of Debord's theory of a society of a spectacle:

"Fascism sees its salvation in giving the masses not their right, but instead a chance to express themselves. The masses have a right to change property relations; Fascism seeks to give them an expression while preserving property."(Sanbomatsu, 2004, 21)

In the academic environments these marginal classes used to be barely visible: the cleaning companies employing mainly foreign female laborers were the case in point. However, the universities increasingly rely on temporary and part-time employees and on student part-time employment in order to run their daily businesses. In this situation of a relative and real loss and deprivation, especially in working life and professional career, one source of identity preserves its accessibility and increases its attractiveness – namely the religious one. The rise of religious fundamentalisms, both west and south-east, signals significant shift in identizing as a response to this massive emergence of the new marginalized classes, old and new. Deprived of the full participation in identity forming experiences, individuals turn towards organized religion, which provides a collective framework for their individual anxieties. Organized religion, removed by the secular nation-state to the private sphere of individual, subjective experiences, returns in a new form of a collective, objectively institutionalized solidarity. However, since religious rituals have been severely reduced and limited, newly found identity has to manifest itself in non-religious rituals – for instance in political action in the public sphere. Ostentatious performance of attending public school with head cover by Muslim school girls in France reflect the same re-invented religious identity as a conspicuous defence of a stone with ten commandments in the court building in the United States or a struggle of the Spaniards, the Irish or the Poles for inserting the reference to common Christian roots into the newly designed constitution of the European Union. It has often been claimed that religious fundamentalism is the single most important source of new terrorism. This claim is difficult to substantiate. Jets, which destroyed World Trade Center buildings in New York City, have been highjacked by fundamentalists, who had been motivated more by class resentment of the global capitalist "empire" than by a religious zeal of "sacred warriors". A hypothesis that a religious idiom has been found to express many social movements and initiatives, born of a variety of causes, but mostly in response to political and economic inequality, offers a good chance for a contrary thesis, namely, that political terrorism requires a set of circumstances, of which religious fanaticism is neither essential nor necessary component (and thus religious idiom is added for political marketing purposes). An educated Iranian woman (i.e. a woman who had access to a professional identity forming) and an employed Palestinian man (i.e. a man who had a chance to exercise his identity in meaningful occupation) are better safeguards against terrorism than dealing and wheeling with the religious establishments. They can, however, freely choose their identities only if they can access the resources and they are not limited to a single set of "identity entrepreneurs", especially if the latter happen to be religious fundamentalists (who are often the only party to offer systematic and meaningful aid in social and humanitarian organization in poorest and most forgotten Arab communities). According to the Italian sociologist, who studied the new social movements as crucial social flows, in which "nomads of the present", i.e. contemporary individuals, continually engineer and re-engineer their identities, this process of identizing can be helped by social identity "entrepreneurs", who are:

"social actors, creating and selling the capacity for manoeuvring with identities; producing new opportunities for recognition, importing languages and codes from one

field to another. (…) The sources of identity are increasingly individual, but for this very reason the social dimension of individual experience comes to the fore."(Melucci,1996,53)

Social identity entrepreneurship is not likely to become either an academic specialization or a consulting field in the nearest future – although the attempts of the US conservatives to come up with "nation-building" initiatives certainly demonstrate an attempt to become an identity entrepreneur, at least in societies, which have suffered an extreme crisis of governance and "governability". Is this social identity entrepreneurship, then, a future safe haven and an assembly line for new organizational forms fit for extremely subjective and privatized, individually honed selves? Not necessarily; one of the first responses to the new situation can be a conservative attempt to narrow down the options for new forms of identizing and organizing and to speak of, for instance, an individualist and cognitive backlash with a theory of sophisticated stereotypes (cf. McGarty, Yzerbyt, Spears, 2002) or to attempt a re-engineering of a cognitive, rational and individualist paradigm (cf. Earley, Ang, 2003, Turner, 2002). Some attempts to broaden the awareness of virtual stakeholders' of academic communities indicate that this may, indeed, be the case, and that social scientists should be appealing not only to an anonymous society at large or to their own professionally defined community, but to:

"educationists, sociologists, political scientists, clinical practitioners in psychology and medicine, nurses, communications and media specialists, cultural studies workers, and a score of other assorted disciplines".(Denzin, Lincoln,2003,635-6)

Complexity of contemporary societies and frequency of changes in their core processes demand new sets of skills; among them honing our personal identities, framing our professional identities and networking our social and political designs. Extreme but media-aided subjectivity requires extremely innovative forms of organizing. The main struggle will probably be waged along the lines of a methodological and ontological individualism vs. collectivism debate, as signaled by Turner, who focuses on individual "habituation" and learning processes and justifies a replacement of "sharing" as a mechanism of participating in a culture with "habituation". It is indicative of the present, smaller cognitive turn in social sciences in general and in behavioral sciences of organization in particular, within which the rational choice theories, slowly eroding under sustained criticism, are being replaced with their new variants, rejuvenated by psychologists and social psychologists:

"The habituation alternative to sharing, once we look carefully, seems to accord better with what we know about causal processes that actually operate in the world and with the known facts that practice theories purport to explain. This alternative account of what is going on when people learn to communicate, make scientific discoveries and so forth, is more plausible as an explanation because it does not appeal to any quasi-magical processes of transmission. Individual habituation (with the term being broadly construed in order to include all acquired learning that is tacit) I argued, does explain the same things, and we can even make some sense of such mysterious things as our common feelings by reference to the role of rituals and performances in inducing habits.(…) Rituals are behavioral technologies that produce a certain uniformity of habits – a uniformity, however, that is literally superficial, a matter of external similarity, with internal or personal consequences that vary from individual

to individual. For example, prayer has effects on those who pray, but the effects vary from person to person."(Turner, 2002, 12)

Honing ourselves we thus arrive at the new generation of cognitive researchers who would like to salvage the causal explanation cognitive architecture of rituals, management of organizational learning and competence and processes of individual identizing. (cf. McCauley, Lawson, 2002 and Carver, Scheier, 2001) The first shots in this individualist/cognitive vs. collectivist/social struggle have already been fired. Precision weapons are being honed and targeted. Academic researchers of the world – do not unite, support both causes with a slight preference for the one, which will emerge as an underdog. A sustainable, democratic, critical but not exclusive in a biased, non-merit related way, community of research practice is attainable in our lifetime.

Literature:

Aldrich, Howard, Organizations Evolving, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 2003

Amadae, S.M., Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy. The Cold War Origins of Rational Choice Liberalism, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2003

Appadurai, Arjun, ed., Globalization, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2001

Archer, Margaret, Tritter, Jonathan, eds., Rational Choice Theory. Resisting Colonization, Routledge, London, 2000

Boski, Pawel, "The Double Trap of Uncertainty Non-Avoidance. Bureaucratic Overregulation and Organizational Improvisation", a paper presented at the ERIM research seminar "Organizing for Performance" on Dec.5, 2003, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Capozza, Dora, Brown, Rupert, eds., Social Identity Processes, Sage, London, 2000

Carver, Charles, Scheier, Michael, On the Self-Regulation of Behavior, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001

Chomsky, Noam, Studies on Semantics of Generative Grammar, Mouton, The Hague, 1972

Chomsky, Noam, Reflections on Language, Pantheon, New York, 1975

Collins, Randall, Interaction Ritual Chains, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2004

Conant, James, Haugeland, John, eds., The Road Since Structure. Philosophical Essays 1970-1993 with an Autobiographical Interview. Thomas Kuhn, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2000

Denzin, Norman, Lincoln, Yvonna, The Landscape of Qualitative Research, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 2003

D'Iribarne, Philippe, La logique de l'honneur: Gestion des entreprises et traditions nationales, Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1989

Earley, Christopher, Ang, Soon, Cultural intelligence. Individual Interactions Across Cultures, Stanford Business Books, Stanford, 2003

Fang, Tony, "A Critique of Hofstede's Fifth National Culture Dimension", in: International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, vol.3(3), 2003

Ferrara, Maria, Roberson, Lorian, "Reconceptualizing Individualism – Collectivism and Analyzing its Relationship with Entrepreneurship and Cooperation", paper at the IACCM conference, Universita Parthenope, Napels, Italy, May 21-22, 204

Fuller, Steve, Thomas Kuhn.A Philosophical History For Our Times, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2000

Gabriel, Yiannis, Organizations in Depth. The Psychoanalysis of Organizations, Sage, London, 1999

Gooderham, Paul, Nordhaug, Odd, "Are Cultural Differences in Europe on the Decline?", *European Business Forum*, Winter 2001/2002

Hofstede, Geert, Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind. Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival, McGraw-Hill, London, 1991

Hofstede, Geert, Culture's Consequences. Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations, second edition, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 2001

Hofstede, Geert, "Dimensions Do Not Exist – A Reply to Brendan McSweeney", *Human Relations*, 56(2), 2002

Ibarra, Herminia, Working Identity. Unconventional Strategies for Reinventing Your Career, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, 2004

Joinson, Adam, Understanding the Psychology of Internet Behaviour. Virtual Worlds, Real Lives, Palgrave, London, 2003

Juarrero, Alicia, Dynamics in Action. Intentional Behavior as a Complex System, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1999

Lakatos, Imre, Musgrave, Alan, eds., Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge, Cambridge University Press, London, 1970

Lamont, Michele, Thevenot, Laurent, eds., Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology. Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000

Laubacher, Robert, Malone, Thomas, and the MIT Scenario Working Group, Two Scenarios for 21st Century Organizations: Shifting Networks of Small Firms or All-Encompassing 'Virtual Counties'"?, MIT Initiative on Inventing the Organizations of the 21st Century, working paper 21C WP #001

Leinerger, Paul, Tucker, Bruce, The New Individualists. The Generation After the Organization Man, Harper Collins, New York, 1991

Kets de Vries, Manfred, Struggling with the Demon: Perspectives on Individual and Organizational Irrationality, Psychosocial Press, Madison, Connecticut, 2001

Kuhn, Thomas, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1961

March, James, The Pursuit of Organizational Intelligence, Blackwell, Oxford, 1999

Marion, Russ, The Edge of Organization. Chaos and Complexity Theories of Formal Social Systems, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 1999

McCauley, Robert, Lawson, Thomas, Bringing Ritual to Mind. Psychological Foundations of Cultural Forms, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002

McGarthy, Craig, Yzerbyt, Vincent, Spears, Russell, eds., Stereotypes as Explanations. The Formation of Meaningful beliefs about Social Groups, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002

McSweeney, Brendan, "Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and Their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith – a Failure of Analysis", *Human Relations*, 55(1), 2002

Melucci, Alberto, The Playing Self. Person and Meaning in the Planetary Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996

Mirowski, Philip, Sent, Esther-Mirjam, eds., Science Bought and Sold. Essays in the Economics of Science, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2002

Mitchell, William, Me++. The Cyborg Self and the Networked City, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 2003

Osland, Joyce, Bird, Allan, "Beyond Sophisticated Stereotyping: Cultural Sensemaking in Context", *Academy of Management Executive*, 2000, vol.14, no.1

Podgórecki, Adam, Higher Faculties. A Cross-National Study of University Culture, Praeger, Westport, Conn., 1997

Pomper, Philip, Shaw, David Gary, eds., The Return of Science. Evolution, History and Theory, Rowman and Littlefield, Boston, 2002

Popper, Karl, Open Society and Its Enemies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1966

Popper, Karl, Objective Knowledge. An Evolutionary approach, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972

Ritzer, George, The Globalization of Nothing, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 2004

Roberts, K.H., Boyacigiller, N.A., "Cross-national Organizational Research: the Grasp of the Blinded Men", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6, 1984, 425-476

Sanbomatsu, John, The Postmodern Prince. Critical Theory, Left strategy and the Making of the New Political Subject, Monthly Review Press, New York, 2004

Searle, John, Expression and Meaning; Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979

Searle, John, The Construction of Social Reality, Allen Lane, London, 1995

Tayeb, Monir, "Hofstede", in: Warner, Malcolm, ed., International Encyclopedia of Business and Management, Thompson Press, London, 1996

Taylor, Charles, Modern Social Imaginaries, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2004

Therborn, Göran, European Modernity and Beyond. The Trajectory of European Societies 1945-2000, Sage, London, 1995

Thois, Peggy, Virshup, Lauren, "Me's and We's. Forms and Functions of Social Identities", in: Ashmore, Richard, Jussim, Lee, eds., Self and Identity. Fundamental Issues, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997

Turner, Jonathan H., Face to Face. Toward a Sociological Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2002

Turner, Stephen, Brains/Practices/Realtivism. Social Theory after Cognitive Science, The university of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2002

Wallerstein, Immanuel, The Uncertainties of Knowledge, Temple university Press, Philadelphia, 2004

Weick, Karl, Making Sense of the Organization, Blackwell, Oxford, 2001

Whyte, William H., Jr, The Organization Man, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1956

Wierzbicka, Anna, Język-umysł-kultura, Polskie Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa, 1999

Wilson, E.O., Consilience. The Unity of Knowledge, Little Brown and Company, London, 1999

Zammito, John, A Nice Derangement of Epistemes. Post-Positivism in the Study of Science from Quine to Latour, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2004

Publications in the ERIM Report Series Research* in Management

ERIM Research Program: "Organizing for Performance"

2004

Learning And Governance In Inter-Firm Relations
Bart Nooteboom
ERS-2004-003-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1122

Organisational Learning And Multinational Strategy
Bart Nooteboom
ERS-2004-004-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1123

Density And Strength Of Ties In Innovation Networks: A Competence And Governance View
Bart Nooteboom and Victor A. Gilsing
ERS-2004-005-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1124

Innovation, learning and cluster dynamics
Bart Nooteboom
ERS-2004-006-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1125

Empirical Tests Of Optimal Cognitive Distance
Stefan Wuyts, Massimo G. Colombo, Shantanu Dutta, and Bart Nooteboom
ERS-2004-007-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1126

Entrepreneurship in Transition: Searching for governance in China's new private sector
Barbara Krug and Hans Hendrischke
ERS-2004-008-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1128

Exploring Emotional Competence: Its effects on coping, social capital, and performance of salespeople
Willem Verbeke, Frank Belschak and Richard P. Bagozzi
ERS-2004-014-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1174

The Impact of Business Ownership Change on Employee Relations: Buy-outs in the UK and the Netherlands
Hans Bruining, Paul Boselie, Mike Wright and Nicolas Bacon
ERS-2004-021-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1263

Towards a Dynamic (Schumpeterian) Welfare Economics
Wilfred Dolfsma
ERS-2004-026-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1264

The Three-Step Test-Interview (TSTI): An observational instrument for pretesting self-completion questionnaires
Tony Hak, Kees van der Veer and Harrie Jansen
ERS-2004-029-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1265

Measuring the Knowledge Base of an Economy in terms of Triple-Helix Relations among 'Technology, Organization, and Territory'
Loet Leydesdorff, Wilfred Dolfsma & Gerben van der Panne
ERS-2004-034-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1300

Paradoxes of Modernist Consumption – Reading Fashions
Wilfred Dolfsma
ERS-2004-035-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1330

Some Economics of Digital Content
Wilfred Dolfsma
ERS-2004-036-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1331

Learning Opportunities And Learning Behaviours Of Small Business Starters: Relations With Goal Achievement, Skill Development, And Satisfaction
Marco van Gelderen, Lidewey van der Sluis & Paul Jansen
ERS-2004-037-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1429

The Process Of New Service Development – Issues Of Formalization And Appropriability
Wilfred Dolfsma
ERS-2004-051-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1445

On And Off The Beaten Path: How Individuals Broker Knowledge Through Formal And Informal Networks
Rick Aalbers, Wilfred Dolfsma & Otto Koppius
ERS-2004-066-LIS/ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1549

Governance Modes For Systemic Innovation. Service Development In Mobile Telecommunications
J. van den Ende and F. Jaspers
ERS-2004-067-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1539

Human Resource Function Competencies In European Companies
Paul Boselie and Jaap Paauwe
ERS-2004-069-ORG
http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1451

Honing and Framing Ourselves (Extreme Subjectivity and Organizing)
Sławomir Magala
ERS-2004-076-ORG

Cross-cultural compromises, multiculturalism and the actuality of unzipped Hofstede
Sławomir Magala
ERS-2004-078-ORG