

# THE CORPORATE NATIONALITY: A QUESTION OF CULTURE AND COMMUNITY?<sup>1</sup>

## Authors

---

Professor Eric Godelier  
Humanities and Social Sciences Department  
Ecole Polytechnique  
[eric.godelier@polytechnique.edu](mailto:eric.godelier@polytechnique.edu)

## Résumé

---

Today, many scholars in Management and Business History use “Nationality” as a core criterion to classify corporations and to explain their behaviour, values and strategy. In management sciences for instance, G. Hofstede tried to explain the cultural differences. Many authors in management and business history recognized the difficulty of getting rid of the concept of “Nation” in management studies and historical History. This paper discusses the importance of “Nation” in the evolution of Enterprises throughout history and as an intellectual frame for academics involved in management studies and Business history. In one way or another, a better understanding of Corporation Nationality imposes the use of this concept of “cultural identity” rather than “political Identity”.

**Keywords:** National Culture ; Business History ; Values ; Management models ; Management technics

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank Pr Declan Mc Cavana for his improvements of the English version.

## Introduction

In 2008, Harm Schröter edited a collective book aiming to define what the “European Enterprise”<sup>2</sup> could be. Many authors underlined the importance of the dynamic of Nations within European frontiers. They recognized the difficulty of getting rid of the concept of “Nation” in historical studies. This example, like many others, reveals the importance of “Nation” in the evolution of Enterprises throughout history and as an intellectual frame for business historians. Besides, legally in many countries, the nationality of an enterprise is defined by the location of its head office i.e. from a geographical perspective. In fact, this criterion is not easy to use. For instance, could we tell that Jaguar is a British company while being controlled by the Indian group Tata? Most of the time, other criteria are suggested: national origin of capital, worldwide market shares, turnover, company leader’s or owner’s nationality, dominant shareholders nationality, place(s) of production. Despite this long list, enterprise nationality is still a critical issue in management and business history. But how to define “nationality” and nation?

Since the XIXth Century, Nation and Nationalism have been core elements to understand the political and cultural constitution of European countries and around the World<sup>3</sup>. Step by step, frontiers, institutions, production models or national markets framed collective values and behaviours. Political leaders used nation and nationalism for mass mobilization, sometimes leading to wars. The concept of “Nation” and “Nationalism” appeared convenient to freeze, to reshape and, from time to time, to invent historical or cultural traditions. In Business History, at least since the XIXth Century and Western Europe, businessmen have designed their corporate strategies, management models and tools first to supply local markets and sometimes for national or even international markets. Obviously, for more than a century, “nation” “national”, “nationalism” have deeply framed behaviours and representations of the world not only for citizens but, of course, for scholars. But do the later have other possibilities and intellectual tools?

Today, many scholars in Management and Business History use “Nationality” as a core criterion to classify corporations and to explain their behaviour, values and strategy. In management sciences for instance, G. Hofstede tried to explain the cultural differences. Thanks to his famous 1970s study of the US company IBM, he proposed a ladder of national culture types based on a set of couples (individualism vs collectivism, etc). Apparently, US values are more tolerant, Russia is long term oriented, Sweden more feminine than masculine and Brasil relies on large power distance<sup>4</sup>. Step by step, national type is supposed to enable researchers to understand the main origin of individual psychology and collective culture. Thanks to this, the culture of some companies or subsidiaries would be described as “German”, “Italian” or “French”. For G. Hofstede, or E. Schein, culture is reduced to a set of “values” or to a “software of the mind”<sup>5</sup>. Most of the time, this essentialism leads to a kind of “stereotypization” of people and cultures<sup>6</sup>. Despite the terrible limits – ethnocentrism, disembodiment, a-historical and a-sociological approaches, etc. -, this intellectual frame is still a reference. It is rarely criticized. It is still used to classify cultural differences, values and behaviours of company communities.

---

<sup>2</sup> Schröter H. (ed.), (2008).

<sup>3</sup> Hobsbawm E. (1992).

<sup>4</sup> This 6th criteria was added in 1991.

<sup>5</sup> Hofstede G. (2001); Schein E. (2016). For E. Schein : [culture is] « *a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way you perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems* »

<sup>6</sup> Hampden-Turner C. & Trompenaars A. (1994) & (2000).

One assumption is that, being born in a country could explain all the values and behaviours of national citizens and enterprises. On the contrary, in a first draft, we define “Culture” as a organized system of ways of thinking and doing things within a community of people. Culture is a mixture of material and immaterial elements. It is composed of values, behaviours and institutions organized in a specific structure.

Some Business historians are still using Hofstede’s work to understand the strategy, behaviour and values of corporations, businessmen and managers<sup>7</sup>. From a certain point of view, a Nation is seen as a homogeneous geographical zone or country. But how could a Nation be defined?

As a draft, Nation – in a political sense - is defined by frontiers settled through out history by political decisions. It is organized thanks to a set of institutions (State, Religion, Family, Markets, Trade unions, etc...). Political Leaders have celebrated a common language (France), a shared Religion (Great Britain) or some common values (Freedom in the USA). Some Nations have no common language or religion and are a Nation with its heterogeneity and a large variety of communities. One can think of India... But if Nation is presumed homogeneous, what could be the main criterion for nationalists: one language? shared traditions and customs? Even sometimes ... physical and “blood” types? These are supposed to give a national identity to some countries’ inhabitants and not to others. An assumption is that this could explain citizen values and behavior. But does the concept of “Nationality” help to find some explanations of national corporations’ idiosyncrasy?

Actually it seems to be obvious to observe that there are some recurrent behaviours or values in a certain population. It is taken what is seen as an explanation of the deep origins of culture... and Nation. However it does not really help to understand what is actually going on. Last but not least, it does not provide a methodology to observe the complex gap between what is observable in day to day business life and what is underneath i.e. the actual roots of culture. Before going forward, what is Culture?

For Business Historians, the first question could be: does the concept of “Nation” – and “nationality” - contribute to a better comprehension of the history of Enterprises and from then, of Capitalism, its birth, its development and, possibly, its varieties? Then a set of questions must be raised. “Nation” and “Nationalism” are relatively new as Historical phenomena. It is clearly a political idea<sup>8</sup>. Let’s say that most political and academic debates around this critical issue emerged in the XIXth or early XXth centuries. Therefore, how have these new political institutions or intellectual concepts influenced and framed Enterprises and their actors in Europe, or around the World? From a historical perspective, what have been the means, connexions and vectors of influence and diffusion between this political organization – the “Nation” – and the values, representation, behaviour or action of business leaders and all the stakeholders?

In this paper, we assume that Nation and nationality – not only in a Political sense- are useful for the comprehension of Enterprise history and culture. Of course, Nation and nationality framed Enterprise strategies, management models and tools. But as a political phenomenon, Nation, Nationality and Nationalisms are only a partial explanation of Enterprise evolution. One must analyze other dimensions like technologies, markets, culture, etc. This article will propose a general set of arguments, thus it is not really possible to provide in this short essay a systematic empirical examination. Nevertheless, many business scholars have published useful but indirect knowledge about the history of national Enterprise context<sup>9</sup>. This paper will try to answer the previous questions in four parts.

---

<sup>7</sup> For instance, K. Macharazina K. , in H.Schröter, *op.cit.*, p.13. or in the same opus FiooleW. , Van Driel H. and van BaalenP. (2008), p.156.

<sup>8</sup> ChabotJ.-L. (1986), p.3

<sup>9</sup> See for instance, Schwarzkopf S. (2009) ; Schachter G. and Engelbourg S. (2005).

“Nation” and “Nationality” must be briefly defined to see how they could be used by Business Historians (Part I). “Nation” explains some elements of business culture, but some elements only. Unfortunately it seems that there is a lack of data and case studies specifically focused on this specific relation between “Nation” and business culture. A complementary work must be done to link these elements of context to the roots of business and corporation culture. If “nation” and “nationalism” is part of a broader culture, it is important to mobilize the concept of culture and corporate culture to understand the importance of “Nationality” in Business History.

To clarify the relationship between “Nation” and corporate culture, the researcher must gather a lot of data not only from the business actors discourses but also from their actual and day to day behavior. Does “Nationality” help Business Historians to design a classification of strategies, structures, business models and practices, management cultures, etc? The risk is to take for granted categories which seems homogeneous but are in fact heterogeneous. For instance, in European countries, the same words (structure, hierarchy, control, performance, social regulation, etc.) could in day-to-day business life designate different practices, different logics or meanings and content. Therefore another definition of Culture must be presented. It could help to use the concept of “nationality” in a better way. (Part II).

Regarding the enormous number of objects to take into account, the task seems impossible for Historians. Nevertheless, it must be attempted in a clever way. How could it be possible to design a research process and to select some specific objects to analyze them with a particular angle? It seems that one can benefit from two kinds of help. On the one hand, it could be interesting to mobilize Institutions theory, but not in the Agency theory sense (Part III).

On the other hand, one may focus on the cultural dimensions of business models and management tools. Thanks to some conclusions imported from Anthropotechnology, one can understand how management models and values, products, business tools, behaviors have a cultural identity designed within Nation boundaries. Technical and managerial devices are not purely technical or managerial. Like Snails, they are carrying their culture, and therefore national background on their back. They are travelling thanks to corporation, businessmen, Consultant companies... or Wars and invasions. The way they are travelling between Nations or “Nation States” reveals elements of their home nationality. This approach may help to question the existence of a national type of management or Capitalist models. In a way, it will help to make clear how some “Nations” are dominating others. Once again, Classical history and geopolitics could be very useful by providing an enlightenment of the political and institutional background for National business and Enterprises life (Part IV)

In one way or another, a better understanding of Corporation Nationality imposes the use of this concept of “cultural identity” rather than “political Identity”.

## **“Nation” and “Nationality”: homogeneous or heterogeneous communities?**

G.Hofstede’s model is mainly based on individual values. From then his followers and users explain National differences extrapolating general characteristics from personnel psychological dimensions.

At this point, one must underline the fact that “Culture” is quite different from “Identity”. Hence both share common parts, on the one hand – Culture - is mainly unconscious and the result of a collective and long term historical process, where as on the other – Identity – is more an individual and conscious object. As a psychologist, G.Hofstede is dealing more with Identity than with Culture. In this paper, the challenge for Business history is to be able to understand the Corporate cultures i.e. the deep roots and logic of enterprise organization, of its owners, leaders, managers, staff, and of different stakeholders involved in its historical path. Before a

presentation of the limits of this model, it is important to understand that even “Nations” are not so homogeneous despite the nationalist discourse of leaders.

From the XIIth or XIIIth century onward, step by step the “Nation” has slowly become a central principle to design and settle European countries political organization. Spain, France and Great Britain were clearly the leading western countries in this intellectual and institutional process<sup>10</sup>. The French Revolution is clearly a turning point in the increase of political legitimacy embodied by the People instead of the King or Emperor. At this stage, “Nation” started to get its modern meaning.

In the XIXth century, Nationalism becomes a central political movement spurred by local elites struggling for the recognition of their local or regional specificities i. e. language, Traditions and Customs, Religion, etc. Often lost in huge Empires or in a bunch of small countries and states, their key demand was the creation of a new State, supposed to be more homogeneous. The new Nation or State objective was to aggregate a part of the global population, which had the feeling to be dominated and to suffer from the political or cultural domination of the global political elite. In the second half of the XIX century, this political debate was widespread in Europe, especially after Napoleon’s Army invaded the Northern part of Europe, and the future Germany. In order to fight against French Political and cultural Imperialism, Fichte, Schiller started to develop a German vision of Culture and Nationalism. Like many countries in the late XIXth or early XXth century, France and the new Germany created an Education system which highly contributed to the diffusion of Nationalist ideas and to the reinforcement of the legitimacy of the Nation state. The use of a common language (French, English, Spanish, ) was a good avenue toward standardization and homogeneity<sup>11</sup>. Outside their frontier, Western countries started to invade Africa or Asian Regions. Imperialism and Scientific Racism became a significant part of Nationalism<sup>12</sup>.

E. Hobsbawm has clearly analyzed that one of the main problem for the nationalist leaders around the World was to find strong and clear criteria to legitimize their claim for independence. It was also to understand why people were aggregating to the nation? In other words, how could a nation state last for a long period and win its political and institutional legitimacy? It is possible to classify the Nationalist doctrines in two families. The first, which can be named “organicist” or “organismic”, underlines the core component of a nation, which could be distinguished from a simple country. The second, could be called “legalist”. It emphasizes that the legitimacy of the Nation relies either on people’s feeling that they belong to the Nation, or to the right of peoples’ self-determination. In both cases, academics and scholars were often mobilized to provide scientific elements to support or contest the justification in favor or against a new “Nation”<sup>13</sup>.

In the second half of the XIXth century, especially after the 1880s, the “organismic” supporters used 4 kinds of justification to demand the creation of their own Nation: 1) the long term existence of separate Customs, Traditions and a distinctive History of a small part of the population; 2) a different Religion; 3) a Specific Language; 4) or even a particular “Human Race”<sup>14</sup>. Some of the “organismic” supporters were Republicans and progressive, but others were conservative intellectuals or political leaders. All of these arguments have in common the fact that they underline the homogeneity of the future new nation’s population. On the contrary, they point out its heterogeneity while mixing with other populations of a broader or ancient political structure (Empire, Kingdom, Ancient State or Republic, etc.). From then onwards, the

---

<sup>10</sup> Chabot J.-L., *op. cit.*, p. 8

<sup>11</sup> Lebovics H. (1991), p. 23-43.

<sup>12</sup> Arendt A. (1951).

<sup>13</sup> Noiriel G. (1991), p. 72.

<sup>14</sup> This set of explanation is often presented as a German approach of Nation and Culture vs a French définition of Nation which underlines its legal basis and Universal citizenship acquired by people vote.

political history of “Nation” and of “Nationality” is entirely built on a central hypothesis: the identification of the “individual” with the “collective”. This assumption enables some scholars, commentators or political leaders to illustrate or even conclude that a single person could embody the Nation-State (Charismatic political leader or elected chief)<sup>15</sup>. One could go further and assume that every member of the new nation state could be seen as an identical citizen. Each of them is the embodiment of a religion, a custom, a language. Therefore, he or she has internalized the basic values of Nation-state. Educated and raised in a homogeneous community, with a set of common values, settled in a specific geographical space, Population members could be seen in a way as interchangeable.

This is also a corner stone of the second family: the legalist. One of its prominent representatives is Ernest Renan. Nation exists thanks to what Ernest Renan named “the willingness to join” or an “Everyday Plebiscite for the Nation”<sup>16</sup>. This Nationalist feeling could be framed and expressed through democratic votes, but also in day to day citizenship. The vote allows the people to express its envy to participate in the Nation’s life and to consolidate its legitimacy. From an intellectual point of view, thanks to people’s polls, every citizen is a living incarnation of the Nation. Nevertheless, once again this value is a political object and do not epitomize all country cultural dimensions.

In both family – organismic or Legalist - the agregation of such homothetic individuals produces a collective community i.e. a Nation. Despite their apparent simplicity, from an historical and scientific point of view, many of these criteria are not historically proven.

We will not lose our time discussing the so called racial homogeneity or purity. Many things have been already concluded and History has tragically given proof of the falseness and danger of this racist criterion. Physical types were used negatively: The so-called specific physical appearance of Jews, Negros or Asians criticized because they were supposed to all look alike. The aim was to legitimize their rejection from the new nation and the importance to create a new and “pure” Nation.

For the others, E. Hobsbawn has demonstrated that most of these criteria and legitimization were new and even sometimes totally invented. There were produced to gain advantage in political fights. They have to be studied thanks to the historial context in which they were raised. For instance, many Nationalist leaders argue that the roots of the Nation – i.e. Customs, Language, Religion-, were always present in the population’s mind and behaviour even before political regimes were installed. Therefore, they see it as an explanation to create a new nation more compatible with these old cultural roots<sup>17</sup>. In Wales or in Croatia for instance, in the late XIXth or early XXth century, some local elites or nationalist groups reinvent an ancient language which was just used by a tiny minority of people or, sometimes, had totally disappeared. Language was used as a political argument to find a reason to be separated from others parts of the population<sup>18</sup>. As a matter of fact, in many countries, even those like France or the United-Kingdom which have an old national language, people very often used another local vernacular. In France, many inhabitants were not able to speak French but Breton, Basque or a local dialect<sup>19</sup>. The idea that one Nation-state relies on one language is really challenging.

Another problem was to be able to demonstrate that in a specific geographical area, the population shared the same cultural and national roots. Unfortunately, in many situations, the local population looks like a multicolor mozaic rather than a monocolored tile. In the late XIXth century, one critical point was to establish a set of frontiers for the new born Nation-State. One problem for nationalists around Europe was to define the right size of the new Nation.

---

<sup>15</sup> Noiriel G. (1991), p. 84.

<sup>16</sup> Noiriel G. (1991), p. 89.

<sup>17</sup> Hobsbawn E. (1992), p. 35

<sup>18</sup> Hobsbawn E. (1992), p. 105, 109, 110.

<sup>19</sup> About Breton, see the famous book of P.-J. Heliard P.-J. (1999).

One of the first intellectuals to invent this doctrine was the Italian nationalist Mazzini (1805-1872). The size of a new Nation-State should be big enough to gather a homogeneous population from a cultural and ethnical point of view. One political criterion was the threshold which marks the need for a new Nation. After WWI, this doctrine was also used by US President Woodrow Wilson to justify the size and frontiers of a set of new states in Central Europe<sup>20</sup>. The fact is that the bigger the State is, the more heterogeneous its population is. Therefore, the idea that a Nation-State is a homogeneous thing was, and still is, a false theory. From an historical point of view, many Nationalist arguments are not demonstrated.

If within a Nation, individuals are not homogeneous units, it becomes impossible to generalize from psychological and individual dimensions the general cultural characteristics of a national community. Business Historians need to aggregate objective data and more subjective elements to understand the deep roots and logics of a single national population's behaviour<sup>21</sup>. In other words, one needs a new methodology to avoid G.Hofstede's essentialism and to study a national community, either as a set of individuals or as a pure political dimension<sup>22</sup>. To know if a Nation-State is composed of a set of cultures and communities, it is important to understand how they have step by step emerged throughout History, how these communities and cultures, and the people which embodied them have been able to stay together. Last but not least, how they have developed some social models and Tools to enable them to organize their life, their individual and collective action. Regarding usual State Nation heterogeneity, the concept of culture seems more convenient to understand the regularities and values of country communities. From then onward, the study of Nationality influences on Enterprises will need the use of Culture as a descriptive tool and an intellectual concept. A brief definition of Culture must be presented before suggesting two methodological paths to study the relations between Enterprise and Nationality (Part II). The main issue is to understand how communities and cultures are linked. It is the role of institutions to keep people in the same community (III). All these individuals framed in their communities are inventing and implementing Tools and models to organize their action. These intellectual and technical Tools are therefore Culturally framed (IV). As an institution and a part of a Nation, Enterprise is at the core of this dynamic.

## **From Homogeneity to Heterogeneity: National Culture, a set of Communities, Unconscious collective Values and behaviours.**

From a historical point of view, as a political dimension, Nationality and nationalism could explain some Enterprises values and behavior. For instance during wars<sup>23</sup> or to support geopolitical manoeuvres, The question is how Nation state and nationality are influencing day to day enterprise life? One way to answer this is to mobilize the concept of "culture" and see how it could help to understand the regularities of Enterprises values and behaviours within a heterogeneous Nation?

Since the late 1990s, business history has intensively worked on technology transfer between countries, on the diffusion of management models between corporations, on consultancy<sup>24</sup>, on the expatriation of top managers and leaders, corporate globalization, etc. They raise for instance the question of local and special or « indigenous » management. This opens the question of possible diversity or types of capitalism within the world economy in Europe and elsewhere. Step by step, a need for analyzing the components and structure of these

---

<sup>20</sup> Hobsbawm E. (1992), p. 313, 342, 343

<sup>21</sup> Noiriel G. (1991), p.84, 86

<sup>22</sup> Descombes V. (2014), p.124.

<sup>23</sup> See for instance, Chanut J.-F. & Eck J.-F. (eds.) (2011) and (2012).

<sup>24</sup> McKenna C. (2006).

economies was needed<sup>25</sup>. Many have used, and sometimes benefited from, the concept of culture. Maurice Godelier proposed a clear and concise definition of culture:

*The Whole set of representations of the universe, rules for organizing society, positive or negative values and behavioral standards to which the individuals and groups that the make Baruya society<sup>26</sup> refer when acting on other groups, themselves or the world around them<sup>27</sup>.*

Some elements must be added. Culture is

*A set of signs and behaviors differentiating the behavior of two communities [...]. To engender a culture, these signs and behaviors must be shared by the members of the group, be transmitted socially and individually, [...]. The set of principles, representations and values shared by the members of the same society (or of several societies), and which organize their ways of thinking, their ways of acting on Nature around them and their ways of acting on themselves. To act on themselves, that is, to organize their social relations, (in other words) Society. [...] By values we designate positive or negative norms, which are attached in a society to ways of acting, living, or thinking; some Values being proscribed, others prescribed<sup>28</sup>.*

Cultures are wider than countries, but each nation is composed by many cultures and communities. Sometime communities are larger than Nations and countries. For instance, in capitalist economies or in business leaders' minds, there are common cultural representations about the status of corporations, the market structure and dynamics (regulation, supply and demand), etc. To go forward, we may try to suggest a list of Culture components and how Culture emerged?

Culture is composed by a set of material elements combined with representations and values.

In the first category, one may find physical structures (building, houses, cities, etc..) and spaces (offices, kitchen, classrooms, etc.), everyday life elements (clothes, food, technology, etc.), machines, Management tools (accounting, quality indicators, production, etc.). In the Second category, Values and representations are embodied in persons and physical elements. Values have normative functions on people's ways of thinking and behaving. Values delimitate the community frontiers and membership. They are the result of long and contradictory collective arguments, therefore community members are both their bearers and their creators. Values allow individuals to be integrated or excluded from the community. They are collectively and historically constituted. They result from cooperation and conflicts that develop in the repetition of daily life. Values and moreover Culture become institutionalized over the course of history. Last but not least, People must share an idea of what their own society or community has to be. No single member of a society or a culture incarnates on their own all the dimensions and values of the community or society in which he or she lives. Furthermore, No member of a society is clearly aware of the deep cultural roots and multiple dimensions of his or her behaviour and representations. How could this definition help to understand the relation between Nationality and Enterprises ? At least for three reasons.

First, Nation State and nationality define some Enterprise communities, values and representations through Education, Administrative practices, Market regulation, Labour relationship, State policies in various activities, etc. As we will see below, National institutions are more or less framing these National communities and cultures. Nevertheless, it seems quite clear that their influence varies by type of enterprises and corporations – local, regional, national or international-, by type of business or market, by type of technologies. Military business and technologies are obviously more delicate than others. Here, the nationality of

---

25 See for instance, Marsden D. (2002), p. 41-55.

26 The Baruya is a tribe from Papua New Guinea.

27 Godelier M. (2011), p.34-35

28 Godelier M. (1998), p. 217-222



products, technologies, company owners or business leaders are clearly a touchy issue<sup>29</sup>. It is less clear how the influence of Nationality in a political sense plays for Small and medium local enterprises.

Second, the bigger the enterprise is, the more different communities are gathered. If we focus on multinational corporations, their core business is to develop strategies around the globe passing over National frontiers<sup>30</sup>. Their business and managers are facing day-to-day problems of cultural differences, technology transfers and adaptation, national differences between consumer tastes and product market regulations. They have to solve communication problems between a set of National or local languages. In addition, these huge organizations have to recruit, to train, to manage and to pay many categories of workers and managers. To analyze and solve these cultural challenges, most of them are using “Nationality” as a key explanation. Does this mean that it is the best tool?

This is the third reason: “Words are culture traits »<sup>31</sup>. Words used to describe each nationality, i.e. “French”, “German”, “Japanese”, frame the vision and ability to understand the deepest roots of people values and behaviors. A five-year Education and research program organized between 2007 and 2017 between France, India, Japan, China and Korea has proved that most of the time this does not work<sup>32</sup>. When Engineers from Renault are collaborating with Engineers from Nissan, it is not the fact that they are “French” or “Japanese” which explains their problems. It is because they have different professional backgrounds and belong to different communities created and changed in distinct historical and cultural environment. Of course they are “French” and “Japanese” but because of their culture, not of their Nationality. And it is not possible to define what a “French” or a “Japanese” Engineer” is thanks to a short list of formal and visible elements. What is interesting is to understand how French and Japanese institutions and communities have throughout history framed their values, behavior and representations. This problem comes from the fact that many people make a confusion between two dimensions of “Culture”: as an intellectual tool for describing how a community of individuals is functioning and as an explanatory concept to understand the deep roots of community culture. To use apparent elements - like in G.Hofstede’s model - as an explanation is the clear mark of essentialism. It is not possible to compare – national – communities using such a kind of list or ladder. Each criterion is embedded in its own culture and community. Nevertheless, the comparative approach is fundamental to clarify the categories – Values, Representations, Logics, Structures - of each culture. Instead of Nationality, from an intellectual point of view, the concept of culture strongly helps to understand the influence of “Nation” seen as a heterogeneous and cultural concept and not as a political one. Nevertheless, it raises the problem of large scale observation and proximity with a set of community members.

Despite this terrible complexity and the dreadful lack of empirical data<sup>33</sup>, one must go in depth and try to understand the Culture and Nationality effects of Enterprises. We suggest two complementary paths or objects of study: study of Institutions (III) and study of tools (IV)

### **When Institutions link the cultural communities in Enterprises (and?) frame Enterprise Action and culture on a national basis.**

---

<sup>29</sup> Godelier E. (ed.) (2016).

<sup>30</sup> Jones G. (2005).

<sup>31</sup> Shalins M. (1999), p. 401

<sup>32</sup> Chiapello E. et Godelier E. (eds.) (2015).

<sup>33</sup> Noiriël G. (1991), p 84.

It is important to understand how since the XIXth century, Nation-States have created numerous institutions to reinforce their country's Nationalistic organization. But How do institution influence and frame the Nation population?

In her famous book, *How Institutions Think*, Mary Douglas describes the influence of institutions on people's behaviors, actions and representations:

*Communities classify in a different mode. [...] Institutions survive by harnessing all information processes to the task of establishing themselves. The instituted community blocks personal curiosity, organizes public memory, and heroically imposes certainty upon uncertainty. In marking its own boundaries, it affects all lower level thinking, so that persons realize their own identities and classify each other through community affiliation. Since it uses the division of labor as a source of metaphors to affirm itself, the community's self-knowledge and knowledge of the world must undergo change when the organization of work changes.... But individual persons do not control the classifying. It is a cognitive process that involves them in the same way as they are involved in the strategies and payoffs of the economic scene, or in the constitution of language.... First, the people are tempted out of their niches by new possibilities of exercising or evading control. Then they make new kinds of institutions, and the institutions make new kinds of labels, and the labels make new kinds of people. The next step in understanding how we understand ourselves would be to classify kinds of institutions, and the kinds of classification they typically use.... [For example,] classifications emanating from administrative institutions have a territorial base, while those emanating from manufacturing institutions focus on production. What the classifications are devised for, and what they can and cannot do, are different in each case. A classification of classificatory styles would be a good first step towards thinking systematically about distinctive styles of reasoning. It would be a challenge to the sovereignty of our institutionalized thought style<sup>34</sup>.*

From an historical point of view, the Nation-State has developed institutions to reinforce the national feeling and to establish a list of criteria and laws to give national citizenship. These institutions have allowed some part of the population to be integrated and some other minorities to be neglected or even rejected. The « Nationalisation » of personal and family names is a good example of the role of National institutions<sup>35</sup>. But Nation State used many other kinds of institution. First, the intégration of popular classes occurred in the XIXth and XXth century thanks to Universal suffrage (Political rights) and Social protection or the Welfare state (social Rights)<sup>36</sup>. The Education system, its programs, its organization and its selection process had a critical role. It generated a certain type of elites either in Politics or business. They started to speak and behave in the name of the Nation-State and its inhabitants. In Management Education, the US influence in Business schools in Europe and around the world is growing since WWII<sup>37</sup>. In many countries, National service and, unfortunately, Wars, speed up the creation of a National feeling. Second, Administrative organization of the State contributed to nationalize the country space through national laws, a dominant and single language and, of course, national symbols (Flag, colours, etc.). From time to time State intervention regulates Markets and integrates them on a national basis like in grain markets for instance<sup>38</sup>. This Historical process created a context in which enterprises developed their activities locally, nationally or internationally.

As institutions, all companies bring together many communities and cultures. They create classifications for problems, questions and « good » solutions, behaviors or ways of thinking and acting. « Good » does not represent an absolute criterion inspired by moral laws or

---

<sup>34</sup> Douglas M. (1986), p 102.

<sup>35</sup> Noiriel G. (1991), p.93.

<sup>36</sup> Noiriel (1991), p.92.

<sup>37</sup> Puig N. (2003), p. 58

<sup>38</sup> PerssonK.-G. (1999).

philosophy, but what is considered as legitimate or « true » ways of doing things by the institution. Therefore, one cannot understand rules or the logic of action and thought without recontextualizing them in the time and space of the institution which allowed them to emerge i.e. for this paper, a Nation. This means that history and geography must be seen as constraints to understand corporate cultural components and logic in depth. This leads to the rejection of all the attempts to define and describe community cultures with formal and superficial methodologies. If a list of material, symbolic and social objects are necessary, there must be a search for the hidden logic and structures which organized everything into a « cultural system ».

For instance, what would be important is to see how Nationality and nationalism are defined, used or rejected by Enterprises, their leaders and owners and more over by all the stakeholders in the company's life, organization and strategy. If it is done it would enable us to verify that National identity really plays a role. For instance, 3 elements must be studied to confirm or reject the importance of Nationality and Nationalism in one enterprise:

*1) a self image, a consciousness of the specific characteristics of one's own nation, its strengths and weaknesses compared to others (the cognitive component) ; 2) a certain kind of love and attachment to the nation, including national pride and shame (these are both primarily emotional component) ; 3) the readiness to act on behalf of the nation and to support political measures to strengthen and project the nation (the action component)*<sup>39</sup>. This could help to understand the Relationship between Multinationals and gouvernement. For instance Unilever had to learn and to adapt the company to fit with the Turkish and the Indian governments. The Corporation developed new competences and collective capabilities and memories<sup>40</sup>. It is important to understand how these institutions succeeded, or failed, to integrate and fully homogenize the country into a Single Nation. If the Nation is strongly homogeneous, one may guess that the criterion of nationality will heavily impact business and enterprises<sup>41</sup>. If the Nation is too diversified, the relationship will be very loose in most of the business sectors apart from those linked to National critical activities (Military supply, Strategic technologies, etc...).

This Institutional approach will probably not be conclusive by itself. Nevertheless, the complexity of nationality suggests to conduct a comparative study. Let's see how things i.e. Tools, technologies and management models are crossing national frontiers. Do they travel with their nationality?

## **When Models and tools cross National frontiers and reveal nationality.**

As explained above, if Enterprises history and evolution cannot be explained by their Nationality, taken in the Political sense, one must admit that their path and culture are framed by the geographical place i.e. the country where they are settled and the actions they have taken in this institutional and cultural context<sup>42</sup>. The rapid globalization interrogates the existence and so called purity of National business models. It challenges the frontiers of National types of Capitalism. Enterprises, business leaders and managers design tools and models to organize their strategy and to develop their national business or sometimes around the world. We will suppose that objects and ideas are framed by their context of birth. To go further in the comprehension of Nationality influence, one must stand as close as possible to the moment and place of this birth then see why and how they travel. Importation and exportation raise the problem of naming, settling and using objects and models in another culture or community. For instance, Taylorism was designed in the USA and exported to Europe in the late XIXth and

---

<sup>39</sup> Haller M., Ressler R. (2006), p.821

<sup>40</sup> Jones G. (2007), p.78-101.

<sup>41</sup> Schröter H. (2008), p. 57-59.

<sup>42</sup> Daviet S. (2004), p. 59-60.

early XXth century. Through industrial companies and consultants, this contributed to the first stage of an Americanization of Europe. Some budgeting tools or total quality procedures have moved from the USA to Japan. This created some of the Japanese Production system Basis<sup>43</sup>. Then this model was exported to Europe. This process was also conducted by managers or business leaders educated in one country with its own institutions, one academic system and one kind of socio-historical structure. Globalization is not only a dissemination process of “neutral” tools but could be seen also as the domination of some “national” models - i.e. countries – over others countries.

It is possible, for certain management theory, to figure that these tools and models are universal and culture free<sup>44</sup>. This means that they are efficient and do not face adaptation and translation problems to fit into any country around the globe. In France, the difficulty encountered by Taylorism in the 1920s and Total quality in the 1980s condemned this academic hypothesis. Besides the ridiculous aspect of the cultural free hypothesis, Historians and Anthropologists have proved that tools and models have always cultural and historical backgrounds. The challenge is to see how National culture influences the conception of tools and models used by Enterprises in a country - France for instance – or by National companies outside the country. The conclusions of Anthropotechnology<sup>45</sup> could be useful for our purpose.

The basis of Anthropotechnology was launched in 1962 by Alain Wisner, a French ergonomist, who wanted to understand how people around the world understand, interpret and apply work procedure and prescription. Because there always are differences between what it required and what is actually done, it is very interesting to see how this impacts technology transfer and all situations where the usage context of a technique or an object is different from its conceptional context. In the Anglo-saxon world, Michael Kaplan developed a set of studies in Cultural Ergonomics<sup>46</sup>. This intellectual frame will help to see how « nationality » is revealed through object conception and actions carried out by Enterprise members to implement the models and tools. Business history provides an enormous number of items which could be considered as Tools, Technologies or models. By management tool, we mean, like E. Chiapello<sup>47</sup>: a technical and formal support, associated with a set of social practices. The tool objective is to improve or guarantee efficiency and effectiveness for individual or collective actions. These actions are taken in a finalized organizational framework. A management tool is the most visible part of a management system. Some tools are « hard » (machines, desk, enterprise premisses laptop, etc.), some are « soft » (excel sheet, software, consultant model (like BCG matrix), ...). Some are relatively simple to implement (Microsoft or OS). Some need a system of things (SAP production software, Kanban system of factory organization, etc.).

To detect a possible « nationality » of a management tool, it is important to leave aside three of the most frequent basic assumptions in management: 1) The construction of tools follows rational universal rules. 2) Any problem has its tool, therefore actors just have to find the right one thanks to a rational choice 3) A Management tool is "neutral" i.e. independent from the context and actors. On the contrary, our assumption is that the cultural and historical context is crucial to make clear how an Enterprise could define its “nationality”. How ?

Like all technical devices, management tools are not purely technical. The influence of culture must be taken into account as a fundamental "non-technical" dimension of management instrumentation. As C. Levi-Strauss wrote : *“The techniques can be seen as a group of significant choices which each society – or each period within society’s development – has been*

---

<sup>43</sup> Kurosawa T (2008), p. 57.

<sup>44</sup> Some scholars sustained this hypothesis in the 1980's in the USA.

<sup>45</sup> The name « anthropotechnology » was invented in 1979, Geslin P. (ed.) (2017), p. 9.

<sup>46</sup> Kaplan M. (ed.) (2004).

<sup>47</sup> Chiapello E., Gilbert P. (2013).

*forced to make, whether they are compatible or incompatible with other choices*”<sup>48</sup>. Management tools and models must be considered as components of a culture, seen, like defined above, as a system of ideas, values, material elements shared by a community. Material components, values and representations, behaviors gathered and legitimized by institutions are generating a « nationality ». When some parts – Tools – travel they bring the background like a snail. All of this means we must study tools in their cultural, organizational and institutional context, relying on a minimum of anthropology, sociology and history: “*The study of relations between material culture and society then becomes the study of the conditions of coexistence and of reciprocal transformations of a technical system and of the socioeconomic organization of the society in which it operates*”<sup>49</sup>. Step by step, within a country limits or across, Enterprises create, their own management tools and models. They invent or import them. They innovate. They implement. These tools and management models contribute to create communities of practices and identities<sup>50</sup>. For instance, in the 1980s and 1990s, early retirement scheme in Steel industry became a crucial means to move from one plant to another, to select, to promote and to train workers and managers<sup>51</sup>. For instance one corporation status, *private limited liability company (PLLC)* initially invented in one country traveled around Europe and the world to become a common Capitalist type of organization<sup>52</sup>.

There are many studies of Tools and models in Business history: Accountanting, Marketing, finance, production system, management and consultant models. It is a good starting point to describe and understand the context. Nevertheless, because many are relying on official archives or managers statements, much stays at the surface or at a formal level. To go in depth, imposes to observe technologies in action<sup>53</sup> i.e. an ethnography of « simple things ». It imposes also to pay attention to the thickness of these things i.e. « the multiple meanings ascribed to particular material artifacts »<sup>54</sup>. The aim is to be able to explain how nationality, as a cultural, and not political concept, is expressed in individual and collective actions within an Enterprise or at least some of its communities. Different communities within a company or country may use identical Tools or models. Nevertheless, if people do not use them in the same way, or if they give them a different value, this tool or model belongs to two different cultural systems<sup>55</sup>. This is also true when these objects are traveling because of an increase of Globalization. These movements across frontiers and National Capitalism create reveal. P. Geslin underlines 6 phenomena<sup>56</sup> :

1) The origin and the circuit taken by a technical object will lock in its future uses. Within this frame, there is no circulation without hybridizations. How and where these traveling objects are imported and settled are direct answer to social, symbolic and economic questions. These questions are asked in a very specific way by local actors and institutions. They define a local context for the tool and model installation. 2) Thanks to this circuit of circulation, the users can correct possible errors or shortcomings which could have emerged in the design process. In all enterprises, a translation occurs. This improves the fitness of the imported object to its new environment and to what new users expected of it. 3) The technological object that circulates is always associated with a discourse about the right way to use it. What is important is the discrepancies between the discourse of designers, the discourse of those who are importing and promoting the new tool and, of course, the discourse of users. 4) Circulation of tools and models

<sup>48</sup> Levi-Strauss C. (1976), p.11.

<sup>49</sup> Lemonnier P. (1986), p.154.

<sup>50</sup> Wenger E. (1998).

<sup>51</sup> Godelier E. (2007).

<sup>52</sup> Guinnane T., Harris R., Lamoreaux N., Rosenthal J.-L. (2007).

<sup>53</sup> Hutchins E. (1995).

<sup>54</sup> Adler K. (2007)..

<sup>55</sup> Chiapello E., Godelier E (2015), p. 23.

<sup>56</sup> Geslin P. (2009).

generates something named “regimes of familiarity”. This is the moment the new tool is accepted, considered as efficient and its use generalized within a community. The scale of its diffusion in a geographical zone, a professional group or an enterprise is a good indicator of the community limits. 5) A good comprehension of technical diffusion needs to understand the power and influence of decision-makers and of public opinion. They often generate forms of appropriation that are not necessarily those desired by users. 6) Because of the Lock in, there is an ascendance of the existing things (tools, models, techniques) on the deterritorialized technical objects. As explained by Philippe Descola, each individual or community reacts to the new imported technical object according to the value given to the last technical object which successfully integrated”.

Thanks to this intellectual and methodological frame, it would be possible to clarify the “nationality” of an Enterprise through the study of Tools and model. This will help to describe how cultural influence is part of national domination from one country to another<sup>57</sup>. Advertising for instance is a good example of this process<sup>58</sup>.

Nevertheless, this frame has its limits. First because a kind of field or ethnography study seems only possible for modern history. To go in depth, useful data could be provided by a cross examination of other company stakeholders history. Secondly because most technology transfer concerns only big corporations or globalized companies. Nevertheless, step by step, an accumulation of case studies could draw a good picture of Enterprise Nationality, its components, and its structure.

## Conclusion

Today, Nationalism is regaining strength around the world and Globalization seems to be at one of its highest historical developments. Nationality of the company surely is a critical issue for scholars, business leaders and political decision-makers. In Europe, since the second half of the XIXth century, Nationalism and the nation state are a central phenomenon in political and economic life. Within national frontiers, Laws, taxes, Production and Market regulation, Public policies, Trade unions organize the life of society. Each nation has created some idiosyncratic institutions. People’s actions, behaviours and values are the inheritance of a long term and collective historical journey. Step by step, throughout History, they design a national model of business and capitalism. This frame Enterprises margin of evolution and locks them into a cultural context. Therefore, in a way, it is possible to conclude that they have a nationality. Nevertheless, this paper has tried to demonstrate that if they have a nationality, it is not in a political sense.

Political sciences and public leaders have over-estimated the homogeneity of Nationality and Nationalism. They consider that national community is a block with a shared will to participate in national life. In a way, this may explain a part of collective life from a political point of view. Nevertheless, as we have seen, despite Nationalist discourses, most of the time, Nations are composed of many communities. They have their own culture and limits. Sometimes, the cultures of some communities cross national frontiers. This change in perspective imposes some renewal of Business History methodology. Instead of limiting National values to a list of essentialist stereotypes, the challenge is to be able to observe and understand Enterprises cultures and practices as close as possible to the field. Therefore, social scientists and managers who want to seriously study cultural issues need to choose a research protocol which will allow them to get as close as possible to cultural complexities and their

---

<sup>57</sup> PuigN. and Álvaro A. (2003).

<sup>58</sup> Schwarzkopf S. (2009).

hidden aspects. It is also important that they find ways to remain at their observation point within the organization for quite a long period to study the actions, behaviors and cultural components being used. As suggested by Clifford Geertz, this process makes it possible to propose a detailed description of culture, thus revealing its regularities, symbols and contradictions<sup>59</sup>. What are the sources for business historians? Of course, archives, but also interviews of stakeholders and if possible, observation. Globalization could be a good opportunity to study the travel – and perhaps reveal the nationality - of objects involved in transnational Capitalism.

To conclude, let us examine Howard Becker's advice on « theories and facts » about the concept of « ethnicity »<sup>60</sup>. Quoting his former professor Everett Huges, he suggested the following scientific position about a critical question: How did we know if a group was one of those or not?

*« An ethnic group is not one because of the degree of measurable or observable difference from other groups; it is an ethnic group, on the contrary, because the people in and the people out of it know that it is one; because both the ins and the outs talk, feel, and act as if it were a separate group ». (...) « It takes more than one ethnic group to make ethnic relations. The relations can no more be understood by studying one or the other of the groups than can a chemical combination by the study of one element only, or a boxing bout by the observation of only one of the fighters »*<sup>61</sup>.

This long extract points us to the road we should be taking to start reshaping research methodologies in Business History on National Capitalism.

---

<sup>59</sup> Geertz C. (2000).

<sup>60</sup> Becker B (1998).

<sup>61</sup> Hughes E.-C. (1984), p.153, 154, 155.

## Bibliography:

Adler K. (2007), « Focus : Thick things », *Isis*, p. 80-84.

Arendt H (1951), *The origins of Totalitarianism*, T. II « Imperialism », New York, Schocken Books, 1951

Becker H. (1998), *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998, Chap 1 « Tricks ».

Chabot J.-L. (1986), *Le Nationalisme*, Paris, PUF, coll. « Que sais-je ? », 128 p.

Chanet J.-F. & Eck J.-F. (2011 ; 2012) (eds.), Spécial issues « Occupations militaires et entreprises en Europe occidentale », *Entreprises et Histoire*, T1, n°62, Avril and T 2, n°68, Septembre.

Chiapello E., Gilbert P. (2013), *Sociologie des outils de gestion, Introduction à l'analyse sociale de l'instrumentation de gestion*, La Découverte, Coll. " Grands Repères ", Paris, 128 p.

Chiapello E. et Godelier E. (eds.) (2015), *Management multiculturel*, T1. « Pratiques de management comparées », T2. « Explorations indiennes », Paris, Ellipses - Éditions de l'École Polytechnique.

Daviet S. (2004), « L'entreprise entre territoire et mondialisation », *Entreprises et histoire*, n°35, juin 2004, p58-68.

Douglas M. (1986), *How Institutions Think*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 146 p.

Descombes V. (2014), *The Institutions of Meanings. A Defence of Anthropological Holism*, Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press, 392p.

Fioole W., Van Driel H. and P. van Baalen P., « Europeanisation and Americanisation: Converging Backgrounds of German and Dutch Top Managers, 1990-2205 », H. Schröter H. (ed.) (2008), *The European Enterprise. Historical Investigation into a Future Species*, Berlin, Springer, p. 155-167

Geertz C. (2000), *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York, Basic Books, 1973, rééd., p.470

Geslin P. (2009), « Choix Technologiques et Impacts organisationnels. Quelques petites thèses anthropologiques sur la circulation des connaissances, des hommes et des techniques », Séminaire « Management et Cultures d'entreprises », 23/10, *Les Annales de l'école de Paris*.

Geslin P. (ed.) (2017), *L'Anthropotechnologie. Cultures et Conception*, Vol.1, ISTE éditions, London, 159p.

Godelier E. (2007), « Pyramides des âges et gestion des ressources humaines », *Vingtième siècle, Revue d'histoire*, n°95, juillet-septembre.

Godelier E. (ed.) (2016), « Militaires et Entreprises », *Entreprises et Histoire*, n°85, décembre.

Godelier M. (1998), *La culture est-elle naturelle ?*, A. Ducros, J. Ducros et F. Joulian (dir.), Paris, éditions Errance, p. 217-222.

Godelier M. (2011), *Metamorphoses of Kinship*, New-York, Verso, 654 p.

Guinnane T., Harris R., Lamoreaux N., Rosenthal J.-L. (2007), « Putting the Corporation in its Place », *Enterprise and Society*, Cambridge University Press, vol. 8(03), September, p. 687-729.

Haller M., Ressler R. (2006) « National and European identity. A study of their meanings and interrelationships », *Revue française de sociologie*, 47-4, p. 817-850.

Hampden-Turner C. & A. Trompenaars A. (1994), *The Seven Cultures of Capitalism: Value Systems for Creating Wealth in the United States, Japan, Germany, France, Britain, Sweden, and the Netherlands*, London, Piatkus, 405p.



- Hampden-Turner C. & A. Trompenaars A. (2000), *Building Cross-Cultural Competence. How to create wealth from conflicting Values*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 388p.
- Heliaz P.-J. (1999), *le Cheval d'orgueil. Mémoire d'un breton du pays bigouden*, Paris, Terre Humaine Poche.
- Hobsbawm E. (1992), *Nations et Nationalisme depuis 1780. Programme, mythe, réalité*, Paris Gallimard, coll. « Folio/Histoire », 372 p.
- Hofstede G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 616p.
- Hughes E.-C. (1984), *The sociological eye: Selected papers*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1971, reed., 614p
- Hutchins E. (1995), « How a Cockpit Remembers Its Speeds », *Cognitive Science*, 19, p. 265-288,
- Jones G. (2005), *Multinationals and Global Capitalism. From the nineteenth to the twenty-first century*, Oxford, OUP, 340 p.
- Jones G. (2007), « Learning to leave with Governments: Unilever in India and Turkey, 1950-1980, *Entreprises et Histoire*, n°49, décembre, p.78-101.
- Kaplan M. (ed.) (2004), *Cultural Ergonomics*, Elsevier, London.
- Kurosawa T. (2008), « Common European Assets: A Japanese View on the « European Enterprise » » in H. Schröter, *op. cit.*, p. 51-63.
- Lebovics H, (1991) « Assimilation ou respect des différences ? La colonisation au Vietnam, 1920-1930 », *Revue Gèneses. Sciences sociales et histoire*, dossier « Le National », n°4, mai, p. 23-43.
- Lemonnier P. (1986), « The Study of Material Culture Today: Toward an Anthropology of Technical Systems », *Journal of Anthropological Archeology*, 5, p. 147 – 186.
- Levi-Strauss C. (1976), *Structural Anthropology*, vol II, Basic Books, New York, 440 p.
- Macharazina K., in H. Schröter H. (ed.) (2008), *The European Enterprise. Historical Investigation into a Future Species*, Berlin, Springer.
- Marsden D. (2002), « Indigeneous management and the management of indigeneous knowledge », in Wright S.(ed.), *Anthropology of Organizations*, London, Routledge, 1994, reed 2002, p. 41-55.
- McKenna C. (2006), *The World's Newest Profession: Management Consulting in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 394p.
- Noiriel G. (1991), « la question nationale comme objet d'histoire sociale », *Génèse, op. cit.*, p.72-94.
- Persson K.-G. (1999). *Grain Markets in Europe, 1500–1900: Integration and Deregulation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Puig N. (2003), "Educating Spanish Managers: the United States, Modernizing Networks, and Business Schools in Spain, 1950-1975," in R. Petter Amdam, R. d Kvålshaugen, and E. Larsen (eds.) *Inside the Business School: The Content of Management Education*, Oslo.
- Puig N. and Álvaro A. (2003), « International Aid and National Entrepreneurship: A Comparative Analysis of Pro-American Business Networks in Southern Europe, 1950-1975 », *BHC On Line*, Vol.1.
- Schachter G. and Engelbourg S. (2005) *Cultural Continuity in Advanced Economies: Britain and the US versus Continental Europe*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 367 p.

Schein E. (2016), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 5th ed, Wiley, 464 p.

Schröter H. (ed.) (2008), *The European Enterprise. Historical Investigation into a Future Species*, Berlin, Springer, 297 p.

Schwarzkopf S. (2009) « What Was Advertising? The Invention, Rise, Demise, and Disappearance of Advertising Concepts in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe and America » *BHC On Line*, Vol 7.

Shalins M. (1999), « Two or three things that I know about Culture », *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Sept.), pp. 399-421

Wenger E. (1998), *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, Cambridge University Press, 336 p.