Against « shared values »: Towards an inclusive definition of Organizational Culture valuing *gaps* and *deviations*

Bousalham, Youcef

Université de Rouen

Youcef.bousalham@univ-rouen.fr

Abstract :

This article questions the powerful call to conformity that hides behind the simple and apparently humanistic idea of "shared values" within contemporary organizations, as well as the tacit modalities that, in managerial discourse, determine a member's "belonging" to his or her company, his or her loyalty to the organization.

We ask the following question: might it be possible to envisage an alternative concept to that of organizational values, one that would allow organizational culture in management sciences to be thought of in terms that are inclusive, pluralistic, reflexive and performative? This paper argues that the philosophy of François Jullien can prove particularly fruitful for rethinking the way we construe organizational culture in management. Jullien (2008, 2012, 2016) uses the philosophical and political concept of *cultural resources* to challenge totalizing academic and political discourses wherein national culture and identity are reduced to a sum of "shared values".

This article attempts to provide researchers, employees and reflexive managers with a critical and performative approach to organizational culture. An approach which values what Jullien calls *cultural gaps*, enabling members of a given culture/organization to challenge/deviate from the implicit norms, thereby fostering their existential capacity. Valuing gaps and deviations as positive and creative by no longer turning them into elements of exclusion of « poorly acculturated » subjects, but, on the contrary, into a fruitful ingredient of the collective future, effectively summons the "members" of an organization, to develop their existential capacity and to belong to the group not only by conformity but also by disadherence. (Jullien, 2016: 61).

From a theoretical standpoint, harnessing the concept of cultural resources in organization theory also enables us to eschew a limitation at the heart of *Critical Studies on Organizational Culture* (CSOC). In this regard, we suggest that the concept of *cultural resources* offers the possibility of developing a CSOC approach which is more in line with recent proposals on critical performativity, especially in favor of alternative organizations (Parker and Parker, 2017).

Keywords: F. Jullien, Organizational Culture, Shared Values, Critical Performativity, Diversity/Inclusion

Against « shared values »: Towards an inclusive definition of Organizational Culture valuing *gaps* and *deviations*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate how the philosophy of François Jullien can prove particularly fruitful for rethinking the way we construe organizational culture in management. Jullien, a French philosopher, Hellenist and Sinologist, has a philosophical approach based on (or is at the crossroads of) Chinese and European philosophy. Harnessing the concept of cultural resources from Chinese philosophy enables him, for example, to revisit European ontology, by deconstructing it from the outside, and so to appreciate more fully its influence on the ways in which we approach areas as varied as strategy, ethics and aesthetics. In particular, through the lens of Chinese philosophy, the work of this author opens the way to challenging notions of efficiency, strategy and power in organizational theory (Jullien, 1997).

In this paper, we focus more specifically on Jullien's way of examining the universal within and among human groups, which we propose to apply to the field of organizational culture in organizational theory. Through his critique of the notion of cultural identity – a critique directed as much at a certain academic and anthropological philosophy as at political discourses that exalt national identity – Jullien invites us to appreciate that the culture of a human group should never be construed as a sum of fixed traits or identity values – which produce uniformity – but rather as *resources* and that the *gaps* therein revealed can be utilized to *promote a common intelligence* that is both plural and dynamic.

Of particular interest to this present study is the heuristic and performative potential of the notion of "cultural resources" as developed by Jullien (2008, 2012, 2016), that we present as an alternative concept to that of "shared values" which is widely used in works on

organizational culture in management. The concept has mainstream works, both those that are classics[1] and those that are more recent[2], together with the proponents of cultural and national identity, view the culture of an organization as pure, objective and identity-based values, unanimously shared throughout organization. These are historical values, whether inherited from the founders (some of this literature even speaks of "high priests" or "ancestors"), or disseminated by leaders/managers, then absorbed more or less consciously by the employees who are members of the group, and in turn passed on to or "inculcated" to those who aspire to become members.

The notion of cultural resources as developed by Jullien (2008, 2012, 2016) has both an intellectual and a political dimension[i]. Applied to organizational theory, this notion can be seen as a continuation of (and a contribution to) a whole body of critical studies on organizational culture (CSOC). This critical and anti-performative literature on organizational culture very soon aligned itself with challenging, or even deconstructing, mainstream understanding of culture in terms of shared values, without, however, offering any "actionable" conceptual alternative. This poses the question: might it be possible to envisage an alternative concept to that of organizational values, one that would allow culture in management sciences to be thought of in terms that are both reflexive and pluralistic? Moreover, might it be conceivable – without falling into the normative trap of *mainstream "cultural engineering"* recipes – to contemplate a potentially performative concept which, because it goes above and beyond academia, is likely to impact the reality of practitioners who are looking for conceptual alternatives that are not only reflexive, but also "actionable"?

This paper supports the idea that the concept of cultural resources, provided it is imported into organizational theory in a creative way, may constitute such an alternative. A recent proposition (Parker and Parker, 2017) suggests that an agonist and creative way for CMS to escape the alternative between being 'for' and being 'against' performativity is to make a clear choice about the organizations and organizing we support as CMS and actively engage in favor of alternatives. We suggest that a critical and performative approach of the concept of organizational culture, a concept traditionally dismissed by critters because of its use and abuses

[1] For example, the works of Deal & Kennedy, 1984; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985/2010, etc.
[2] See Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Mrisha et. al., 2017; Warrick, 2017, etc.

in mainstream studies, could greatly benefit those "other" modes of organizing whenever it is a case of maintaining, transmitting or prolonging the historical principles they defend so vigorously (solidarity, organizational democracy, mutualism, etc.) and which differentiate them from traditional capitalistic organizations (Cheney et al., 2014; Parker et al., 2014; Parker, 2002).

This paper is structured in the following way. First, we offer an overview of existing mainstream works that define organizational culture in terms of shared and identity-based values; secondly, we present CSOC, a body of critical literature that challenges this reductive acceptance of the notion of a group's culture. Thirdly, we present our proposal of importation of the original notion of *cultural resources*, with particular emphasis on its pluralistic, reflexive and performative properties.

By way of conclusion, the paper establishes the conceptual link between the notion of cultural resources and existing literature on critical performativity in favor of alternative organizations. Finally, we will explore the practical opportunity this novel approach offers for making room for employees and managers within our organizations who are less "acculturated", less "corporatist", but more reflexive and citizen-oriented. They would be actors who belong to the group but able, through deviations and as proof of their belonging, to question the group's choices, its values and its shared self-evident truths and beliefs.

1. A MAINSTREAM AND INSTRUMENTAL UNDERSTANDING OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN TERMS OF IDENTITY VALUES

The concept of organizational culture became a key notion in the early 1980s. A series of books – among the best-selling in the history of management – drawing on the success of Japanese organizations, proposed Western companies seeking excellence should build "shared values". These values are what would ultimately constitute the "soul" of the company and would enable it to develop a "strong identity" (Archier & Serieyx, 1984; Deal & Kennedy, 1984; Ouchi, 1981; Peters & Waterman 1982; &). "Culture", as a somewhat abstract concept borrowed from anthropology, is thereby transformed into a technical management tool, formulated in terms of strong identity (1.1), values that are actionable or "manageable" (1.2). Moreover, these are positive and objective values, that founders, leaders and senior managers must know how to formulate and pass on to all members of the organization (1.3).

1.1 "STRONG", "CLEAR" AND "THE RIGHT SORT OF" VALUES

According to this approach, values define culture and are the fundamental driving force behind what companies do and how they seek to perpetuate their identity (Claude & Wellhoff, 2011). They represent a system of thought and interpretation that guides members towards what are considered the right behaviors: *"Values are the bedrock of any corporate culture. As the essence of a company's philosophy for achieving success, values provide a sense of common direction for all employees and guidelines for their day-to-day behavior. (...) In fact, we think that often companies succeed because their employees can identify, embrace, and act on the values of the organization.* (Deal & Kennedy, 1984: 21). Values constitute the social glue of the company. They must be "clear" or "strong", foster the emergence of a "consensus" and be adopted by all the members of the group: "*If they are strong, they command every one's attention: 'What people really care about around here is quality.' If they are weak, they may often be ignored"* (Deal & Kennedy, 1984: 21).

Consequently, in order to perform well, companies must own these strong values and inculcate them in their employees: "In fact, we wonder if it is even possible to be an exemplary company without clear values *"In fact we wonder whether it is possible to be an excellent company without clarity on values and without having the right sorts of values."* (Peters & Waterman, 1982: 279). Consensus and conformity with the corporate values and ways of thinking valued within the organization are essential here. Whenever differences of interpretation arise among members of an organization, this is indicative of a lack of culture or a culture that is "too weak": *"(...) It does not make sense, therefore, to think about high or low consensus cultures, or cultures of ambiguity or conflict. If there is no consensus or if things are ambiguous, then, by definition, that group does not have a culture with regard to those things"* (Schein, 1991: 247-248).

1.2 "SHARED VALUES": A SIMPLE CONCEPT THAT TURNS CULTURE INTO AN ACTIONABLE LEVER BY MANAGEMENT

The concept of values rapidly became unavoidable in defining organizational culture because it is an "actionable" concept, that responds to a managerial demand; a concept that "speaks" to

players and enables them to establish a link between the notion of culture and the needs of management (Alvesson, 1990a).

In management theory, it is by means of the concept of values that the relatively abstract anthropological notion of culture (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Smircich, 1983) becomes more "manageable" (Alvesson, 2002). In these terms, then, culture is a tool that belongs to the management side, and the benefits of this vague anthropological concept, imported into management sciences, become closely tied to a concern for technical efficiency: "*Culture is relevant for management if – and only if – it increases its chances of efficiency"* (Thévenet 1993: 12). This is because shared values are simple, easily remembered ideas that can be repeated, re-enacted, at every major meeting, and materialized in a code of conduct that can easily be pinned on company walls (Deal & Kennedy, 1984: 23; Delavallé, 2009; Schein, 1985). These values express, more or less clearly, the behavior, way of thinking and acting within the group that is considered appropriate. Values, therefore, become a new normative management tool which permit a level of control over the members of the organization, guiding them towards common aims and objectives, and this more effectively than Taylorian rationalization or administrative and bureaucratic control, which in all events were beginning to show their operational limitations,

The link between the values and the leaders/managers becomes crucial, and the ability of the latter to develop and disseminate the former, becomes the principal role for managers: *"In fact, shaping and enhancing values can become the most important job a manager can do."* (Deal & Kennedy, 1984: 23). How this influenced what was seen as the role of corporate management is particularly illuminating in this regard. They should abandon all technical or functional involvement, in order to focus on their position as "corporate heroes" (Deal & Kennedy, 1984: 21). The role of directors becomes akin to that of corporate "gurus" or management "gods" (Handy, 1996): " *Excellent companies seem to have developed cultures that have incorporated the values and practices of great leaders, and thus those shared values can be seen to survive for decades after the passing of the original guru (...) the true role of the leader is to administer the values of the organization* (Peters & Waterman 1982: 45).

In academia, it was Schein's (1985) model that elaborately established the idea of there being a direct link between values, culture and leadership. He explains that culture consists of three "levels" or "cultural stages": artifacts; values; and fundamental beliefs. The same work argues it is by leveraging the intermediate level values that the founders and leaders of the organization

can establish new fundamental beliefs and have a profound influence on the ways of thinking and acting within the organization. This characteristic of values being actionable by leaders/entrepreneurs and their role as "architects of culture" is, moreover, a key point of this author's theoretical proposal in the revised edition (2010) of his book: *"I will continue to argue (1) that leaders as entrepreneurs are the main architects of culture, (2) that after cultures are formed, they influence what kind of leadership is possible, and (3) that if elements of the culture become dysfunctional, leadership can and must do something to speed up culture change."* (Schein, 2010: xi).

In essence, therefore, culture is materialized in terms of shared values, and it is the responsibility of founders, leaders and managers to shape these values, to ensure they are "shared" and, whenever the need arises, to "change" them.

1.3 "REAL" VALUES, THAT ARE OBJECTIVE, OBSERVABLE AND "AUDITABLE"

"Exploiting" culture as a new management tool implies being able to fully grasp and formalize it in relatively simple terms – but is this something that can be achieved? Anthropological standards in this area are very demanding and require an extensive and painstaking work of immersion in the field and subsequent monographic description. It seems difficult to reconcile such a thorough approach with the immediacy of the concern for efficiency and managerial instrumentalization of culture. This led to the emergence of survival guides (Schein, 1999), diagnostic tools (Wilkins, 1983) and even corporate culture audits (Thévenet, 1986) – bearing no resemblance at all to the imposing Malinowski-style ethnographic monographs –, offering consultants and managers methods for apprehending and describing culture, together with measurement tools for researchers (Ashkanasy et al., 2000).

These methods for cultural analysis are very revealing. First of all, they share the assumption that culture can be formulated in terms of: shared values (Ashkanasy et al., 2000: 135); values that are objectively observable, and sometimes even quantifiable (Cameron & Quinn, 1999) by means of items and variables; and that the same terms can be used to describe all these. Some of the literature even suggest the culture of a firm can even be graphically represented on a two-dimensional matrix (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Zammuto et al., 2000). Such audit and diagnostic tools make it possible to draw up a sum of values that "must be formulated in a positive way" (Schein, 1999: 68) and "in line with the needs of the organization" as defined by the decision-making leaders (Schein, 1999: 68) : *Not only the articulation of values but also the content of*

those values, and probably the way they are said, makes the difference'." (Peters & Waterman, 1982: 279).

Combined into a code of conduct displayed on the walls of the company, these values should not exceed four to six per code to avoid the message being too complex (Delavallé, 2009). These are sometimes accompanied by corresponding "expected behaviors", which, in turn, should not exceed four to six for each value (Delavallé, 2009). Thanks to the idea of shared values, a written code of conduct and expected behaviors, culture becomes something concrete which management can use, and it provides them with a vehicle for stating objectively the right way of thinking and acting within the organization: *"At this stage, we are able to present an open-ended set of shared references (...). Culture takes on a concrete tone."* (Thévenet, 2003: 79).

In summary, then, according to the perspective we have just presented, culture assumes a concrete form by means of strong, shared, objective and positive identity values. These are inherited from the organization's ancestors, founders and heroes. These values are actionable, can be leveraged by management, they give the group a strong identity and are passed on to new members.

2. A CRITICAL AND ANTI-PERFORMATIVE UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURE THAT REJECTS THE IDEA OF SHARED VALUES... WITHOUT PROPOSING AN "ACTIONABLE" CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVE.

Alongside this mainstream work, a whole body of critical literature has been developed that offers a critical and dissenting understanding of the concept of culture. Under the broad title of Critical Studies on Organizational Culture (CSOC), this current advocates for a form of anti-performativity characteristic of Critical Management Studies (Fournier & Grey, 2000), a line of research with which CSOC align themselves and which, in historical fact, they helped to establish.

A relative distrust of the idea of values and cultural management in organizations pervades CSOC (Frost et al., 1985, 1991, Martin et al., 1985). Their understanding of the concept of culture is due in part to the historical and contextual need to moderate or even "deconstruct" the excessive engineering and cultural identity proposals of mainstream works (Meyerson, 1991a & b). This movement is driven by the desire to relativize, or even challenge,

instrumental proposals for cultural management and engineering that emerged as from the early 1980s. Indeed, CSOC challenge the hegemony and "false neutrality" of mainstream works in the field of culture, and set out to deconstruct it (Martin, 1990) by highlighting its implicit functionalist logic (Alvesson 1990a; Willmott 1993).

This plurality of critical works on culture offers a vigorous response to proposals that present culture as a potential lever for cohesion (Peters & Waterman, 1982), involvement (Thévenet, 1992), change (Cameron & Quinn, 1999) and clan control (Ouchi, 1980). CSOC see these technical and managerial proposals as a new normative attempt at "mind control" (Knights & Willmott 1993, 1995; Ray, 1986), or "cultural engineering" (Kunda 1992/2006; Barley & Kunda, 1992).

Consequently, while the majority of definitions of culture in mainstream literature suggest using the idea of shared identity values, CSOC adopt a defiantly critical stance towards excessive ideas of shared values (Jermier et al., 1991; Martin 1992). In their view, these values are largely superficial, manipulated (Alvesson 1990a, Alvesson & Svenigsson, 2008; Willmott, 1993) and propagated by the dominant sub-groups of leaders backed-up by "mercenary" consultants (Alvesson 1990a).

The concept of values, therefore, should be regarded as devoid of any substance (Alvesson, 1990b) and merely part of a vacuous managerial rhetoric (Spicer, 2013) that promotes a form of "functional stupidity" among employees. It contributes to a curtailment of their autonomy by annihilating any form of reflexive and critical questioning on their part (Alvesson & Spicer 2012, 2016). For example, the systematic reference to shared values obscures, or at the very least fails to capture adequately, the extent to which groups with divergent interests within the same organization develop their own subcultures for handling relationships of power and opposition (Jermier et al., 1991; Van Maanen, 1991).

Moreover, these shared values fail to address the inconsistencies, tensions, contradictions and plurality of interpretations found in actual managerial practices at different hierarchical levels of the organization (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2008; Martin 2002). Most CSOC agree that culture should be seen more as the evolving fruit of a process of collective bargaining and of tension, rather than in terms of fixed identity values (Knights & Willmott 1993; Ogbor, 2001).

We have pointed out that CSOC, unlike technical research on culture, are overtly anti-performative. Such studies address a limited audience of critical researchers and are seldom

taken up by management practitioners (Spicer et al., 2018). Of course, whereas managers can quite easily (re)cite their company's values, it is more difficult to make sense of the relatively abstract recommendations of CSOC (e.g., not *reifying*, *essentializing*, *unifying*, *idealizing*, *consensualizing*, *totalizing*, *otherizing* culture (Alvesson, 2002: 186) and how they could impact their concrete practices. From this point of view, the anti-performative character and unilateral critique generally found in CSOC gives them, in a way, an unfinished, unfulfilled character (Spicer et al., 2009). This is a shortcoming that we hope to mitigate by leveraging the concept of *cultural resources* from within CSOC.

3. A REFLEXIVE, PLURALISTIC AND PERFORMATIVE UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURE: FOR A PLURALITY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES, WHICH CONVEY MEANING WITHIN AN ORGANIZATION

We agree with most of the criticisms leveled by CSOC and, while we recognize the contextual need for such an intellectual position, we think it important to think of ways to move beyond their anti-performative bias. To this end, we propose to adapt the notion of "cultural resources" as developed by Jullien. In our opinion this concept enables us both to defend the critique raised by CSOC and at the same time it offers an alternative to the concept of organizational values in management that is reflexive, pluralistic and performative.

It is important to note that the philosopher himself does not give a formal definition of the concept of cultural resources. This concept is heuristic and generative, meant to be thought provoking. However, if challenged to offer a broad outline of its scope in order to apply it to organizational theory, we dare suggest cultural resources could be described as: artifacts, ideological themes and/or anthropological objects that – although they are part of an organizational history, or a tradition (what Jullien calls a *milieu*) – are nourished by deviations (deviations from the norm, from members of the collective, from "other" groups and "other" cultures), and as a result establish a dynamic, pluralistic "common ground" which is both shared by the group and in a state of tension.

Unlike values, such cultural resources are not imposed, nor are they exclusive. They are not "inherited" from the founders and "do not belong" to managers nor to employees. On the contrary, they constitute "a field of shared intelligence" and are "available" to each of the

members of an organization. These members, as part of a reflexive and democratic deliberation process can choose whether or not they want to *activate* and *deploy* specific cultural resources. As we can see, this concept enables us to develop an understanding of organizational culture that is not only original, but also at the opposite end of the spectrum from the idea of identity values. As such, it is a concept that provides an interesting entry point to Jullien's philosophy treatment of the *gap* (*écart*) and the *in-between (entre)*.

Certainly, the notion of cultural resources calls for a more tolerant and reflexive understanding of the idea of culture, but also, we believe, one that is better suited to the empirical complexity of contemporary organizations. We will explore the dimensions of this concept that, in our opinion, are the most relevant for our particular field of study, that is its pluralistic, reflexive and performative properties. Because Jullien's work is both abstruse – he himself describes it as "oblique" – and seldom applied to organizational theory, when presenting each of the three axioms derived from the concepts we borrow from him in the subsequent paragraphs, we have chosen to quote him abundantly.

3.1 A PLURALISTIC AND DYNAMIC CONCEPT OF CULTURE THAT TOLERATES TENSIONS AND IS NOURISHED BY DEVIATIONS

According to a mainstream understanding, the spontaneous adherence to strong identity values is what makes culture; it is conformity to more or less explicit norms on the one hand, and compliance with "accepted" or "expected" behavior on the other. The effect is to reduce divergences between actors, forge cohesion and establishes a collective of people who work together efficiently. This dual movement of adherence and conformity is much valued in managerial literature on culture (Alvesson, 2002). The notion of cultural resources, on the contrary, invites us to consider that what makes a society, i.e., deploys it, enables it to grow and shapes it, is its capacity to allow simultaneously for both gaps/deviations from and adherence to the norm; for both dissimilitude and shared commonality; for both resistance and conformity. Jullien explains "*the con-sistency of a society is its capacity for gaps and for shared commonality: a shared communality from within which gaps are deployed and create tension, making it active and productive, preventing it from being entrenched in a norm and from atrophy, ultimately driving it to renewal."* (Jullien, 2016: 75). For, unlike values, cultural

resources leave room for heterogeneity within any given culture, something Jullien describes as its "internal heterotopia" (see Coblence and Servant, 2017).

This heterogeneity is characterized by *gaps*: from the in-group; from its social norms; from its more or less insidious demand for conformity; and from identification with its founders, its heroes... its ancestors. However, such gaps should not be construed as separative in a definitive way. In Jullien's philosophy, this vocabulary is used to signify a distance that opens up, or as the philosopher puts it himself a *gap*, an *in-between*, an interstice that connects, *contrasts* or *sets up a tension between what is separated* (Jullien, 2016: 67). For Jullien, cultural gaps should therefore be seen as openings enabling new links to be made – connections whether between thoughts or individuals – through the development of new resources[3].

It is from this perspective that the author invites us, for example, to consider anew the traditional opposition between the thoughts of Plato and Aristotle, which should no longer be viewed as fostering inherent antinomic differences, but rather as a productive gap that activates and nourishes, setting up a tension between these two philosophies: *"What interests us is not how Aristotle's philosophy differs from that of Plato: this leads to placing them in what becomes a closed system and assigning each to their own pigeonhole (Platonism or Aristotelianism). Rather, what is important – is significant – is in what way Aristotle opens a gap vis-à-vis Plato: how he attempts to open a dissident breach vis-à-vis that which resists Aristotle's thought. In other words, opens new avenues to the unthought. In so doing, Aristotle's philosophy re- sets Plato's philosophy in tension, instead of letting it sink into the platitudes and clichés of Platonism; makes it emerge anew from its distanced point of view, brings it into sharper relief: opens up an in-between where they dialogue with each other. The more gaps open up vis-à-vis Plato, then the more of a resource Plato becomes, and the more this philosophy is activated. What is a library of philosophy, after all, but the juxtaposition of countless gaps unfolding and indefinitely deploying what is thinkable by re-setting thoughts in tension?* (Jullien, 2016: 68-69).

[3] On this topic, see: Jullien (2012) *L'écart et l'entre. Leçon inaugurale de la Chaire sur l'altérité, [The gap and the in-between. Inaugural lecture of the Chair on Otherness];* Jullien (2008) *De l'universel, de l'uniforme, du commun et du dialogue entre les cultures [On the universal, the uniform, the common and the dialogue between cultures]* and Jullien 2018, *Si près, tout autre: de l'écart et de la rencontre* [*So Close, So "Other": Gap and Encounter].*

This idea of gaps and tension in Jullien's work does not exclude – something particularly interesting considering the *mainstream* definitions of organizational culture in management – a form of active resistance or dissidence by the members of an organization. However, this is not seen here as a lack of culture – or acculturation – but rather, in a positive and initiating way. Indeed, these features are evidence of a culture's vitality: "*The characteristic of what is cultural is that it unfolds in this tension – or gap (...) in short, there is no dominant culture without the corollary – and immediate – emergence of a dissident culture (underground, etc.). Indeed, of what else is 'culture' the result, if not precisely this tension of difference produced by gaps, which obliges the culture to work and so be in constant mutation?*" (Jullien, 2016: 44-45). Cultural tensions or gaps give body to the social group and make it evolve, they make the interactions and ways of thinking of its members fruitful. "*They pull culture out of the rut of tradition, ideas out of the comfort of dogmatism – its own right-thinking – and re-engage the mind in an adventure"* (Jullien, 2016: 67). These cultural gaps are outpourings of individual and collective intelligence which, from within, open up new possibilities and allow for new creative ways of articulating thought and action.

Accepting or valuing cultural gaps within our organizations as the very ingredients of their future, rather than as deviances, means allowing players to depart from norms, to go off the beaten path of conventional opinion, to distance themselves from what is accepted and agreed upon (Jullien, 2016: 68). From this point of view, what gives body and intensity to a culture is neither the intrinsic strength of the values converted into slogans, nor the vehemence with which these values are proclaimed or defended, nor their being formulated in codes of conduct in magnified, positive terms. Rather, it is the continuous process of setting gaps in tension that constitutes culture and breathe life into it. Somewhat counter-intuitively, it is these gaps that "generate" what is common, namely a living, dynamic culture, enabling it to be deployed "from within", to have meaning for its members and to intensify.

This is an original understanding of culture that contrasts with the idea of shared values and of cultural identity, and potentially opens the way to a better understanding of the plurality of contradictory interpretations that characterize and transform contemporary organizations. This is a notion that invites to consider, along with homogeneity, the socio-anthropological phenomena that are all too often dismissed in management research – contradictions, resistance, deviations from the norm, ambiguity, the subcultures, countercultures. It leads us to view these

positive, or even potentially "culture-creating", rather than considering them, as does mainstream work on culture, as marginal phenomena and so as characteristic of an absence of organizational culture (Schein, 1990) or of a *weak culture* (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). It should be noted that this pluralistic understanding in terms of cultural resources also implies a dynamic vision of organizational culture that contrasts with the static definition often found in the management of immutable, sacrosanct values needing to be defended from any form of change. If culture is conceived as the product of a dynamic tension between gaps and what is common within a group, a society, an organization, then there is no other way of thinking of it except as a perpetual movement of *transformation*[4]: *"A culture that ceases to evolve is a dead culture (just as when we speak of a dead language, a language that, because it is no longer spoken, no longer evolves)."* (Jullien, 2016: 45).

This idea of cultural resources that are the product of a tension between gaps and what is common also means we are also able to rid ourselves of the binary and ultimately less than credible vision according to which culture means a total and exclusive identity-based adhesion of members of an organization to its value system. This because, as distinct from values, cultural resources are not built on an exclusive system of thought. Instead, rather than excluding one another and canceling each other out, cultural resources can *accumulate* or make for creative articulation and in so doing invite players to realize how cultures and systems of thought that are far apart, developed in distinct, far-removed *environments*, can interrelate fruitfully and creatively whenever they are viewed as resources rather than as totems, as roots for a shared identity.

Jullien offers a particularly relevant example of the intellectual resources which, in Western civilization, and particularly in France, emerge from the tension between atheist and Christian resources, provided that the latter are not seen as "roots": "…*If I adhere to 'Christian values', then I would find it difficult to adhere to atheist values; if I were to do so it would be the fruit of a compromise. Resources, however, are not mutually exclusive: I can benefit from both equally. (...) And so, I prefer to speak of Christian resources rather than the all-too-often quoted Christian 'roots'. The 'root' image is open to suspicion, as indeed is any metaphorical representation of culture through nature: saying 'root' diverts us from its historical representation. As a result, it makes us forget how Christianity has been compromised*

[4] See also Jullien (2009) on the concept of *silent transformations*.

throughout history whenever it was used in service of the dominant ideology, once it became the state religion of 'Catholic France', unified in its dogmas and in its politics, no longer tolerating any gaps ('one king, one law, one faith'). So, of what interest to non-Christian are 'Christian roots' or Christian values? Yet on the other hand, it seems absolutely elementary to me that there are resources in Christianity to be explored and exploited. It is high time to approach Christianity outwith the believer/non-believer divide, (...) *to take into account how Christianity has promoted the human person – but not in a way that would reduce this in a facile way to its merely 'anthropological' content (in the manner of a Feuerbach); but rather to consider it as a resource that contributes to the existential promotion of the subject."* (Jullien, 2016: 65-66)

This extensive quote reflects the fertility of this way of thinking for cultural thinking, now not in terms of exclusive, reflexive adherence to values, but rather as gaps and setting plural resources in reflexive tension. The example may seem far removed from our management science concerns. However, the pluralistic propensity of cultural resources may well prove particularly interesting for a more detailed understanding of the empirical complexity of contemporary organizations that are often confronted with problems of "cultural tensions" linked to the contradictory, even irreconcilable nature of the ideological references that run through them (Bousalham, 2017).

As evidenced in this discussion, the idea of cultural resources, relying on the inventive power of the gap, offers a pluralistic and dynamic perspective of value for management, within which the tensions in relation to norms and the group of people which comprise the organization, the micro-resistance on the part of individuals and their creative dissidence, all generate an intensive, vivacious common ground, enabling the organization to deploy a pluralistic and authentic culture. However, cultural resources possess other properties that make them interesting for the cultural analysis of organizations. They can be conceived of as "operational" conceptual themes, stimulating both the reflexivity and the operational intelligence of the actors.

3.2 A REFLEXIVE UNDERSTANDING THAT CALLS FOR A COLLECTIVE AND PERFORMATIVE ACTIVATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

In addition to the pluralistic and dynamic dimensions already mentioned, the idea of cultural resources as developed by Jullien does indeed have a "performative" scope that potentially goes

beyond its purely academic or intellectual appeal. Resources, then, are not only the objects of a fine anthropological understanding, but they also seem able to constitute an "actionable" and reflexive medium for practitioners. Is not their very title an invitation to consider culture as being made up of resources available to players? Jullien (2016) explains specifically that to defend resources is not to protect them (as in the case of values) but rather to activate them *consciously*. In the organizational framework, this could be an invitation to creativity on the part of its members, in a democratic, quasi-civic approach to activating a "*field of shared intelligence*"; something that both makes sense for the collective and can be activated and even "defended". It is an approach, in our opinion, that is compatible with an approach to management that is both critical and performative.

By "auditing" or describing the cultures of organizations – as we too often do in management – as a sum of strong identity values, we leave ourselves open to the risk of reducing them to banalities and slogans. There is ample evidence of this phenomenon in the codes of conduct and value statements of our major companies, which all display the same values of *quality, excellence, respect for the customer*, etc. These insidiously lead players either to postulate an unintelligent and almost unconscious adherence to the "company values", or to be content with a superficial conformity to "expected behaviors": behaviors that can be evaluated, according to a grid, during yearly performance appraisal interviews. In the latter case, values have no real use other than helping "flexible" employees to build their careers by maximizing their efforts towards a pious conformity to the proclaimed values and behaviors expected of them by their managers and executives (Jackall, 1988; Kunda, 2002). As we have seen, the views that dominate research on organizational culture often give the latter a predominant and almost exclusive role as creators, guarantors and transmitters of cultural values (Barley & Kunda, 1992: 383; Smircich, 1985: 62).

Whereas values "belong", are defined, "are preached" and call for conformity, cultural resources are the outcome of a reflexive activation, debated and co-constructed by members. These resources develop and emerge from a relatively specific environment, an organizational trajectory, a "milieu". However, they do not "belong": they belong neither to the elders, nor the leaders, the founders, nor even to the employees. They are to be inventoried, to be exploited and are available to everyone. They can be activated and sustained by and for those who take

the trouble to mobilize[5] them. *Defending* one's culture from this perspective is an opportunity for the collective – and in a certain sense as an ethical and civic duty incumbent upon the collective – to question the cultural resources at its disposal, to decide those which it wishes to activate consciously in a reflexive process of formulating and shaping meaning.

This involves a demanding process of "*dia-logue"* and collective reflexion, about whose practical details nothing is said by the philosopher, but when applied to organizations, seems to involve all the members of an organization in a process of critical examination of the very purposes of their existence. In such a context, the group is called to a collective, deliberated and "conscious" activation of cultural themes and resources that are no longer axiomatic for the group about "who we are" or "what we ought to do" in order to belong to the group, which is precisely what values do. Thinking of organizational culture in these terms, therefore, means considering it in a way that is both reflexive and performative (but not instrumental), more from the standpoint of a philosopher-anthropologist rather than that of a leader-manager. It means giving back to each and every one of the members, whatever their hierarchical rank, the anthropological prerogative that their condition as social individuals already confers on them *de facto*; namely, that of contributing, even if only in the smallest way, to acting upon and changing the culture of the group of which they are a member.

The discussion implied by this active participation needs to happen in a reflexive and collective manner. Because discussing collective themes and accepting gaps in thinking within the group means inviting its members to question collectively what they view collectively as making sense for them as a group, through open and free discussion. It also means assuming the freedom that is theirs to question current value charters and admitting collectively that the major values to which the organization lays claim and to which it claims to adhere may be empty signifiers. When applied to the corporate sphere, the practical form of "dia-logue" that Jullien advocates cannot happen without a continuous, persevering, persistent examination of the forms of congruence between the ideals of social responsibility claimed by the organization and the

[5] This is, moreover, what Jullien himself does when he mobilizes the cultural resources of Chinese philosophy, which is not "his own", to re-think his Western culture "from outside". On this topic, see Jullien and Marchaisse (2000), *Penser d'un dehors (La Chine*) [Thinking from outside (China)], or Marchaisse (2003) dir, *Dépayser la pensée. Dialogues hétérotopiques avec François Jullien sur son usage philosophique de la Chine. [On otherizing thought. Heterotopic dialogues with François Julien on his use of Chinese philosophy]*

actual practices that its employees develop and implement daily at the different managerial and operational levels of the company.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

We started this article by posing question: might it be possible to envisage an alternative concept to that of organizational values, one that would allow culture in management sciences to be thought of in terms that are reflexive, pluralistic and performative? We have presented a *mainstream*, instrumental and dominant understanding of organizational culture in management and shown how the latter, by defining itself in terms of shared values, ultimately proposes an identity-based and exclusive vision, somewhat similar to that of the proponents of cultural identity at the national level. We then discussed a body of critical research, CSOC, which questions the idea of definitive, reified values actionable by managers for defining the culture of an organization. This research criticizes any instrumental mobilization of culture and calls instead for greater reflexivity, pluralism, denaturalization and democratic deliberation when it comes to defining the content of the principles that guide the collective action of a human entity. CSOC belong to a critical current that is openly anti-performative and therefore does not aim to formulate an actionable concept that would serve as an alternative to that of values and that would be consistent with both a critical and yet performative approach to management. In this context, we introduced the concept of cultural resources and discussed its properties as pluralistic, dynamic, reflexive and potentially "actionable".

From a conceptual point of view, we argue that this notion of cultural resources seems to enable us to establish a link between two fields of research which, until now, have hitherto remained separate: the idea of critical performativity (Cabantous et al., 2015; Spicer et al. 2009, 2016; Parker and Parker, 2018) and organizational culture. The call for Critical Management Studies to become more performative and actively and subversively intervene in managerial discourse and practices has triggered interesting debates among critical scholars themselves creating an antagonism between "pros and against" critical performativity (Parker and Parker, 2017). The field of organizational culture is characteristic in particular of the critique formulated by Spicer et al. (2009) with regard to CMS. In their efforts to resist proposals for values management, to reveal its implications and to deconstruct its instrumental logic, CSOC have not sought to develop a positive alternative concept that would enable us, while maintaining a critical

outlook, to think about culture in more pluralistic, reflexive and performative terms. The most enterprising CSOC to have tackled this have limited themselves to providing broad warnings, advice or recommendations, directed primarily to researchers, on what to do and what not to do in thinking about organizations in cultural and reflexive terms. Alvesson (2002), for example, invites us to eschew the *seven traps (*or *sins* as described by Alvesson, 2002: 186) which consist in *reifying*, *essentializing*, *unifying*, *idealizing*, *consensualizing*, *totalizing* and *otherizing* culture. Other similar recommendations suggest: 1. focusing cultural study on a specific event, situation, action or process; 2. understanding culture as a network of meanings and interpretations, 3. understanding culture as perpetual becoming, 4. understanding culture as subject to variations and contradictions, and 5. understanding culture in terms of power dynamics being a determining explanatory force (Alvesson, 2002; Alvesson & Svenigsson, 2008). It must be acknowledged that these recommendations are intellectually appealing and consistent with the content of CSOC, inviting researchers to yet more reflexivity and to take better account of the power dynamics at play in organizations.

However, they fail to offer an original proposal as to how to stimulate the creativity of reflexive practitioners and to open up the possibility of other ways of thinking about culture within organizations, without delimiting it to a set of definitive, exclusive and reified values, which would be the sole prerogative of senior managers. A recent proposition (Parker and Parker, 2017) suggests that an *agonist* and creative way for CMS to escape the alternative between being 'for' and being 'against' performativity is to make a clear choice about the organizations and organizing we support as CMS and actively engage in favor of *alternatives*.

It is interesting to note that a significant number of research have recently confirmed the existence of specific *cultural tensions* faced by alternative organizations whenever it is a case of maintaining, transmitting or prolonging the historical values they defend so vigorously (solidarity, organizational democracy, mutualism, etc.) and which differentiate them from traditional capitalistic organizations (Cheney et al., 2014, Parker et al. 2014, Bousalham and Vidaillet, 2018). We suggest that alternatives could greatly benefit from a critical and performative approach of the concept of organizational culture, a concept traditionally dismissed by critters because of its use and abuses in mainstream studies.

The reflexive and performative approach of culture we advocate here can help 1) acknowledge gaps, deviations and investigate cultural tensions in such organizations, and 2) explore the potentially positive aspects of culture deploying and deliberating about meaningful (and not

merely rhetorical) cultural resources especially for those "other" modes of organizing (Cheney et al., 2014; Parker et al., 2014; Parker, 2002), which seem to offer a concretization "in the field", of the theoretical project of critical performativity (Parker and Parker, 2017).
It seems, then, that, at least when applied to alternative organization, the notion of cultural resources constitutes a performative tool for CMS insofar as it responds to the proposals put forward by proponents of the idea of critical performativity in terms of agonism (Parker and Parker, 2017), ethics of care, pluralism and critical normativity (see Spicer et al., 2009: 546, for a synthesis of these notions or Alvesson et al., 2016, and Alvesson and Spicer, 2012, for an update of "tactics" in favor of a performative critique). This conceptual proposal, therefore, offers an alternative that is both critical and performative, and which enables to circumvent the limited alternative of, on the one hand, abusively instrumental proposals of cultural engineering and management by values and, on the other hand, a critical and anti-performative approach that does nothing other than deconstruct *mainstream* proposals while carefully avoiding formulating "actionable" proposals for fear that these be recuperated by managers.

In terms of diversity/inclusion and from a more operational standpoint, by insisting on the constructed and instrumental character of the concept of corporate culture, this article questions the powerful call to conformity that hides behind the simple and apparently humanistic idea of "shared values" within contemporary organizations, as well as the tacit modalities that, in managerial discourse, determine a member's "belonging" to his or her company, his or her loyalty to the organization; what it means for a member to have assimilated the culture of a given group and to "own" or "share" its values.

Thinking of organizational culture as the product of "gaps", therefore, provides an opportunity to reflect on the type of actors, managers, employees and citizens that our organizations and business schools wish to encourage, value and promote. What, indeed, is ultimately the social as well as economic, managerial or civic contribution that can be expected from such a *corporate* employee, *standardized* in his or her *dress-code* and standardized behavior but also in the way he or she thinks and acts within the group? What contribution might be expected from such an "ideal" employee that our identity-based and managerial understanding of corporate culture seem to value and promote? What players, managers and citizens are we helping to recruit and mold, following our more or less vaguely measurable items of *fit* and

"*savoir-être*"? What can such a subservient employee be, other than a sum of postures, consensual positions and calculated behaviors that he or she knows are "expected"?

Moreover, what place do our organizations ultimately give to the *gap*, that is, to deviance, to difference, to change, to the questioning of organizational dogmas, to the diversity of ways of being, thinking, acting and presenting oneself? A partial answer may lie in the multiplicity of scandals that continue to arise in our economic/financial news (ecological, economic, social, societal etc. and the repercussions of each of these scandals, whether for the companies at fault or for the societies and lands in which they are located) without us ever questioning their common dominator and which, on closer inspection, could very well have been avoided with the help of employees who were less "acculturated", less "corporate", but more reflexive and civic. That is, players who belong to the group but who are capable, through gaps, deviations and as proof of their belonging, of questioning its choices, its presumed shared beliefs and of criticizing its proclaimed values, or even of identifying activities within the group they find to be hypocritical and contradictory. Or again, reflexive employees capable of resisting "groupthink" and of showing a form of creative disobedience and salutary indiscipline that would benefit not only their own organization, but also, in many cases, society as a whole.

It is at this very concrete level that we propose the appropriateness of valuing both the gap and what is common together with the tension between them, rather than valuing conformity and adherence to magnified, *corporate* and identity-based values. Organizational culture would thereby take on an unexpected, counter-intuitive, existential property that would be most stimulating for both critical researchers and reflexive practitioners. From the moment organizational culture is no longer based on the mode of belonging or possessiveness – "my values, my culture" – but rather on the intelligence of a collective and conscientious construction of meaning, then as opposed to being a normative confinement device, organizational culture can, on the contrary, be understood as a vector for *denaturalization* inviting reflexive subjects to question and challenge the truths and beliefs of their group of belonging.

Valuing gaps as creative by no longer turning them into elements of exclusion of poorly *acculturated* subjects, but, on the contrary, into a fruitful ingredient of the collective future, effectively summons the "members" of a culture, of an organization, to develop their existential

capacity and to belong to the group not only by conformity but also by *disadherence*. (Jullien, 2016: 61). We argue this would bestow on our societies and organizations a powerful potential for transformation and innovation, by giving them the means to promote reflexive subjects. These would, as members and so from within, conform while also learning to *distance* themselves, to move beyond the fence, *to raise themselves out of subservience*, what Jullien rightly calls "ex-isting" (Jullien, 2016: 62 and 90-91).

The operational modalities of implementation and activation by the members and *in awareness of* these cultural resources have yet to be addressed. Cultural resources that, in terms of their very definition, are capable of stimulating what is in common without however demanding conformity, and tolerating – and even being nourished by – gaps and tensions. The examples of cultural resources offered by Jullien himself are relevant essentially to the scale of French (and European) culture. These are linguistic, historical, pedagogical, artistic and philosophical resources that are, a priori, quite far removed from the organizational field[6]. Consequently, it is incumbent on the actors of organizations – practitioners, employees, managers and leaders – to discuss the cultural resources that they effectively wish to activate and deploy within the framework of their organization, measured in relation to their activity, their past, their present and the common future to which they aspire. This is undoubtedly a stimulating challenge for management researchers, consultants and reflexive practitioners alike: how can cultural resources be deployed at the scale of contemporary organizations without diluting what makes their conceptual originality?

REFERENCES

Alvesson, M. 1990a. Organization: from substance to image? ***Organization studies***, 11(3): 373.

Alvesson, M. 1990b. On the Popularity of Organizational Culture. ***Acta Sociologica***: 31-49.

Alvesson, M. 2002. ***Understanding organizational culture***. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.

Alvesson, M., et Spicer, A. (2012). A stupidity-based theory of organizations. Journal of management studies, 49(7), 1194-1220.

[6] Jullien (2016) offers a few examples: the promotion of the subject, which affords individuals the prerogative to deploy other cultural resources. The author also mentions: the subjunctive as a resource for expressing thought; the philosophical essay as a resource for citizen intelligence passed on through education; the teaching of Latin; or the teaching of principles of elegance and affability as a way of living together; etc.

Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2016). **The stupidity paradox: The power and pitfalls of functional stupidity at work**. Profile Books.

Alvesson, M. et Spicer, A. (2012). Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity. *Human Relations*, 65(3): 367-390.

Alvesson, M., et Sveningsson, S. 2008. ***Changing organizational culture : cultural change work in progress***. New York, NY: Routledge.

Archier, G., & Sérieyx, H. (1984). ***L'entreprise du troisième type***. Paris, Le Seuil.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C., et Peterson, M. F. 2000. ***Handbook of organizational culture et climate***. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Barley, S., et Kunda, G. 1992. Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative ideologies of control in managerial discourse. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 37(3): 363-399.

Bousalham 2017, *Alternatives and CMS, reconsidering the performative potential of Organizational Culture, Academy of Management proceedings, 2017.248* https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2017.248

Bousalham, Y., et Vidaillet, B. (2018). Contradiction, circumvention and instrumentalization of noble values: How competition undermines the potential of alternatives. Organization, 25(3), 401-427.

Cabantous, L., Gond, J. P., Harding, N. and Learmonth, M. (2015). Reconsidering critical performativity. *Human relations.*

Calás, M., et Smircich, L. 1987b. ***Post-culture: is the organizational culture literature dominant but dead***. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the International conference on organizational symbolism and corporate culture, Milan, Italy.

Cameron, K. S., et Quinn, R. E. 1999. ***Diagnosing and changing organizational culture : based on the competing values framework***. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Cheney, G. (2002). Values at work : Employee participation meets market pressure at Mondragon. (C. U. Press, Ed.) NY: Ithaca.

Cheney, G., Santa Cruz, I., Peredo, A. M. and Nazareno, E. (2014). Worker cooperatives as an organizational alternative: Challenges, achievements and promise in business governance and ownership. Organization, 21(5), 591-603.

Claude, J-F, Wellhoff, T. (2011) ***L'entreprise en 80 valeurs: Dictionnaire des valeurs d'entreprise.*** Liaisons, Entreprises et Carrières, Paris

Coblence, F. & Servant, B. (2017). Une rencontre avec François Jullien. Revue française de psychanalyse, vol. 81(2), 451-463. doi:10.3917/rfp.812.0451.

Deal, T., et Kennedy, A. 1982. ***Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life***: Reading, Addison-Wesley.

Delavallée, 2009, ***La culture d'entreprise pour manager autrement,*** Eyrolles, Édition d'Organisation

Fournier, V., et Grey, C. 2000. At the critical moment: conditions and prospects for critical management studies. ***Human Relations***, 53(1): 7.

Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R. E., Lundberg, C. C., et Martin, J. E. 1985. ***Organizational culture***: Sage

Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R. E., Lundberg, C. C., et Martin, J. E. 1991. ***Reframing organizational culture***. Sage Publications.

Handy, C. B. (1996). ***Gods of management: The changing work of organizations.*** Oxford University Press, USA.

Jackall, R. 1988. ***Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers:*** Oxford University Press

Jermier, J., Slocum Jr, J., Fry, L., et Gaines, J. 1991. Organizational subcultures in a soft bureaucracy: Resistance behind the myth and facade of an official culture. ***Organization Science***, 2(2): 170-194.

Jullien, F. (2018). ***Si près, tout autre: de l'écart et de la rencontre***. Grasset.

Jullien, F. (2016). ***Il n'y a pas d'identité culturelle.*** L'Herne.

Jullien, F. (2012). ***L'écart et l'entre. Leçon inaugurale de la Chaire sur l'altérité***. *Pratiques'&, 253*.

Jullien, F. (2009). **Les transformations silencieuses**. Grasset.

Jullien, F. (2008). ***De l'universel, de l'uniforme, du commun et du dialogue entre les cultures***. Fayard.

Jullien, F. (1996). Traité de l'efficacité. Paris, Grasset.

Jullien, F., & Marchaisse, T. (2000). ***Penser d'un dehors (la Chine): entretiens d'Extrême-Orient.*** Seuil.

Knights, D., et Willmott, H. 1995. Culture and control in a life insurance company. ***Culture and Organization***, 1(1): 29-46.

Kroeber, A., et Kluckhohn, C. 1952. ***Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions***: New York, Vintage Books.

Kunda, G. 2006. ***Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation (édition augmentée)***: Temple Univ Pr.

Martin, J. 1985. Can organizational culture be managed ? In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. E. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, et J. E. Martin (Eds.), ***Organizational culture***: 95-98: Beverly Hills: Sage.

Martin, J. 1990. Deconstructing organizational taboos: the suppression of gender conflict in organizations ***Organization Science***, 1(4): 339-359.

Martin, J. 1992. ***Cultures in organizations : three perspectives***. New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. 2002. ***Organizational culture : mapping the terrain***. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Meyerson, D. 1991a. Normal ambiguity? A glimpse of an occupational culture. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. E. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, et J. E. Martin (Eds.), ***Reframing organizational culture***: 131-144. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Meyerson, D. 1991b. Acknowledging and uncovering ambiguities in cultures. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. E. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, et J. E. Martin (Eds.), ***Reframing organizational culture***. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Mrisha, G., Ibua, M., & Kingi, W. (2017). Effect of Learning Organization Culture on Organizational Performance Among Logistics Firms in Mombasa County. Journal of Human Resource Management, 5(2), 32-38.

Ogbor, J. O. 2001. Critical theory and the hegemony of corporate culture. ***Journal of Organizational Change Management***, 14(6): 590-608.

Ouchi, W. G. 1980. Markets, bureaucracies, and clans. **Administrative science quarterly**: 129-141.

Parker, S., & Parker, M. (2017). Antagonism, accommodation and agonism in Critical Management Studies: Alternative organizations as allies. Human Relations, 70(11), 1366–1387.

Parker M., Cheney G., Fournier V., Land C. (eds) (2014). The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization, London: Routledge.

Peters, T. J., et Waterman, R. H. 1982. ***In search of excellence : lessons from America's best-run companies***). New York: Harper et Row.

Ray, C. 1986. Corporate culture: the last frontier of control? ***Journal of Management Studies***, 23(3): 287-297.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.

Schein, E. H. 1985/2010. ***Organizational culture and leadership***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (5ème en 2010)

Schein, E. H. 1999. ***The corporate culture survival guide***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (et 3ème édition en 2009).

Schein, E. H. 1991? What is culture? In PJ Frost, LF Moore, MR Louis, CC Lundberg, & J.Martin (Eds.), Reframing organizational culture (pp. 243-253). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications,Schein 1999 p. 68

Smircich, L. 1983 a. Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***: 339-358.

Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., et Kärreman, D. 2009. Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies. ***Human Relations***, 62(4): 537.

Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2016). Extending critical performativity. Human Relations, 69(2), 225-249.

Thévenet, M. 2003. ***La culture d'entreprise***: Presses universitaires de France.

Thévenet, M. 1986. ***Audit de la culture d'entreprise***: Editions d'Organisation.

Van Maanen, J. 1991. The Smile Factory: Work at Disneyland. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. E. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, et J. E. Martin (Eds.), ***Reframing Organizational Culture***: 58-76: Sage.

Warrick, D. D. (2017). What leaders need to know about organizational culture. **Business Horizons**, 60(3), 395-404.

Wilkins, A. L. 1983. The culture audit: A tool for understanding organizations. ***Organizational Dynamics***, 12(2): 24-38.

Willmott, H. 1993. Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: managing culture in modern organizations. ***Journal of Management Studies***, 30(4): 515-552.

Zammuto, R. F., Gifford, G., et Goodman, E. A. 2000. Managerial ideologies, organization culture, and the outcomes of innovation: A competing values perspective. ***Handbook of organizational culture and climate***: 261-278.

[i]For example, Jullien (2016) uses it as a response to former French president, Nicolas Sarkozy, who claimed to defend the *roots*, *culture* and *national identity* of France in these terms: "*The moment you become French, your ancestors are the Gauls.*" The definition used by the former French president to talk about French culture and identity is very close to the definition used in management to define organizational culture: *"France has created myths, principles and instruments to unify its people in a common memory and culture. When I was a schoolboy, our teachers used to tell us about our ancestors, the Gauls. Neither the teachers nor the students were fooled. But it was an act of faith*. Both quotations of Nicolas Sarkozy can be found in the following articles : https://www.franceculture.fr/emissions/le-billet-politique/la-potion-sarkozyste-et-la-marmite-mediatique and https://www.nouvelobs.com/politique/presidentielle-primaire-droite/20160920.OBS8418/sarkozy-et-nos-ancetres-gaulois-ce-ne-sont-pas-les-ancetres-qui-font-une-nation.html (consulted the 12th October 2019)