Beyond bureaucracy, fordism and entrepreneurialism: on the mutual construction of career contexts and professional self-identities

Bernadette Loacker (bernadette.loacker@wu.ac.at)

Katharina Chudzikowski (katharina.chudzikowski@wu.ac.at)

Sub-theme 40: From Bureaucratic to "Post-Bureaucratic" Identities? Epochalism, Hybridisation and the Politics of Organizing

Convenors: Haldor Byrkjeflot, Paul du Gay, Heidi Houlberg Salomonsen

1. Introduction

The present paper is interested in the influences that bureaucratic-fordistic and post-bureaucratic/-fordistic work and career contexts have on the formation of subjectivity. Even if not following an "epochal approach" (du Gay 2007), we will discuss the discursive rationalities and norms of the bureaucratic-fordistic 'career regime' and the post-bureaucratic 'enterprise regime' in the conceptual part of the paper. In the empirical section we then want to explore to what extent these regimes produce self-identities that comply with the discourse-specific images of the 'ideal workforce' or 'legal person' (ibid.: 30). Therefore, we analyse the professional biographies, the context-specific work and career *practices* and the self-understanding from 12 business graduates that completed their studies between 1970 and 2000 at the University of Vienna.[1]

However, the following research questions will govern our conceptual and empirical analysis:

a) To what extent do the formation of work and career contexts and the formation of professional identities influence and constitute each other? b) To what extent comply the specific 'identities at work' with the discourse-specific 'subject ideals? and c) To what extent is it (conceptually and/or empirically) possible to separate and distinguish the bureaucratic-fordistic and the post-bureaucratic/-fordistic regime from each other?

The paper will be *structured* as follows:

In the first section we explore the shift from fordistic-bureaucratic to post-fordistic/bureaucratic regimes of work (Josserand/Teo/Clegg 2006). Thus, we discuss the specific logics, structures and power strategies of the "bureaucratic organization" and the "network organization" (Courpasson/Reed 2004, Harris/Höpfl 2006, Heckscher/Deonnellon 1994).[2] Besides, we analyse the different normative expectations and subject ideals

[1] The research was funded by a grant from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) as "Change in managerial careers", Project number P213411-G11.

[2] From a discursive point of view we assume that bureaucracy and fordism can be characterized through several common organizing and control strategies, several common rules of conduct and norms regarding the 'ideal individual'. Simultaneously we won't follow an 'epochal approach' and so we do not assume that the field of public and private administration/management can be treated and, thus, be structured and categorized according to the same schemes. As we conducted our empirical

associated with the two social paradigms, suggesting that the 'appropriate individual' of the bureaucratic-fordistic regime of work was constructed as fixed, focused and disciplined 'occupational employee', whereas the role model of the post-bureaucratic regime is constructed as 'hyperproductive, empowered and autonomous entrepreneur of the self' (du Gay 1996).

In the empirical part of the paper we will then focus on the concrete individual and collective practices of organizing work and careers of business graduates (also Salaman/Storey 2008). By this means we will question the strict distinction between the 'bureaucratic' and the 'post-bureaucratic' paradigm and, thus, the stable distinction between the 'bureaucractic' and 'post-bureaucratic' (work) ethos. Furthermore, we will empirically analyse the mutual interplay between the formation of work and career contexts and self-identities: since we care about our interviewees' professional self-understanding, self-relations and concrete work and career practices, our analysis will focus on the question to what extent subjectivities are formed and organized according to the field-specific "rules of the game" (Bourdieu 1993: 108) and to what extent these rules are consciously and unconsciously transgressed by the business graduates and, thus, re-created through their enactment. So we are interested into both conformity *and* non-conformity with rules and roles since this seems to allow the development of a deeper understanding of how self-identities are enacted within concrete contextual settings (Pullen/Linstead 2005: 6f.).

However, in the concluding section of the paper we will assume that 'post-bureaucracy' and 'post-fordism' can and must be understood as a complex, heterogeneous and ambivalent 'hybrid' that connects diverse logics, power technologies, codes, rules and forms of organizing. This implies, among other things, that bureaucratic-fordistic rationalities are not external to 'post-bureaucracy'/'post-fordism'; even if amended and adapted, they are included in it (Courpasson/Reed 2004, also Fournier/Grey 1999, Hodgson 2004, McSweeney 2006). Our empirical study will also show that bureaucratic-fordistic career contexts (which still exist) are shifting and increasingly involve certain post-bureaucratic norms. Moreover, the study will exemplify how identities are constituted within specific historical and socio-cultural contexts of work and career organization. This makes, again, evident that subjectivity and identity work can't be determined through power programs and (moral) codes and that selves are, thus, constituted in a variety of ways (du Gay 2007, Loacker 2010). It is the idea of the 'politics of organizing' (Steyaert 2000) that reminds us that the discursive "rules of the game" are and will remain under continuous and precarious construction.

2. Regimes of work organization

Since the 1980s we have been witnessing fundamental changes in the way work and employment relations and, thus, careers paths and forms are organized. These changes can be related to a paradigm shift on a societal level, which has been differently described in contemporary management studies (Handy 1995, Kanter 1997, Peters 2001), in sociology (Bauman 2000, 2007, Boltanski/Chiapello 2006, Sennett 1998, 2004), in the field of work, organizational and governmentality studies (du Gay 1996, 2000, Höpfl 2006, Krasmann/Volkmer 2007, Munro 2005, Osborne/Gaebler 1992) and career studies (Arthur/Rousseau 1996, Gunz/Peiperl 2007, Hall 1996, Peiperl/Arthur/Anand 2002). In the field of (critical) management and organization studies this paradigm change is often called

study within the private business sector, we subsequently primarily want to speak from fordistic and post-fordistic regimes (of work).

"post-bureaucratic turn" (Harris/Höpfl 2006) and is described as a shift from "disciplinary" to "post-disciplinary" or network-based regimes of society (Munro 2005, Weiskopf/Loacker 2006), as a shift from "fordistic" to "post-fordistic" forms of work organization (Lazzarato 1998, Opitz 2004) as well as a shift from "bureaucratic" to "post-bureaucratic" or "entrepreneurial" modes of regulation (du Gay 2000, 2008, McCabe 2009, McKinlay 2002, Tempest/McKinlay/Starkey 2004).

As the paper is interested in the influences that bureaucratic-fordistic and post-bureaucratic/-fordistic work and career contexts have on the formation of identity, the logics, norms and rules of both regimes of work organization have to be analysed (Josserand et al. 2006). Despite not arguing that one regime has substituted the other (e.g. Courpasson/Dany 2003, Salaman/Storey 2008), the specific discursive strategies of regulation and control and the specific forms of organizing that the two regimes of work organization produce are first of all separately elaborated. Besides, the images of the "appropriate individual" (Alvesson/Willmott 2002) that the "bureaucratic organization" and the "network organization" (Harris/Höpfl 2006, Heckscher/Deonnellon 1994) constitute are discussed in this section. However, as Foucault has shown in his analysis (e.g. 1977/1994, 1979, 1987), every governmental regime operates with specific technologies of power (Foucault 1992: 14-25, in Lemke et. al. 2000: 14). The processes, modes and techniques of producing the 'appropriate individual' are consequently historically and culturally variable (Alvesson/Willmott 2002).[3] In this section we are, thus, interested in the *rationality structures*, the particular ways of ordering and the specific ‚politics of thruth' which discursively define and regulate the bureaucratic and the entrepreneurial subject (Barratt 2008: 520, Lemke et al. 2000, Tellmann 2009, Rose 1992). In short: we want to shed light on the "shifting rationalities of the government of work".[4]

From the bureaucratic-fordistic to the 'entprepreneurial' regime of work:
Rationalities, strategies and techniques of work organization and subjectivity regulation

Before the industrial society and the modern state emerged, the (working) subject was, according to Foucault (Foucault 1977/1994: 14ff.) fully dependent from the '***sovereign' regent***. The 'sovereign' had the absolute right to "take life or let live" (Foucault 1979: 138). His power that was visible was demonstrated by a spectacular, excessive outbreak; it was exercized through top-down commands, through corporal punishments and often trough decisions about life and death. Its principle was that of "levying-violence" (Foucault 1977/1994: 219). In 'sovereign societies' labour is subsequently a force to be repressed (Vandenberghe 2008: 886, Weiskopf/Loacker 2006: 398f., also Foucault 1977/1994: 241).

[3] Foucault analysed the different forms of producing subjectivity from 'sovereign power' of the ancient regime to the 'disciplinary power' and 'biopower' of modernity. Deleuze followed and extended Foucaults line of analysis and thus, speaks from "societies of control" that modulate, again, disciplinary modes of power and (subject) regulation (Foucault 1977/1994, 2004, Deleuze 1995b). "Disciplinary societies", however, emerged at the end of the 18th century, and reached their heyday at the beginning of the 20th century. After 1950 they are, again, modulated; and since the 1980s the post-disciplinary or post-bureaucratic/-fordistic regime (of work organization) seems to be established (Bauman 2000, Munro 2005, Weiskopf/Loacker 2006).

[4] In the current context government means the diversity of powers and governing authorities which regulate the subject's space (of freedom). In this respect government can be seen as a discursive activity that relies on instruments and technical procedures that shall support the achievement of the targets of intervention (Barratt 2008, Rose 1992). Foucaults (2000, 2008) concept of govermentality, thus, defines a complex of heterogeneous practices of power directed at the conduct of collective bodies and individuals, including their self-conduct.

The historical figure of the worker of this "regime"[5] is that of '*the proletarian worker'* (Pongratz/Voß 1998). He has no special skills or qualifications; it is the 'rough' working capacity that is used within the production process which was dominated by manual work. This kind of working subject has no rights, it is exploited like a slave, without (public) protection (ibid: 146f.); the worker completely depends on the will of the sovereign that can hire and fire him at any time (Loacker 2010: 20f., also Knights 2004).

However, the sovereign regime lost its power with the establishment of the 'modern state', in Foucauldian terms with the emergence of 'disciplinary societies', at the end of the 18th century (Foucault 1977/1994: 279, Foucault 2008, Tellmann 2009, Weber 1921/1980: 160ff.). The power relation between economy and policy considerably changes in this historical period; both the state and the market gain increasing significance. Furthermore, a growing (mobility of the) population requires new modes of government: individuals and groups of individuals can no longer be permanently territorialized, they can no longer be just directly governed, through external orders and commands (Hamann 2009: 41, Foucault 2000). With the establishment of liberalism, the focus of power/knowlege strategies and its exercise is, thus, increasingly orientated on the population and its different social classes and on the individual (increasingly appealed as 'economic and productive subject') and its specific life modes (Foucault 2008: 312ff.). However, the fact that direct, centralized control decreases – whereas autonomy scopes increase – with growing population and mobility rates, seems to require more objectifying and subjectifying knowledge to order and calculate individual and collective bodies and, thus, make their conduct governable (Tellmann 2009). This can be seen as the 'birth' of detailed documentation and evaluation processes of (non)activitives, practices, interests and capabilities of human beings – and subsequently of statistical analysis and studies – which should operate as 'risk management' (Foucault 2000: 66, Virno 2005). In other words, from now on governmental programs are increasingly occupied with the normalization and normation of human conduct and the regulation of individual scopes and, thus, the self-regulation of subjects and objects (Reckwitz 2008: 35). Amongst others this implies that disciplinary technologies[6] are multiplied and distributed within several areas of life over the 19th century (Foucault 1977/1994, Tellmann 2009). However, in the following the specific forms and modes of *work organization* that are bound to the 'disciplinary' governmental shift will be discussed.

For the new paradigm or regime of work organization the model of the 'factory' – within industrial production – and the model of 'the office' – within public administration – are characteristic. Both models were characterized through a rational and technical alignment of the work organization (Courpasson/Reed 2004, Höpfl 2006). In more detail, the following principles and maxims were distinctive for the ***bureaucratic-fordistic regime of work organization***: the work and production process was hierarchically, formally organized and regulated, centrally planned, documented and controlled (Kallinikos 2004: 29, Kieser 2002: 79). As the idea of "Amtstreue" was at the core of the functionalistic and impersonal "ethos of bureaucracy" (du Gay 2007: 105ff., Höpfl 2006), rational and impersonal rules existed for every single organizational activity; they also defined, divided and distributed functions, competencies and responsibilities (du Gay 2008: 339). By this means, efficiency, objectivity and the prohibition of arbitrariness should be reached. Organizational strategies, also inspired by the ideas of functional rationalization and efficiency (Courpasson/Reed 2004: 6), were long-term, linear and uniform strategies that should force the regularity and continuity of

[5] We use the term "*regime* of work" in order to delineate a more or less coherent assemblage that encompasses various discourses, codes, practices and technologies (Foucault 1997, Rabinow/Rose 2003).

[6] Technologies Foucault (2007: 8) understands as a 'system of correlations' in which different power techniques are aligned.

organizational and individual performances and practices (Oechsler 2006: 106, Kieser 2002). The specific production process was organized according to a strict division of labour, more specifically, of mental and manual work (Lazzarato 1998: 46, Gutenberg 1986); it was orientated to mass production of standardized and homogeneous goods – it was "elephantine" and rigid (Vandenberghe 2008: 879f.). Fixed blueprints and linear time tables produced a stable rhythm of the work process as they clearly defined what had to be done, when and by whom (Weiskopf/Loacker 2006: 408). Communication processes were, moreover, strictly documented and regulated through official 'channels of commands' (Kieser 2002: 73f., Oechsler 2006). Anyway, these very standardized and mechanical modes of work organization guaranteed stability and calculability of organizational activities (Kieser 2002: 66ff., Kallinikos 2004).

Within the fordistic regime work is concentrated in "enclosed spheres" (Bauman 2001); workers were, thus, fixed at the production line or the office – so the principle of visual surveillance was quite easily to implement (Foucault 1977/1994: 241). Workers were more or less passive objects of information and had to carry out the task that was assigned to them. Workers or employees were principally separated from each other and by this way, lateral communication was cutting off (Weiskopf/Loacker 2006: 408, also Hofbauer 1998: 303ff., Foucault 1977/1994). Labour and capital were also territorialized in the factory; they were coupled like (working) space and time. In this epoch, it was not to foresee that production becomes post-industrial and post-fordistic and, thus, that capital can be divided from labour, exist separately and be produced and/or accumulated outside the factory. It was also not to foresee that work can be done outside the factory or the office – that space become fluid (Bauman 2001). However, one consequence of the fix and stable coupling of labour and capital, (working) time and space are clear and stable *boundaries* between work and leisure, between professional competencies and non-professional interests and talents – between private and professional identities (Marin 1998: 463ff., du Gay 2000, 2008, Garsten 1999). The rights and duties of workers or employees were clearly defined within the – principal long-term and stable – employment contract. They were asked to fulfil the organizational demands they got; it was an unconditional order not to question organizational rules; differently spoken, formal obedience and discipline were insisted (Weber 1921/1980). In return the employee was a 'free subject' outside the factory; thus, organizations didn't follow the ideal of 'total inclusion' of subjectivity – social relations were 'non-inclusive' (Kallinikos 2004: 22). Organizations were, thus, 'just' interested in the more or less directly usable aspects of human working capacity; absorption of labour (not of "bundles of potentials and competencies") was the strategic target (Lazzarato 1998, Townley 1998). Thus, within the bureaucratic regime there was a clear distinction between the 'ethos of the office' and the 'personal ethos' or ethics (du Gay 2007: 103ff., du Gay 2008). The *bureaucratic-fordistic working subject* was a 'man of exchange' (Hamann 2009): he offered his working capacity and energy, promised his obedience and loyalty (to the 'office and/or its function') – therefore he got a stable and long-term employment contract, a fix income and an indexed pension, stable working times and room, certainty and calculability of single (ex ante defined) 'career steps' and, more generally, of the whole professional perspective or life (Kieser 2002: 65, Loacker 2010: 40). It was, thus, the 'bureaucratic career' (Tempest et al. 2004: 1540) that organized the subject's professional biography (McCabe 2009). This career model demonstrated the central form of regulating the individual performance (McKinlay/Wilson 2006: 657).

However, the state, the employers and the unions had an arrangement that – if the workforce succeeds to pass the – objectifying *and* individualizing technique of – organizational "examination" (Foucault 1977/1994: 185) and, thus, proves its conformity with organizational rules and norms, he should have the possibility to become an 'integrated organizational member' that can count on employment security, continuous record of salary and on a predictable, steady career track (McKinlay/Wilson 2006: 676, Tempest et al. 2004: 1541).

One basic idea of this arrangement was that these forms of certainty compensate for the rigidity and technical alignment of bureaucratic-fordistic work organization, furthermore, for the employees' lack of autonomy, control, participation, flexibility and "creativity" and, thus, for alienation tendencies (Vandenberghe 2008: 879). These aspects finally explicitly illustrate that the human work force of fordism was considered as an organizational production resource among others. It dominated a mechanistical, instrumental view of the human being and its work force that should be deployed where its working capacity promises the highest efficiency – but in contrast to the 'sovereign model' workers are no longer seen as slaves. Whereas in the 'sovereign model' the subject was completely dependent from the principal, its will and particular mood, the subject of fordism is dependent from and obliged to formal rules (Kieser 2002: 77, Weber 1921/1980). However, it gets a certain protection from the state as it is constituted as "occupational employee" (Pongratz/Voß 1998): the work force of the fordistic-bureaucratic model is disciplined, productive and anti-nomadic; it is fixed at its work place within the factory (Bauman 2001: 23ff.). Compared to the proletarian work force the employee possesses already certain standardized qualifications that enables him to fulfil the specific production step (Menger 2006: 74); so the exploitation of the work force is weaker than in the 'sovereign model' as the intent of governmental techniques is not to destroy the workforce but to make it 'useful' and productive (Loacker 2010: 13).

Let us recapitulate from a governmental point of view: fordistic or disciplinary regimes were primarily governed by the strategy of "standardization" and "normalization" (Kallinikos 2004: 16ff.). Power was not only directly (through authority) exercised but also indirectly and structurally – through an "architecture of discipline" (Ortmann 1984); this means that e.g. the 'clock', the cycle of machines and prescribing work and time tables also figured as control and disciplinary elements within the organizational production process. Anyway, hierarchical orders and the specific principles of inclusion and exclusion were stable and principally well known by those being the object of power and its exercise (Foucault 1977/1994). The intent of the diverse techniques of "dressage" was, however, the production of the docile body (ibid.: 138). Differently than 'sovereign power' continuous (potential) visual surveillance of the working bodies was characteristic for 'disciplinary power' that is materialized within the so-called panopticon.[7] Following Foucault the target of this form of power was the creation of self-disciplined and -controlled subjects (ibid.: 260). Therefore 'disciplinary power' makes subjects and their (non)activities visible whereas power tends to be invisible (ibid: 241). By this means the panoptic principle seems to be both very efficient and effective (Foucault 2008: 283, Tellmann 2009: 17), as Foucault argues: the individual "who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he (…) becomes the principle of his own subjection" (Foucault 1977/1994: 202f.).

Related to the context of work and, thus, the model of the "factory" or the "office" it is the (promise of) 'career', based on connections and the principle of seniority, that becomes the central form of control over individual conduct and the presentation of the self: personal obedience and obligation for self-regulation according to organizationally defined rules and norms in return for secure and relatively well-paid employment (McKinlay/Wilson 2006: 676). Thus, conformity resulted in promotion and career progression, non-conformity in exclusion. The work force of this historic period was tried to made governable exactly through this

[7] Its realization disciplinary power finds in Bentham's *Panopticon.* In short, this architectural 'inspection house' can be described as follows: The Panopticon arranges individual bodies in a circle. It divides individuals from each other and makes sure, that the horizontal lines are interrupted by walls so that the inmates can neither see each other nor are able to communicate with each other. In this arrangement the inmates are constantly in a position of being seen (from the front by the supervisor) without however seeing (Foucault 1979: 200ff., Weiskopf/Loacker 2006: 400).

composition of reward – 'promise of career' – and contingent punishment – 'threat of being excluded' from one's organization/function (McKinlay 2002: 595).

However, within the field of organization/management and governmentality studies it is argued that since the early 1980s (according to Deleuze (1995b) since the 1950s) the emergence of a new governmental regime, focused on radical discontinuity in institutional forms and organizational practices, can be observed (Courpasson/Reed 2004: 1350). This new regime, mostly called ***"post-bureaucracy and post-fordism"*** seems to follow the *key leitmotiv of "enterprise"* (Barratt 2008, Osborne/Gaebler 1992). Related to this leitmotiv are new ways of imagining and acting on the productive subject at work (Alvesson/Willmott 2002, du Gay 1996, Rose 1992, Storey/Salaman/Platman 2005). However, within this new regime the 'network enterprise' becomes the preferred model for any form of institutional organization in diverse fields (Barratt 2008: 520, Foucault 2004, Thrift 1999). Nevertheless it is important to note that post-disciplinary/-fordistic governmental programs do not substitute previous power forms like disciplinary power; they rather co-exist within the new power regime (Foucault 2007) in which both the state and the economy are and operate decentralised (Tellmann 2009: 6, also Prinz/Wuggenig 2007: 240ff.). So since the 1980s the welfare state is noticably dissolving, whereas the heterogeneity and differeniation of the markets increase (Deleuze 1995b). The relations of the realms of government and economy, the public and the private, the personal and the political are subsequently changing (Foucault 2008: 12f.). Traditional distinctions between these realms or life aspects blurred and are removed, as several studies indicate (du Gay 2007: 169, Haman 2009: 39, also Pongratz/Voß 2000).

Following Foucault in the 19th century, the epoch of liberalism, the state still coordinated and organized the scopes of the market (and of individuals) and their conditions (Lemke et. al. 2000: 14f.). However, with the emergence of "neoliberalism" the relation between the *state and the market* is fundamentally changed: it is the market that now becomes the central organizing and regulative principle of the state and society more generally; it becomes the new "permanent economic tribunal" (Foucault 2004: 340) and defines the "rules of the game" according to the economic order of things (also Hesse 2007, Tellmann 2009). Subsequently, 'post-disciplinary governmentality' and, thus, the specific art and modes of governing (individuals), implies a reduced role of the state in "the economy and social relations, in favour of a new economy of social relations which emphasizes autonomy and individual responsibility at all the local levels where autonomy and responsibility can be brought into interaction" (Donzelot/Gordon 2008: 59). However, as dynamic and mainly incalculable market-based mechanisms increasingly condition the conduct of individuals, the actions of institutions and the population as a whole, boundaries between organizations (and its environment), but also *boundaries* between nations, between different spheres and fields of society and social life, become dynamic and liquid, too. Whereas the welfare state, that was characteristic for the 'industrial polis' (Boltanski/Chiapello 2006), was organized and structured through clear and stable boundaries as regards space and time, the postfordistic society is transformed into a network of transient, flexible, uncertain and multiple associations (Vandenberghe 2008: 881). Thus, the model of the *'network enterprise'* and of 'new public management' does not only reduce the role of the 'factory model' and of bureaucracy within organizations (du Gay 2000); the idea of the network enterprise encroaches on the whole public space; this is why Boltanski and Chiapello (2006) speak from the emergence of a 'new spirit of capitalism' that they call the 'project polis'. In the 21st century the model of the nation states erodes and is, by trend, substituted for the model of the "network society" (Castells 2001). In other words, the economic enterprise network form is extended to the entire social realm (Storey et al. 2005).

With the establishment of entrepreneurial network societies new forms of production and control are associated, too (Munro 2005). This is, again, connected to the development that flexible forms of organizing work obtain growing significance in the "liquid modernity" (Bauman 2000) where it is argued that work is also no longer concentrated in "enclosed spheres" but is rather "de-limited" (Pongratz/Voß 2000) and "spatially diffuse" (Beck 2007). Nowadays *work/labour and capital, time and space* become fluid, "de-territorializing" or "dis-organized" (Sennett 1999: 131). The significance of immaterial work – that can be intellectual, communicative, symbolic or emotional work – increases in the "flexible capitalism" (Sennett 1999) that is orientated on innovation, creativity, improvisation, knowledge and a very specific form of "subjectivity" (Vandenberghe 2008: 884, Virno 2005). Neither work/labour nor capital is any longer bound to traditional spheres of production. Moreover, immaterial work 'needs' the "open space" to unfold productively (Lazzarato 1998, Menger 2006). Differently spoken, immaterial work and, thus, 'creative work' seem to be disturbed by bureaucratic structures of organizing (ibid., Styhre 2007). Hence, nowadays capital can reproduce itself without labour (and the other way around). It leaves the factory. Its logic is increasingly integrated into all spheres of life and colonizes our life-worlds (as 'market worlds'); to escape the logic of capital and the order of the market seems to be impossible (Vandenberghe 2008: 878ff.). So the boundaries between production and communication, production and consumption, work/labour and leisure, paid and unpaid work, professional and private 'persona' and, thus, the 'ethos of the office' and the 'personal ethos' are reversed (du Gay 2008, Virno 2005). Every sphere of social life is discursively defined as 'productive sphere' or space. Today, work and productivity seem to be delimited (Kallinikos 2003, Lazzarato 1998).

Whereas fordism was characterized through "heavy accumulation", postfordism refers to "light and flexible accumulation" (Bauman 2001). This means, the postfordistic network organization is a "lean" organization; management, work(ers) and capital are decentralized, hierarchies are flattened, production processes and increasingly immaterial products are no longer standardized but flexible, mobile, heterogeneous, differentiated, 'knowledge-intensive' and orientated on "niche-markets". Organizational strategies (of production and HRM) are still interested in efficiency but they became dynamic, too (Oechsler 2006: 106, Kärreman/Alvesson 2004); they are focussed on *"flexible specialisation"* and self-responsible "personnel development" – *except* the investment (in "key resources") is seen as profitable (Ridder 2002). So forms and structures of work organization are increasingly dominated by self-organized team-structures and regulated along "*values*" – rather than impersonal rules (Kaufmann 2004: 188, Barker 1999). However, the growing network-orientation and market focusing of organizations become also evident within the specific alignment of *work and employment relations*. They are more and more 'contractualized', individualized, project-based, flexibilized, short-term, multiple, competitive and insecure (Beck 2007, Eikhof/Haunschild 2006, Loacker 2010). Traditional 'career tracks' subsequently are abolished as *careers* are no longer calculable; by contrast, they are disorganized and subjected under the just-in-time-logic (Vandenberghe 2008: 880, McCabe 2009, Sennett 1998). The post-bureaucratic working subject has no career in the traditional sense, still, he is self-responsible for (the management of) its professional biography. The post-bureaucratic 'career' is composed of diverse projects which define the subjects' employability and, thus, its 'market value' (Bauman 2001: 172, Boltanski/Chiapello 2006: 161).

Like careers incomes are also no longer stable within this regime of work. From now on – individualized – income is earned from one's own *'human capital'* and its expenditure (Hamann 2009: 43). Thereby, 'human capital' is seen as an accumulated, variable capital, it consists of diverse individual qualities, skills, talents, experience, knowledge, potentials – and contacts – and should be self-responsibly trained (Bröckling 2007). The worker of 'control society' (Deleuze 1995b) is no longer dependent on a specific employer or organization; he is as 'autonomous and creative entrepreneur' dependent on fluid and often

loose network contacts and obliged to its own 'human capital'; therefore he is keen to continuously invest in it (Boltanski/Chiapello 2006: 152ff., Courpasson/Dany 2003: 1256). The demand to invest in one's own 'human capital' shows, amongst others, the economization of work and the work force (also Read 2009: 28). Through the theory of 'human capital' the difference between work/labour and capital is effaced. By this means both the 'worker' and the 'capitalist' are defined as 'entrepreneurs of themselves' that shall consider themselves as a bundle of potentials and hybrid competencies that is to be strategically developed – in all spheres of life (Peters 2001). This fusion, however, seems to be paradigmatic for the 'neoliberal subjectivity' (Graefe 2007: 269, Read 2009) that has no longer public protection (Pongratz/Voß 2000). Rather he bears 'full responsibility' for its biography and life.

Subsequently, the market as central organising principle of post-fordism favours a new – entrepreneurial – mode of governing (e.g. du Gay 1996, Rose 1991, 1992) which transforms the *image* of the "appropriate individual" (Alvesson/Willmott 2002): within the entrepreneurial regime individuals are refashioned as subjects of 'human capital' (Read 2009: 25, Prinz/Wuggenig 2007). Thus, within the new "regime of truth" (Foucault 1977/1994), the subject is produced as an entrepreneur of himself (Foucault 2008: 226) and his whole life (Barratt 2008). So the construction of the workforce as 'human capital' modulates the relation of the individual towards its workforce and itself; in so doing it produces subjectifying effects, too (Lazzarato 1998: 42f.). Whereas normalization was the central governmental strategy of the disciplinary regime (of work), the central power technology of the post-fordistic regime is the mobilization of the hyper-productive workforce. As the market is a very dynamic economic tribunal that continuously inserts multiple and partial modes of inclusion and exclusion, individuals are obliged to be on the move (Bauman 2001: 116f.), obliged to "sprint from one project to the next" (Kanter 1990). So within post-bureaucracy the workforce is constructed as so called 'entreployee' (Eikhof/Haunschild 2006) that treets his 'person' as a marketable asset and is therefore – physically and mentally – flexible, adaptable, creative and multi-skilled, always disposable, cooperative *and* strategic and opportunistic (Boltanski/Chiapello 2006: 158ff., Storey et al 2005: 1042ff.). Whereas the bureaucratic-fordistic work force was constituted as 'man of exchange', the neoliberal subject – even if still instrumentalized – is no longer just a partner in exchange but is instead fashioned as 'entrepreneur of the self' (du Gay 1996). As such he is his own potential, his own capital, his own producer; he is the source of his own earnings and success; the source of his own satisfaction – and exploitation (Hamann 2009: 53f., Prinz/Wuggenig 2007: 247ff.).

The tendency that all social areas become potential fields of work and (re)production is characteristic for a society of creative 'entrepreneurs' and, thus, for a society that is dominated by a logic of competition and investment that encompasses all human relationships. Nowadays production and work/labour are distributed across all spheres of cultural and social existence and across all aspects of human existence (from the work of the hands to the mind): within post-bureaucratic governmentality society is constructed as a market. Thereby it disperses bodies and individuals through privatization, individualization, responsibilization and isolation. Deregulation is, however, not the absence of government, by contrast, it is an essential form and technology of governing (Read 2009: 34, Hesse 2007). Governance without government" or "government at a distance" (Osborne/Gaebler 1992, Rose/Miller 1992, Vandenberghe 2008) has, furthermore, various social consequences: they range from governmental policymaking according to the private corporate and industry interests, thus, to the privatization of goods and (almost) all public institutions (like hospitals, prisons, universities, schools etc.) and to the self-responsibilization of individuals for their employment, health, welfare etc. Many areas and aspects that were once understood as social and political are within the "entrepreneurial regime" repositioned within the domain of self-government and self-management (Hamann 2009: 40). This re-positioning is generally

presented as increase of/in individual autonomy and choice. It fits, however, perfectly into the neoliberal key strategy – infusing market values into every aspect of social life and shifting full responsibility onto individuals (Graefe 2007: 279ff.). Differently spoken, the control society seems to be characterized through a "government of individualization" (Foucault 1982: 212) and self-responsibilization that "separates the individual, breaks his links with others (and) splits up community life" (ibid.). So post-bureaucracy creates a reality that states rivalry is the basis of social relations (e.g. Lemke 2000). It creates subjects of interest, locked in competition (Read 2009: 30).

Contemporary governmental strategies seek to mobilize (e.g. through peer-based teamwork control) rather than constrain the subject (Josserand et al. 2006); they seek to empower the subject rather than dominate it (Bröckling 2007, Reckwitz 2008, Weiskopf/Loacker 2006): post-bureaucractic power programs are not so much interested in imposing direct orders and control; they function, moreover, through the imposing of indirect forms of control that primarily structure and regulate field of actions, field of autonomies or 'free choices' of individuals (Vandenberghe 2008: 887, du Gay 2004). This means that in the post-disciplinary regime (of work) individuals are defined, conditioned, constrained and appealed as (self)responsible and *'free subjects'* (Courpasson/Dany 2003: 1231). This offered form of 'freedom' is, however, primarily shaped by predefined conditions and, thus, by promoted competition, market-orientation, individualization and insecurity (Foucault 2008: 29, Hamann 2009: 51). So (neo)liberal government *demands* certain more or less controlled, regulated and calculable individual scopes to make individuals governable. The market that becomes a more and more important and powerful force, is not to territorialize, stabilize or enclose. It is exactly its tendency of deterritorialization and deregulation, its dynamic, flexibility, mutability and, thus, incalculability that makes the market a very effective power instance. However, that the market can unfold its regulative forces it demands subjects that are (more or less) "free" (Maravelias 2007); subjects that are self-responsible for their productivity, success and failure – and for their choices; subjects that can be made the object of competitive and rivalizing strategies. Thus, promoting permanent evaluation and assessment as governmental strategies requires autonomous and flexible (in other words available and adaptable) subjects (Prinz/Wuggenig 2007: 250f.). Freedoms of the market are consequently not or no longer outside of politics, by contrast, they are an integral component of its governmental strategy. Post-disciplinary governmentality operates trough interests, desires, aspirations etc., not through (obvious) obligations, restrictive rules or direct commands (Read 2009: 29).

Whereas in the disciplinary regime of work organization individual scopes were limited and restricted, in the post-disciplinary regime the individual is declared as being self-responsible for the organization and management of itself and of its life (Bröckling 2007, Rose/Miller 1992). Thus, within the entrepreneurial regime individuals are "obliged to be free" (Rose 1991: 213). In other words, within 'entrepreneurialism' 'freedom' is constituted as a form of subjection (Read 2009: 25). This implies that postbureaucratic modes of government include ***self-governing*** practices of individuals (according to predefined norms) as parts of its power and subjectification program (ibid.: 28). The new governmentality is different to the sovereign and the disciplinary model as it intends to aspire individuals to govern theirselves. The 'factory model' focused the subject as object of disciplinary – the new govermentality model focuses the subject as a subject and object of government (Reckwitz 2008: 34). The logic of the – self-regulating – market shall not be imposed on individuals, by constrast, they shall see themselves as active and central part of the (labour) market, as *'human capital'* that can (and must) be self-responsibly developed, organized and sold. They shall subject under the new logic and rationalities – by choice (Tellmann 2009).

Let us recapitulate before concluding this section: From a *governmental* perspective post-fordism and -bureaucracy can be seen as an art to exercise power according to the ideal

model of the economy (Foucault 2000: 49). The role of the state and its modes of "distal government" is primarily the installation of market-based mechanisms for conditioning individual and organizational actions. So within post-bureaucracy the state is not completely irrelevant; the market can only be kept viable through active governmental and legal support and enforcement of market 'truth', ideologies, constructs, strategies and invocations – like 'be competitive!' (Hamann 41f., Read 2009: 35). As elaborated, postdisciplinary/-fordistic regimes of work organization attempt to produce the flexible, hyper-productive, innovative and self-responsible subject (e.g. Bröckling 2007, du Gay 1996, Rose 1992). This is because the 'ethos of the project polis' "demands" entrepreneurialism, creativity, self-organization and cooperation (Boltanski/Chiapello 2006, du Gay 2008, Loacker 2010). As post-disciplinary forms of power operate on freedoms, on a constitutive multiplicity, the "new spirit of capitalism" and its technologies of power become, however, increasingly limitless, dynamic, free-floating and 'creative':[8] the market operates 'like a telescope', an 'information machine', a 'machine of seeing' – a "panspectron" (Tellmann 2009: 22); it continuously assesses and evaluates individuals, their information flows (instead of their bodies) and their performances (Weiskopf/Loacker 2006: 408). Within postfordism the disciplinary technique of "examination" is substituted from the technique of "permanent assessment". Hence, it is argued that control and power (solely) changed their nature. Power became 'post-panoptic' (Bauman 2001: 18): governmental strategies, practices and technologies of control became more complex, decentralized and adaptable to ever changing cultural norms, often invisible and immaterial – like the contents that are the objects of control (Deleuze 1995: 254ff., Lazzarato 1998: 45, Maravelias 2007, Vandenberghe 2008). In sum these 'technologies' – especially the techniques of self-management, self-control, responsibilization, competition and uncertainty production, of flexibilization, marketization and of project- and employability orientation – seem to be very powerful and effective (Loacker 2010: 82ff., Tellmann 2009: 23). This was already recognized by Deleuze and Guattari (1980/2000) which argued that "capitalism is of the viral type" (ibid.: 580).

However, in the empirical part of the paper it will be shown in more detail that this 'viral form' constrains *and* enables human conduct. This reminds us, again, that one must be careful not to take up a deterministic perspective of the current entrepreneurial regime. Discursive logics are, thus, not to equate with context-specific individual and collective practices (of organizing work).

3. Research setting: methodology, research questions and methods

In our paper we are interested, as mentioned, in the question of how different work and career regimes affect the process of professional identity formation in concrete fields of

[8] In this regard one should mention one of the very "creative" but precarious aspects of the power program of flexible capitalism and its specific governmentality. It seems to be able to absorb critique and use it according to its own interests and rationalities. Boltanski and Chiapello (2006: 142ff.) have argued that the "the new spirit of capitalism" is informed by the capitalism critique of the 1960s and 70s that came especially from the artists, political left wings and certain academics or "intellectuals". These groups of actors criticized the industrially informed and organized capitalism – and its specific work organization – for its rigidity, stability, density of regulation, dependencies and restrictions. The control society took up and integrated this critique and transformed it into new norms and ideals, so the assumption of Boltanski and Chiapello. One product of this critique-absorption process is, however, the entrepreneurial and creative subject of work (also Donzelot/Gordon 2008, Schumacher 1998).

practice. Thus, in the following we will explore the conceptual understanding of the self that guides our empirical analysis. Afterwards the specific empirical research questions and methods used are introduced. However, due to the methodology we follow, we tried to critically reflect during the research process that social inquiry always demonstrates a continuous and productive interaction process which enacts and modulates the social (Law/Urry 2004: 390, Cooper/Law 1995).

The process of subjectivity and identity formation

As we follow an 'ontology of becoming' (Chia 1996) we question "that reality pre-exists independently of observation and as a static, discrete and identifiable 'things', 'entities', 'events', 'generative mechanisms' etc." (ibid.: 33). We rather want to stress the processual, cultural and context-related 'nature' of individuals, organizations and society (e.g. du Gay 2007: 11, Pullen/Linstead 2005) and thus, emphasize the "primacy of process over fact" (Chia 1996: 34, Law/Urry 1994). In other words, to focus on relations (within social investigation) is seen as more insightful and more appropriate in terms of 'real' than to look for 'things' and 'entities'. As Fenollosa (1969: 377) puts it: "Relations are more real and more important than the things which they relate" (in Chia 1996: 50). We, thus, aim to re-think universal, autonomous and fix categories and dualistic differentiations, e.g. between organization and individual, order and disorder, discourse/language ('the word') and social/material world, power/knowledge and freedom/critique. Rather we want to consider them as (temporary stable or stabilizing) effects of previous ordering processes (ibid., also du Gay 2007: 23), being themselves just constituted in relation to an other (category).

We consider power/knowledge discourses, discursive practices and language as constitutive for the way the world – and subjects, organizations and social relations – are 'made up' and subsequently are analyzed, codified, ordered and categorized (e.g. Clegg/Hardy 1999, Deleuze 1995, Foucault 1979, Linstead 2002).[9] In our view, thus, neither organizations nor individuals are given categories. Rather they are discursively produced within specific historical and social "regimes of truth" (Foucault 1977/1994). Subjects and identities are, thus, not seen as sovereign but as specifically shaped within a field of power/knowledge relations and techniques (e.g. du Gay 2007: 61, Alvesson/Willmott 2002, Clegg 1994, Knights 1990).[10] This means, subjectivity is considered "as a process rather than a product – a process which involves societal factors, psychological factors, interaction, reflection, practice and performance" (Pullen/Linstead 2005: 3). It is consequently not seen as a stable substance, entity or a core element of personality, which is to be discovered or uncovered (also Bourdieu

[9] In Foucaults thinking power and knowledge are irreducibly intertwined through specific practices, processes and techniques; they mutually produce, influence and transform each other (Foucault 1977/1994, 1979): knowledge and its specific order cannot operate or be unfolded outside of power relations, and power relations are, again, constituted, through and within fields of knowledge (Foucault 1977/1994: 39, Deleuze 1995). Amongst others this conceptualization implies an understanding of power/knowledge relations as "mobile, reversible and unstable" (Foucault 1997: 292). Power is, thus, considered as a dynamic and complex strategic situation rather than an abstract and fixed structure or determining institution – and it is rather productive than repressive (Foucault 1977/1994: 194).

[10] Even if we use both terms – subject(ivity) and identity – we principally prefer to speak from the subject as it allows us to consider how the individual is constituted as physical, mentral and affective 'instance' in and through different practices, forces and discourses (Reckwitz 2008: 17). Whereas identity primarily refers to the modes through which the subject (as specific cultural form) understands and interprets itself, the concept of the subject, hence, includes more than 'just' self-interpretation. It refers to the aspect that the individual is produced through an active and considered work on the self *and* through external techniques of regulation, government and control (Deleuze 1995, Foucault 1988, Rabinow/Rose 2003). Following this line, we understand identity as a – central – part of the subject.

1987). By contrast, “the humanist idea of a single subjectivity, which at any given moment is fixed and complete” (Alvesson/Sköldberg 2000: 164) is regarded as “a Western invention” (ibid.).

Moreover, subjectivity is understood as a *narrative* that emerges, develops and changes over time in its ‘performing’ (Butler 2005: 66). In claiming identity to be performative Butler (1999, 2005) stresses the precarious and dynamic structure of the subject: this temporary structure is constituted and transformed trough its continuous *doing* and narrative performing (Butler 1999: 179, Pullen/Linstead 2005: 7f.). The modes of performing the self should, again, not be understood as being autonomously chosen, as being universal, self-identical, linear and coherent in different contexts or assemblages (ibid., Deleuze 1995: 260, Reckwitz 2008). By contrast, the subject is considered as relationally constituted within specific historical social power/knowledge structures (Foucault 2007: 265, Lemke et al. 2000: 31). Amongst others this implies that “there is no ‘I’ that can stand apart from the social conditions of its emergence, no ‘I’ that is not implicated in a set of conditioning moral norms” (Butler 2005: 7). We, thus, think of the subject as a “a contingent mode of organization” (O'Leary 2002: 117) which is continuously developed and modulating within a ‘process of becoming’ and invented within heterogeneous practices and technologies (Butler 2005: 113, Chia 1996, Deleuze 1995).

However, even if the subject emerges (in this line of thinking) in the interstices of power, truth and the self and is thereby discursively produced within a specific socio-cultural formation of power/knowledge relations, it is not considered timeless or without (life) history (Pullen/Linstead 2005: 4f.): it is seen as a historical form, which has both a past and a future. This also suggests that subjectivity cannot be fully calculated and regulated. Following Foucault, subjectivity arises in the process of subjectification where the subject is produced in two senses. First, in the sense of being “subjected to someone else by control and dependence“ (Foucault 1982: 212), and second, in the sense of being “tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge” (ibid.). This, however, makes evident that ‘subjectification’ is not to equate with ‘subjection’ (Foucault 1982, 1984, 1997); instead such a conceptualization of the subject offers possibilities of both subjugation *and* of self-creation (Rabinow/Rose 2003: xxi). Thus, subjectification includes restricting, repressive and limiting tendencies, but it also involves a process of actively forming and governing the self via ‘technologies of the self’ (Deleuze 1995: 94ff., Foucault 1988). These are, again, practices which are not “invented by the individual himself”. Rather they are “models that he finds in his culture and are proposed, suggested, imposed upon him by his culture, his society, and his social group” (Foucault 1984: 291). In this perspective the production of the subject is, thus, seen as an interplay between technologies of power, which constrain and “determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends or domination” (Foucault 1988: 18) and technologies of the self, which include the attempt to consciously transcend limitations and prescriptions and distance oneself from established power relations and truths (Pullen/Linstead 2005: 5ff., Butler 2005). Or as Alvesson and Willmott (2002: 625ff.) put it: “self identity” continuously arises in the precarious interplay of “identity regulation” – the attempt to normalize and objectify and, thus, to regulate identity according to discursive norms and codes – and “identity work” – the attempt to actively (trans)form oneself according to one’s own ethical-aesthetic beliefs and ideals (also Foucault 1988). This second attempt implies, again, that a central part of “subjectivity formation” through technologies and practices of the self is ‘‘to become critical of norms under which we are asked to act’’ (Butler 2005: 24).

So even if highlighting that the idea of considered “identity work” does not assume an autonomous individual that entirely constitutes oneself or that is able to completely recognize or know itself (Butler 2005: 19, Foucault 1988: 18), we argue that the self, in spite of multiple regulating power technologies and programs, can never be fully defined and determined as “there will always be a relation to oneself, which resists codes and powers“ (Deleuze 1995: 103, Butler 1999). We will re-introduce this idea within the discussion of our empirical material and insights.

Research interests and research sample

As already mentioned in the previous section – within our empirical study we want to investigate both "traditional" bureaucratic-fordistic *business* career contexts as well as "new" entrepreneurial career contexts. At this, we characterize 'fordistic career contexts' through continuity and long-term orientation of employment, through stability of organizational membership and work relations, through clear rights and duties for employers and employees and clear boundaries between work and live. By contrast, 'post-bureaucratic careers' we define as individual and collective biographies that are characterized trough discontinuity and short-term, project-orientated contracts, through high amounts of flexibility, mobility and dynamic and large demands of self-management, self-presentation and responsibilization.

Anyway, the empirical study we present in the following is interested in "the power of example" (Flyvbjerg 2001); subsequently it wants to contribute to *"exemplary knowing"* (Kannonier-Finster/Ziegler 1998). As the qualitative research process was guided by an 'explorative approach' (Edmondson/McManus 2007, Denzin/Lincoln 2000), we followed a flexible, open, context related and methodically plural research strategy (Kannonier-Finster et al. 2000: 6). Context-analysis and open, semi-structured interviews, added by field notes and protocols, were the central methods used in the research process (Lamnek 1995, Silverman 1985). For this study we conducted 12 interviews with both actors (formerly) embedded in 'traditional career contexts' and actors embedded in 'entrepreneurial' contexts of work and career. On average the interviews lasted an hour; they were all fully transcribed and coded (with NVivo). In the analysis of our empirical material we, however, tried to follow a 'reflexive methodology' (Alvesson/Sköldberg 2000). Besides, the empirical insights of our study were communicatively and argumentatively validated (ibid.: 255, Lamnek 1995: 157).

To get more concrete with regard to our empirical sample: it consists of actors who studied business at the University of Vienna of Economics and Business and graduated between 1970 and 2000. All graduates we interviewed are or were engaged in the private business sector. So our sample is composed on the one hand of

- six actors that finished their studies in 1970 and, thus, exemplarily 'represent' the workers or employees of the "career discourse": more specifically, three of them are or were self-employed actors, three of them are or were employed within stable and long-term contracts. As business economists they are (were) mainly engaged in productive industries like automotive industry and aircraft industry; so they principally work(ed) for or in large companies;
- and on the other hand of six actors that finished their studies in or after 2000. They are subsequently involved or positioned within new "entrepreneurial work discourses": again, three of these business economists are self-employed actors and three of them are still 'normally' employed actors. Besides, all of them are active in the service sector; most of them in the consulting business. These graduates are, however, not engaged for large, 'elephantine' organizations; rather they work for or with smaller network enterprises.

Following our research interest – subjectivity constituting effects of different work and career contexts – and our process-orientated conceptualization of subjectivity, we decided to investigate and analyse our empirical material according to three main categories (Keating 1995, Miles/Huberman 1994, also Pullen/Linstead 2005: 9). Research questions were defined for each of these categories:

1. Rules and Norms that structure the specific **work and career contexts**: What are the logics and modes of regulation of the specific work and career contexts? How are the context-related normative expectations described by the business graduates? What is defined and judged as significant power resources or 'capital' (of success) in the particular fields? What strategies are seen as useful for the advancement in the specific career field?

2. Work and career practices and habits: ‚performing' professional identity: How does the every-day work life (activities) of our interviewees look like? How do they fulfil their tasks and functions? How are their works forms and career paths shaped over time and space? Which career transitions did the interviewees experience in their professional lives, and how did they deal with them?

3. Professionel self-understanding and (considered) self-identity: How do the interviewees understand and define 'career' and 'success' for themselves? How do they judge the effects of significant career transitions? What are their (professional) aims, and how do they actively try to reach them? Where and why do they (consciously) resist field-specific rules and norms in which they do not believe in?

In the following we will illustrate and discuss our empirical material according to these three main categories.

4. Empirical findings and insights

After having conceptually characterized fordistic and entrepreneurial work and career contexts in the sections above, the following elaborations will show which specific norms frame the field of action of our business graduates (of 1970 and 2000) and, moreover, how these norms are integrated in the process of professional identity work. Aside from context-analysis-material quotes, stemming from the semi-structured interviews we conducted, build the main source of our discussion.[11]

Rules and norms of work and career contexts

First off, the ways of how the business graduates describe the logics and normative expectations of their particular employment fields are predominantly consistent with those we analysed in the conceptual part of the paper. However, the graduates' stories make also evident that the respective paradigmatic rule and norm sets are not fully to equate with those they experience in their daily work.

As regards the works and career contexts of our graduates that exemplarily represent the 'fordistic-bureaucratic business men', one can assume that these contexts are described as stable, calculable and quite homogeneous. The interviewees force being bound to their employer and being obliged to the function and position they occupy and 'possess'. Besides,

[11] After each quote the source of the interviews is stated in brackets; apart from the initials we indicate gender, professional position or function, employment form and field.

they explicitly refer to their work contracts wherein their duties, tasks and rights are defined. In other words, they are aware that organizational loyalty and obedience are principally rewarded with job security and calculable career steps:

> *"As I've been employed by this company many years ago, it was more or less like a state-owned enterprise, in terms of job security, continuity and so on. Nobody ever thought about the possibility of being outsourced or something similar. For being fired one had to steal something or commit a crime. (…) But times changed… and today there are many people employed by temporary contracts, also in our company – but we never thought of such developments." [HH, male, self-employed, IT industries]*

Despite the fact that the 1970s graduates work in different industries – they are engaged in rather large production or service industries like automobile, aviation or (later on also in) IT – they characterize the (fordistic) context of work they belong to quite similarly. So one can observe certain expressed commonalities with respect to the logics and government modes of the specific professional contexts. Careers are e.g. described as being dependent from the specific organizational structure and vacant positions. Strategies that lead to personal advancement within the organisation are, moreover, mentioned like the following quote shows:

> *"In my career I started with a staff position, a staff position including secretaries etc., and in this staff position I worked with the main department, the management and cooperated with the controlling department. A relatively classical way as regards the organizational structure. … Well, a staff position is simultaneously always a bit more hybrid than the other positions; on a staff position you cannot follow the very classical pattern of advancement. But it also has advantages, like getting access to various information and data (…) So I was involved in the strategy and the controlling department, and the information and connections I got there were very helpful, of course, I mean for my later advancement." [IR, female, 1970, Controlling, Aviation industry]*

This statement illustrates, amongst others, that 'fordistic employees' are or were quite convinced to continuously advance within the organizational hierarchy as long as certain norms and codes are followed and fulfilled.

Even if fordistic organizations were shaped by continuity and stability, the issue of change also emerges when the graduates from 1970 describe their professional field. They all speak from essential *technological* developments and economic growth within the last decades. This aspect illustrates, again, that large industrial – fordistic – companies also passed through transformations and modifications as regards their structures and more general their orientation and positioning. However, our 'traditional business men' generally relate the issue of (technological) change to their direct organizational environment; so they discuss the effects that change processes have (had) for 'their organization' – and not e.g. for the labour market or the branch more generally. The following quote, stated by a controller that holds a staff position and is engaged in the aviation industry, illustrates, besides, that the field-specific industrial developments of the last decades are principally acclaimed:

> *"In general this industry is such a growing industry … in principle we can say there was a boost in technology the last 30 years that was outstanding. And not only the technological advancement is amazing, our company had also double growth rates in the last years." [IR, female, 1970, Controlling, Aviation industry]*

However, some interviewees also mention certain ambivalences that are bound to environmental changes. That social and economic deregulation tendencies affected and transform(ed) organizational practices and norms in the last years, is also perceived by the 'bureaucratic-fordistic' actors:

> *"There was also a disruption within the company because of growth and the whole expansion. So this rapid development and also the internationalization of the company affected the familiar atmosphere which was definitely still there in the 80s; but since the 90s this atmosphere is actually dissolving."[KJ, male, 1970, Accounting, Automobile industry]*

So several business graduates from 1970 also address certain problematic aspects due to organizational 'change processes'. Besides, some of our interviewees started their own business after having worked in large companies for years. The reasons for this step were differently. Some consciously and actively chose this new path; others were more or less the 'victim' of change processes (insofar as they lost formerly attractive career perspectives). For others, again, self-employment was (first of all) a – quite acceptable – possibility to bridge the time gap to the point of retirement:

> *"I can hardly remember that I said to myself, 'I don't want this [being employed] any longer' or that 'being employed for this company is horrible'. I was thoroughly satisfied. (….) Well, however, I started my own business with the age of 57, and first of all I thought, after leaving the company, that it will become easier, that I will work less until I retire… but this was just the case during the first two months of self-employment, nowadays I work more than ever before." [HH, male, self-employed, IT industries]*

Thus, even if organizational reform processes were differently experienced by the 'fordistic business men', most of them indicate that stable work and performance processes, relatively secure career perspectives and long-term employment contracts and organizational membership were or partly still are a matter of course.

In contrast, the graduates from 2000 describe their work and employment contexts quite differently. Most of them use the well known 'new management'-rhetoric when describing their fields of action: they, thus, call networks, project teams, decentralized management and flat hierarchies as characteristics of their specific work organization.

Following the statements of our interviewees that are all engaged in the non-productive/-material service sector, the normative professional expectations with which they are confronted seem to be quite similar, even if some of them still work for a company in the traditional sense, whereas others are self-employed. So our 'postfordistic professional subjects' all emphasize that 'intellectual and creative capabilities' are required within the 'knowledge-intensive' contexts in which they are embedded. They furthermore emphasize that they have to be flexible and 'self-directed' *and* simultaneously team-orientated – as 'knowledge sharing' is seen as a crucial success factor; in this regard the graduates, especially the self-employed, also refer to the necessity to continuously develop and extend their skills for maintaining their 'employability'. The effectiveness of employability as governmental strategy becomes, again, evident in the rhetoric the graduates use; it illustrates the new order of 'career priorities':

> *"Well, what means 'successful'… I can just say that I have not yet reached the limit, probably because there is no limit; it always goes further... There are always changes, there are always challenges and you have to cope with each challenge, with new norms, so you have to fulfil the ever changing demands. …so far I have succeeded." [CG, male, 2000, Consultant/self employed, Consultancy]*

This statement expresses the current demand to be constantly on the move – and the individual attempt to comply with it. Thus, it becomes quickly evident that 'new' work and career contexts are differently organized and governed than the former 'bureaucratic-fordistic' ones. This aspect is also perceived by the graduates from 2000. They are aware that their career paths are instable and dynamic – like the field of actions in which they are engaged. Most of our interviewees work, however, in the consulting branch; some of them had the chance to get a stable employment contract; others however, had to go into business for oneself directly after receiving their master degree. Either way, all graduates describe the consulting business as a very moulding and changing field:

> *"Consultancy means a very dynamic field and so the job is also very variable; this means that you constantly deal with different partners; be it an insurance company, an industrial firm, a commerce, whatsoever. (…) As self-employed actor you have the advantage that you work in many diverse companies, diverse situations and different projects that are scheduled for a couple of months up to one year." [CG, male, 2000, Consultant/self employed, Consultancy]*

The fact that self-employed business men are any longer dependent from one singular company is – like the diversity of tasks and 'projects' and the increasing chances of participation – widely appreciated by the interviewees. However, at least some of them mention that being self-employed also means being obliged to flexibility, openness, adaptability and self-responsibility. In this regard one of the graduates argues that he cares for its employability like he is asked to do, even if the very hard and competitive consultancy market would make it difficult to improve one's expertise and, thus, employability:

> *"The problem is that it is increasingly difficult to find a spot and position yourself. (…) The market looks for real consumer-oriented, IT-focused project solutions, but there are so many suppliers. I belief everything that goes in the direction of strategic consultancy is right now of interest; but it is a tough world out there and hard-fought and the rivalry is principally very intensive." [PO, male, 2000, Consultant, Consultancy]*

To sum up at this point: Differently than graduates from 1970 those from 2000 present continuous change and modulation of work and career structuring rules as normality. They try to fulfil ever changing norms as best as possible; most of them perform as 'entrepreneurs', more or less independently if they are formally self-employed or not. Hence, at the focal point of the following subsection will be the question to what extent the work practices and career paths differ between fordistic and, thus, 'disciplined and dutiful' employees and more entrepreneurial, team-orientated, active and self-organized employees.

Work and career practices: performing professional identity

As mentioned most graduates from the 1970s we interviewed are or were long-term employed within large companies. This specific contractual form also affects the work practices of the fordistic employees. They are or were principally tied to professionalism and specialisation as regards the task and function that was to fulfil. So work practices are related to and defined by the specific position one occupied within the organizational structure:

> *"Well, the position one had already prescribed to a large extent the daily activities and actions. It actually didn't happen that you spontaneously had to care for a new task or something similar. When you changed your position then you got some new duties and responsibilities, for sure; but generally I have to say that my work practices and the days in the company were quite similar to one another. Not that much surprises." [KJ, male, 1970, Accounting, Automobile industry].*

By trend ‘fordistic’ work practices became less routine-based and so more complex and varying on higher hierarchical levels. Spheres of competence and responsibilities were extended if the respective position was formally defined as ‘powerful’ and, thus, as crucial for the organizational performance. How work and career practices are connected, is also expressed within the following statement:

> *“Well, it goes this way: you start being an assistance of a senior organizational member. Well, either you do the same business as your ‘mentor’ does or you just prepare the paperwork and observe your mentor, when you visit for example customers. After a while you gain some confidence and you can extend your line of action a bit. […] I think after three or four years, I was then an independent customer adviser and was leading a group. First it was a small group of two people and after being a senior advisor, I became part of the executive board and took over the agenda of human resources. That’s the normal way, I would say.” [RS, female, 1970, self-employed PR Agency]*

So as regards the issue of career path and advancement the 1970s graduates highlight the internal organizational labour market and explore how they compete(d) for positions within their organisation. On the one hand they call career perspectives as dependent from superiors and whose preferences and judgements; on the other hand they see their career paths as defined by vacant positions within the organisation. One of the ‘fordistic employees’ comments the issue of individual career advancement as follows:

> *“After a while at a certain point in time, you get the feeling that you would like to be more advanced, but your boss or colleague who has more experiences, doesn’t want to clear the position. It happens quite often that you are blocked because there is a boss, that hasn’t got enough yet and does not leave. Well, I had luck! In my case he left the company. It is always luck! If this happens earlier in your career, then you have earlier the opportunity to progress, if it happens later, you must wait, this can get on for years.“ [RS, female, 1970, self-employed PR Agency]*

The quote expresses that career advancement is at least partly attributed to ‘luck’ and coincidence and, thus, seen as highly determined by external aspects, conditions and dependencies that can be merely influenced by oneself. Anyhow, this form of ‘passivity’ cannot be defined as a general characteristic of fordistic-bureaucratic employees. Among our interviewees there are some 1970s graduates that decided to start their own business after having spent years in the same position or at least in the same organization. They, thus, rejected the organizational career path that was predefined for them and left their companies. One in the meantime self-employed actor reports in this context:

> *“After 14 years I decided to leave the company. I was in a leadership position and had a lot of management tasks to fulfil, but actually I missed the core business of consultancy itself. So together with a colleague I established my own small consulting enterprise. We had already some customers that followed us; so the beginning was not that tough. And it emerged as a very good decision to change my original career path.” [RS, female, 1970, self-employed PR Agency]*

Though, one has to add at this point that the chance these employees took was quite calculable. They had large experiences and expertise in their position; they were not unknown in their field of action, they had already business contacts and were, moreover,

active in merely competitive branches. Still, these examples show that the will to increase individual scopes of action let 'fordistic subjects' renounce the privileges their employer promised them. Thus, in sum, the work and career practices are – like the respective discursive norms – not that coherent as the conceptual analysis suggests.

However, let us focus the work and career practices of the business graduates of 2000 in the next step. Even if bureaucratic-fordistic work practices partly still exist within post-bureaucratic (organizational) contexts, in general 'entrepreneurial' practices are characterized by much more hybridism, instability, complexity and continuous modification. These graduates are aware that pure 'technical' professional qualifications are by no means sufficient to 'survive' within the employment and career contexts they are embedded in:

> *"You know, we all work in diverse projects and are engaged in different networks; so it is clear that the demands are different, too. Well, I would say that my working day is very colourful and varied, sometimes too varied. But actually I like that; I have almost no routines. I have the feeling I can continuously develop my competencies." [BP, female, 2000, consultancy]*

This statement makes evident that the graduates from 2000 are already used to ever changing and divers work practices. They merely question the demand of 'being bundles of competencies' or the demand to continuously extend one's know-how and qualifications. By contrast, the 'entrepreneurial subjects' emphasize the necessity of being flexible and open towards new opportunities. New contingent contacts *and* already established network or project contacts would require physical and mental flexibility:

> *"Understanding the problem, especially in my area of work…in consultancy…is very crucial. You have to understand the particular problem very quickly. You have to put yourself in the position of the customer or your partners and then you must quickly react. So you have to keep yourself very flexible, also psychologically." [POe, male, 2000, consultancy]*

Thus, it is argued that 'customer- and team-orientation' 'require' the willingness and adaptability to continuously modulate oneself. That work is any longer bound to a stable room or place is also often appreciated in this regard. The chance to connect at any time in the 'open space' seems to be 'liberating' and, thus, creativity-supporting. In other words, it seems to allow focussing on 'the problem':

> *"We are interested in problem based solutions… even if there are still certain, let's say, bureaucratic elements within our organization.. anyway, it is a huge advantage that our teams are actually very diverse, so everybody has some other strengths. I think this is most important and typical for our modes of working. We work in 'colourful' and good teams and are looking for a close collaboration with the customers." [CG, male, 2000, Consultant/self employed, Consultancy]*

The quotes illustrate that the business graduates from 2000 integrate a diversity of 'skills' in their daily performances; apart from expert knowledge 'creative, intellectual, entrepreneurial and (self)management competencies' are part of the respective work practices (which are, however, still not completely 'cleaned' from bureaucratic elements).

However, not just the work practices of our 'entrepreneurial selves' are heterogeneous and instable; the specific modes through which their 'careers' are shaped over time are also generally insecure, merely calculable and often 'multi-directional'. Still, the self-employed business graduates are keen to force the chances that dynamic work and career fields offer:

"Today you cannot plan your career and follow clear and stable propositions as our parents could. But this general dynamic is also interesting and inspiring, I think. (…) …when I think of a career… I think it would be rather difficult for me, I don't want to be in a working environment for ten years, where there is no change, or few changes; no, I am not patient, I need the challenge and shifting environments and tasks." [CG, male, 2000, Consultant/self employed, Consultancy]

Whereas some graduates from 2000 highlight the advantages of non-determined and open career paths, others admit that the very uncertain professional perspectives are perceived as a burden, too. So uncertainty is also seen as an increase of pressure and of work intensity. In this regard the 'entrepreneurs' often refer to the 'team' that 'helps' them to deal with challenges aligned with 'project careers'. Besides, they care actively for the establishment of stable social relations, even if they are engaged within temporary project groups:

"The team is for me important and central for many reasons. It is not just the success of the project and its reputation; it is also the social aspect. A team where one understands each other, where one really accepts and trusts each other is just great. (…) And such relations just give you a certain continuity and certainty." [POe, male, 2000, consultant, consultancy]

This quote expresses de-limiting tendencies as regards work and life *and* it shows the conscious attempt of some 'entrepreneurs' to border, again, such developments – e.g. through giving form to principally instable, 'fluid' and precarious relations. In the following we, thus, finally want to ask how established discursive norms are integrated and applied in the process of (professional) identity work.

Professional self-understanding and considered self-identity

Looking at our graduates from 1970 we are interested in the question to what extent their self-understanding complies with the "ideal bureaucratic-fordistic worker", characterised as disciplined, obeying and compliant. However, the majority of these business graduates do not actively care about the specific modes through which their career advancement is shaped. By contrast, they generally wait for a vacant position and thereby trust in their superiors or, more generally, the organizational order. In this regard one of the 'fordistic employees' explains his career path as follows:

"I always wanted to stay in accountancy, based on my education. It corresponds to my education and that was what I wanted, because it was interesting. …Soon it was clear to me that my internal career development was limited, apart from going international after a couple of years, but I didn't want that. I had a good relationship with my boss, we were a very good group and spend many years together…. so I stayed in my position until today." [KJ, male, 1970, Automobile industry, Accountant]

As illustrated above not all 1970s graduates show such a clear willingness to subject under organizational prescriptions. Rather, there are individuals that neglect external orders and commands, as the following story clearly points out:

"First of all customer consulting was not my affair. That was already a huge problem. Then there was a lot of pressure. (…) And I wasn't ready for that, besides, my personal views were divergent. My boss said with this views you will never sell something. …(…) Well, I told him I

cannot go out with arguments that are wrong. And finally I gave up this job." [RJ, male, 1970, Financial services]

Thus, normative expectations and invocations are also in the bureaucratic-fordistic work and career paradigm rejected and transgressed. In this context the high value attributed to more or less stable and fix boundaries between work and private sphere should be finally mentioned, too. Almost all 'fordistic employees' insisted on a clear distinction between 'office persona' and 'private persona'. The following statement shows that a fusion between several life spheres is just accepted in exceptional cases – and is 'sanctioned' when developing as norm:

"Of courses, there were phases, where the pressure of the 'house' was enormous…and as an exception I accepted certain private restrictions. (….) Though, after some reforms I left the company. You had to be more and more flexible, being disposable on the weekends…well, finally we thought, my wife and I, is that wise? And we decided, no, such a life mode is not the cleverest thing to practice." [RJ, male, 1970, Financial services]

As regards our graduates from 2000 such distinctions between work and leisure do merely exist. High amounts of flexibility and mobility are characteristic for the graduates' every day work life. As suggested above they try to fulfil these demands, even if simultaneously trying to limit a 'boundaryless working life'; they are, thus, principally keen to take active influence on their modes of working and living. This tension field is also expressed in the following quote:

"Even if I changed my 'weekend behavior'; for example sundays are totally different when you know that you have to get up again at 5am on monday and have to get to the airport. You try to get out the most from your weekends and you get somehow used to living out of the suitcase. But still… there are certain private priorities that are more important than the professional norms. That's clear, and I don't want to subordinate these priorities." [PO, male, 2000, Consultancy]

However, the subject ideal of the "entrepreneurial self" which includes the norms of being 'nomadic', flexible, creative, self-controlled and self-responsible, is still widely accepted by the graduates from 2000. This implies that many aspects of the image of the 'entrepreneur' seem to be integrated into the graduates' self-concept:

"Well, for me it is very important to be continuously active, I continuously want to learn and develop my skills, not just because it makes me employable. I want it on my own. Well, it is quite difficult to care for oneself and to be self-responsible for your career and life, but I think it is worth. All in all I don't want to change with somebody who has a fix and stable job, no, actually not at all." [BP, female, 2000, consultancy]

Amongst others this quote exemplifies the central attempt of being autonomous and self-determined within one's direct, generally project-based, field of activity. In return, most of the graduates are willing to accept a variety of precarious aspects that shape their working conditions.

All in all, most 'post-bureaucratic employees' seem to subject under the activity-norm and the employability-invocation. Besides, they also accept (or even appreciate) the norm of team- and project-orientation. However, this implies in the context at hand, again, that the discursive strategy of producing competition is not as effective as one could expect if one

considers the strong market-orientation of new employment fields. One of the graduates takes up this aspect:

> *"I am not interested in considering my colleagues as rivals. We support each other; and this support is very worthwhile. Most of us are in quite similar situations, so we are able to understand each other; and we are also partly dependent from each other. … no, I try not to be influenced by thoughts like rivalry and so on – I also don't perceive such elements in our common work." [PO, male, 2000, Consultancy]*

Such codes and attitudes show that the business graduates do not fully correspond with the discursive picture of the 'entrepreneurial' self'. Some implications of this insight will be reviewed in the next section. Besides, our main insights will be pointed out in the following discussion.

5. Discussion

Our study shows that the rationalities, rules and norms of fordistic *and* post-fordistic work and career contexts are heterogeneous, partly contradictory and inconsistent – as are the identities they produce (Josserand et al. 2006). Thus, the empirical material illustrates that bureaucratic-fordistic fields of activity cannot be understood as stable and invariant; by contrast they became at least partly 'entrepreneurial' – whereas a certain (re)bureaucratization within diverse post-fordistic 'projectified activities' seems to be not out of the ordinary (also Hodgson 2004: 86f., Kärremann/Alvesson 2004, Räisänen/Linde 2004). More specifically, within our analyzed institutional or organizational work contexts several ambivalent rules, norms and organized practices were identified. Amongst others, the following paradoxes were identified within fordistic *and* entrepreneurial professional contexts: dominance of hierarchical, centralized *and* cooperative, project-based structures of organizing; emphasize on self-responsible performing modes *and* external commands as well as on direct personal control *and* output control; acting according to clear and fix organizational orders *and* according to externally defined competitive market-values; alignment on standardized products, production structures and strategies *and* on diversified and customer-specific products/services and, thus, on dynamic organizational structures and strategies; focusing on efficiency *and* on creativity and innovation; performance regulating according to rationalistic-mechanistic *and* moralizing-emotionalizing criteria – and establishment of long-term employment relations *and* short-term flexible contracts.

From a discursive point of view bureaucratic-fordistic and post-bureaucratic regimes of work follow different rationalities, functions and (subject) ideals and they are structured through different modes of government. Though, in context-specific fields of practice these rationalities and norms are not substituted from one another, e.g. ideals like self-discipline, self-control and -government were established in the 'disciplinary regime'; and they are nowadays still of great importance (see Foucault 2008). Amongst others, this argument implies that one cannot simply assume that the decentrally structured regime of post-fordism/-bureaucracy increases individual freedom and reduces control (du Gay 2007: 173). Rather the empirical study shows that "the discourse of enterprise is ambiguous as are its effects" (McCabe 2009: 1577). So techniques and strategies of power and control do by no means disappear within post-fordism; they 'just' became fluid, protean and de-territorialized; through the pathos and rhetoric of "empowerment, self-responsibility, team- and project-

orientation" they became 'softer' – and this means more ambivalent (Courpasson/Reed 2004: 7, also Barker 1999, Bauman 2000, Deleuze 1995b, Maravellias 2007).

However, let us finally once more pick up the question which subjectivity constituting effects different work and career contexts produce and, thus, the question of how powerful are discourse-specific governmental strategies. Well, our empirical insights do not indicate that individuals formed, socialized and (formerly) embedded within bureaucratic-fordistic work and career fields are more – or less – self-determined and autonomous than those constituted and embedded within more recent post-fordistic, entrepreneurial fields. What our material clearly illustrates is that 'fordistic' and 'post-fordistic' identities (by all means those engaged within the private business sector) – and careers – are regulated according to quite different power techniques. Whereas fordistic employees are or were directly and steady dependent from 'their employer' or superior and were governed by the promise of 'organizational career' (also McKinlay/Wilson 2006), 'entrepreneurial subjects' are merely dependent from a single organization or client. Rather, they are dependent and governed by a very dynamic net of diverse market demands and uncertainties and are dominated by the promise or hope of 'employability' (also Weiskopf/Loacker 2006). Such hybrid governmental techniques produce, again, a variety of individual ambivalences. In other words, tendencies like de-territorialization, de-limiting, marketization and individualization of work are experienced as wearing by the 'entrepreneurial' employees. Whereas graduates from 1970 were principally able to clearly separate between work and life; those from 2000 are continuously occupied with finding an acceptable combination of different life spheres (even though with more or less marginal success); most of them react on the 'dislimitation' of work by actively looking and caring for continuities and stabilities in their (working) life. Such practices demonstrate that the autonomies, given to 'entrepreneurial selves', seem not to be just an 'alleviation' for attempts to consciously form one's self-identity (Kallinikos 2003: 601, also Garsten 1999, Sennett 1999).

However, even if the post-fordistic regime of work organization seems to produce more ambivalences than the fordistic regime does, with regard to the question of how our business graduates deal with dependencies and obligations of their specific career contexts, we can record the following: within both contexts there are individuals who widely accept or even strengthen discursively produced subject positions and there are certain individuals who seem to be less willing to subject under the field-specific 'rules of the game' (also Reckwitz 2008). So we can not argue that the 'governmentality' of one regime is more effective than the 'govermentality' of the other; in fact we see that the discursive norms of both regimes are often accepted – but also, at least partly and sometimes, refused and transgressed (e.g. from those 'bureaucrats' who decided to disclaim the predefined 'organizational career model' and start their own business). Focussing on the currently dominant model of enterprise the examples show that its particular ideals and norms – even if producing subjectifying effects and binding individuals to their identities (Foucault 1982) – can be critically reflected and rejected (like e.g. the rivalry- and competition-invocation). Furthermore, they can be used to legitimate and explain one's conduct and practice; so these ideals constrain the chances of self-government *and* offer possibilities of active self-(trans)formation. Besides, the distinction between dissent and consent with 'enterprise' is often blurring, too.

To sum up: the empirical insights make evident that identity (work) cannot be completely regulated; like the 'rules of the game' it is under continuous and precarious construction. Our study exemplifies, furthermore, that "any hybridization in political systems entails a hybridization of conducts and personalities" (Courpasson/Dany 2003: 1257). Thereby, it refers to the complexity, heterogeneity, dynamics and diversity of identities and (self) practices, and by this means it also forces the argument to focus on "enterprise in practice": The meaning and use of the maxim of "enterprise" cannot be determined; to some extent its realization and materialization always remains an open power game (also McCabe 2009:

1574ff.); it gets involved in the 'politics of organizing' (Steyaert 2000) and therefore reminds us that "resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (Foucault 1979: 95). This implies, again, that 'identities at work' differ from discourse-specific subject ideals (Storey et al. 2005). For social inquiry this insight requires to emphasize the context-specific 'micro-practices' within and through which subjectivities, identities, organizations, careers and social reality are constituted (Chia 2006, du Gay 2007).

6. Conclusion

After all post-bureaucracy must be understood as a complex, heterogeneous and ambivalent 'potpourri' within which diverse discourses and logics co-exist. Following Josserand et al. (2006) the so-called "post-bureaucratic era is characterized by hybridity. Far from being the end of bureaucracy, the post-modern area is that of its refurbishment" (ibid.: 54). Subsequently the attempt to strictly separate between the 'bureaucratic' and the 'post-bureaucratic' (work) ethos or between 'bureaucratic' and 'post-bureaucratic' identities, as an "epochalist perspective" through its logic of dichotomization does, has become obsolete, too (du Gay 2007: 138). So even if capitalism became "fluid" and the rhetoric of the "enterprise" became dominant in all spheres of life, one should be careful not to "over-emphasis on the notion of enterprise" (Salaman/Storey 2008: 316). Bureaucratic modes of conduct and regulation – like hierarchical ordering, the exercise of power through authorities and standardized rules – are not opposite to but immanent within the model of the "enterprise", the "network" and its performing practices (Harris 2006, Josserand et al. 2006). This implies, that bureaucratic forms of organizing are principally part of post-bureaucratic organization – and the other way around (Styhre 2007); consequently "bureaucratic order is both at odds with and yet operates through the enterprise discourse" (McCabe 2009: 1573). If one considers 'entities' as constructed through their other(s), then one can also assume that entrepreneurialism 'needs' bureaucracy as it is constituted in relation to its (du Gay 2004: 44).

Like any other order, the order of "enterprise" should, thus, not be considered as being deterministic, universal or exclusive. As the empirical examples show professional identities can not be simply deduced or 'read off' from management programs of identity construction. By contrast, "the role of enterprise in the construction of employee identity is mediated by numerous factors and discourses all of which contribute to the ways in which individuals understand themselves" (Salaman/Storey 2008: 318) – in relation to several "others". This refers, again, to Foucaults assumption that discourses and power/knowledge relations are not solely repressive and determining. By contrast, power can only be exercised over free subjects (Foucault 1987: 257), subjects that are able to subvert, resist and react on normative invocations, demands and ideals in various ways (also Fournier 1998, McCabe 2009). What we see as a central contribution of this paper, that was interested in the shifting conceptual rationalities of the government of work and life (e.g. du Gay 2004, 2008, Munro 2005, Read 2009, Rose 1992) and in the question of how discursive professional norms can affect subjectivity, ties in with this argument: our empirical material illustrates that (subject) ideals and norms are quite differently integrated in the process of identity work. It shows, moreover, that their meaning is re-produced in applying them; thus, that norms are re-created through their context-specific enactment in practice.

Even if we want to emphasize the large significane and potential of a 'casuistry approach' (du Gay 2007) and 'proximal view' (Cooper/Law 1995) within social inquiry and the field of organization and management studies more general, we conclude our paper in

assuming a governmental position one more time: we suggest that if one thinks and argues from the perspective of “epochal regulation and government” (du Gay 2007: 137ff.), then it seems that in recent years the “entrepreneurial paradigm”, analysed in the paper at hand, is, again, modulating. There seems to be a move towards a new paradigm, we want to call the “*creativity paradigm”.* However, in our view into the “creativity paradigm” it is the ‘artist’, much more than the ‘entrepreneur’, that is discursively defined and positioned as role model of a “liberated”, self-organized, precarious – but creative world of working and living (Loacker 2010, Mayerhofer/Mokre 2007, Menger 2006, Raunig/Wuggenig 2007). By trend, the artist is currently constructed as ‘expert’ of immaterial, knowledge-intensive and innovative work, as expert of self-organized, project- and network-based modes of working and organizing and as expert of ‘good ethics’ – in terms of selflessness, high commitment, passion and enthusiam (McGee 2005, Virno 2005). In fact the wohle cultural branch seems to be organized around and through a “play ethics” (Kane 2004). Hence, our argument is that the artist becomes the new universal subject ideal as with the establishment of the creative ‘knowledge economy’ the economization of several life aspects and the limitless marketization of the working subject are by no means in opposition to the aesthetization, affectualization and moralization of work and life (also Koppetsch 2006: 198, Böhm/Land 2008). So we suspect that constituting human beings as artists offers even more (extensive) possibilities to modulate, regulate and make individuals (and their lives) governable – than ‘just’ appealing them as strategic entrepreneurs. Govermental shifts like these (would) constitute a variety of challenges, not least for the field of critical management studies.

References:

Alvesson, M., Sköldberg, K. (2000). Reflexive Methodology. New Vistas for Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Alvesson, M., Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. In Journal of Management Studies 26 (7): 619-44.

Arthur, M., Rousseau, D.B. (1996). The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organisational Era. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barker, J. (1999). The discipline of teamwork. Participation and concertive control. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Barratt, E. (2008). The later Foucault in organization and management studies. In Human Relations 2008 61: 515-537.

Bauman, Z. (2000). Liquid Modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2001). Flüchtige Moderne. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bauman, Z. (2007). Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (2007). Schöne neue Arbeitswelt. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Böhm, S., Land, C. (2008). No measure for culture? Value in the new economy. In Capital & Class 97 (3): 75-98.

Boltanski, L., Chiapello, E. (2006). Der neue Geist des Kapitalismus. Konstanz: UVK.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). The biographical illusion. (Working Papers and Proceedings of the Centre for Psychosocial Studies, University of Chicago: 1-7). In du Gay, P., Evans, J., Redman, P. (2000). The Identity: A Reader. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). Soziologische Fragen. Frankfurt. Suhrkamp.

Bröckling, U. (2007). Unternehmerisches Selbst. Soziologie einer Subjektivierungsform. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Butler, J. (1999). Gender Trouble. New York/London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2005). Giving an account of oneself. New York: Fordham University Press.

Chia, R. (1996). The Problem of Reflexivity in Organizational Research: Towards a Postmodern Science of Organization. In Organization 3 (1): 31-60.

Clegg, S. (1994). Power-relations and the constitution of the resistant subject. In Jemier, M., Knights, D. Nord, W. (Eds.). Power and resistance in organizations. London: Routledge: 274-325.
Clegg, S., Hardy, C. (1999). (Eds.). Studying Organization. Theory & Method. London: Sage.
Cooper, R., Law, J. (1995). Organization. A distal and a proximal view. In Research in the Sociology of Organizations 13: 237-274.
Courpasson, D., Dany, F. (2003). Indifference or Obedience? Business Firms as Democratic Hybrids. In Organization Studies 24(8): 1231–1260.
Courpasson, D., Reed, M. (2004). Introduction: Special Issue on Bureaucracy in the Age of Enterprise. In Organization 11 (1): 5-12.
Deleuze, G. (1995): Foucault. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Deleuze, G. (1995b). Negotiations. 1972-1990. New York: Columbia University Press.
Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (1980/2000). A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Mineapolis: University of Minesota Press.
Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Doherty, M. (2009). When the working day is through: the end of work as identity? In Work, employment and society 23 (1): 84-101.
Donzelot, J., Gordon, C. 2008. Governing Liberal Societies – the Foucault Effect in the English-speaking World. Interview. In Foucault Studies 5: 48-62.
du Gay, P. (1996): Consumption and Identity at Work. London: Sage.
du Gay, P. (2000): In Praise of Bureaucracy. London: Sage.
du Gay, P. (2004). Against ‘Enterprise’ (but not against ‘enterprise’, for that would make no sense). In Organization 11 (1): 37–57.
du Gay, P. (2007). Organizing Identity. London: Sage.
du Gay, P. (2008). Without Affection or Enthusiasm. Problems of Involvement and Attachment in 'Responsive' Public Management. In Organization 15 (3): 335-353.
Edmondson, A.C., McManus, S.E. (2007). Methodological Fit in Management Field Research. In Academy of Management Review 32 (4): 1155-1179.
Eikhof, D., Haunschild, A. (2006). Lifestyle Meets Market: Bohemian entrepreneurs in creative industries. In Creativity and innovation management 15 (3): 234-241.
Fenollosa, E. (1969). The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry. In Pound, E. (Ed). Instigations. Freeport/New York: Books for Libraries.
Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). Making social science matter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Foucault, M. (1977/1994). Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison. London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. (1979). The History of Sexuality. The Will to Knowledge. London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. (1982). Afterword by Michel Foucault: The subject and power. In Dreyfus, H. L., Rabinow, P. (Eds.). Michel Foucault: beyond structuralism and hermeneutics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 208-226.
Foucault, M. (1984). The Use of Pleasure. The History of Sexuality. Volume 2. London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. (1987). Warum ich die Macht untersuche: die Frage des Subjekts. In Dreyfus, H.L., Rabinow, P. (Hrsg.). Michel Foucault: Jenseits von Strukturalismus und Hermeneutik. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp: 243-261.
Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In Martin, L., Gutman, H., Hutton, P. (Eds.). Technologies of the Self. Amerst/MA: University of Massachusetts Press: 16-49.
Foucault, M. (1997). The ethics of the concern for the self as a practice of freedom. In Rabinow, P. (Ed.). Michel Foucault, ethic, subjectivity and truth. New York: The new Press: 281-301.
Foucault, M.(2004). Geschichte der Gouvernementalität. Die Geburt der Biopolitik. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
Foucault, M. (2007). Ästhetik der Existenz. Schriften zur Lebenskunst. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
Foucault, M. (2008). The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College De France 1978-1979. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
Fournier, V., Grey, C. (1999). Too Much, Too Little and Too Often: A Critique of du Gay’s Analysis of Enterprise. In Organization 6 (1): 107-128.
Garsten, C. (1999). Betwixt and between: Temporary Employees as Liminal Subjects in Flexible Organizations. In Organization Studies 20 (4): 601-617.
Graefe, S. (2007). Im Schatten des Homo oeconomicus. Subjektmodelle ‚am Lebensende‘ zwischen Einwilligungs(un)fähigkeit und Ökonomisierung. In Krasmann, S., Volkmer, M. Michel Foucaults

‚Geschichte der Gouverementalität' in den Sozialwissenschaften. Internationale Beiträge. Bielefeld: transcript: 267-286.
Gunz, H.P., Peiperl, M. (2007). (Eds.). Handbook of Career Studies. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Hall, D.T. (1996). Protean careers of the 21st century. In Academy of Management Executive 10 (4): 8-16.
Hamann, T.H. (2009). Neoliberalism, Govermentality, and Ethics. In Foucault Studies 6: 37-59.
Handy, C. (1995). The age of paradox. Boston/Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
Harris, M., Höpfl, H.M. (2006). Introduction: Organization in the age of post-bureaucracy. In Journal of Organizational Change Management 19 (1): 5-7.
Heckscher, C., Donnellon, A. (1994). (Eds.). The Post-Bureaucratic Organization. New Perspectives on Organizational Change. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Hesse, J.O. (2007). ‚Der Staat unter der Aufsicht des Marktes' – Michel Foucaults Lektüren des Ordoliberalismus. In Krasmann, S., Volkmer, M. Michel Foucaults ‚Geschichte der Gouverementalität' in den Sozialwissenschaften. Internationale Beiträge. Bielefeld: transcript: 213-237.
Hodgson, D.E. (2004). Project Work: The Legacy of Bureaucratic Control in the Post-Bureaucratic Organization. In Organization 11 (1): 81-100.
Hofbauer, J. (1998). Raum als geronnenes Denken. Büroorganisation vom Fabriksmodell zur Kulturlandschaft. In Work@Culture. Büro. Inszenierung von Arbeit. Klagenfurt: Ritter Verlag: 303-310.
Höpfl, H.M. (2006). Post-bureaucracy and Weber's "modern" bureaucrat. In Journal of Organizational Change Management 19 (1): 8-21.
Josserand, E., Teo, S., Clegg, S. (2006). From bureaucratic to post-bureaucratic: the difficulties of transition. In Journal of Organizational Change Management 19 (1): 54-64.
Kärreman, D., Alvesson, M. (2004). Cages in Tandem: Management Control, Social Identity, and Identification in a Knowledge-Intensive Firm. In Organization 11(1): 149–175.
Kallinikos, J. (2003). Work, Human Agency and Organizational Forms: An Anatomy of Fragmentation. In Organization Studies 24 (4): 595-618.
Kallinikos, J. (2004). The Social Foundations of the Bureaucratic Order. In Organization 11 (1): 13-36.
Kane, P. (2004). The play ethic. London: Macmillan.
Kannonier-Finster, W., Ziegler, M. (1998). (Hrsg.). Exemplarische Erkenntnis. Zehn Beiträge zur interpretativen Erforschung sozialer Wirklichkeit. Innsbruck/Wien: Studien-Verlag.
Kanter, R. (1990): When Giants Learn to Dance. London: Unwin Hyman.
Kanter, R.M. (1997). On the frontiers of management. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
Kaufmann, S. (2004). Netzwerk. In Bröckling, U., Krasmann, S., Lemke, T. (Hrsg.). Glossar der Gegenwart. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp: 182-189.
Keating, P. J. (1995). A framework for classifying and evaluating the theoretical contributions of case research in management accounting. In Journal of Management Accounting Research 7: 66-86.
Kieser, A. (2002). Managementlehre und Taylorismus. In Kieser, A. (Hrsg.). Organisationstheorien. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: Kohlhammer: 65-99.
Knights, D. (1990). Subjectivity, power and the labour process. In Knights, D., Willmott, H. (Eds.) Labour process theory. London: Macmillan: 297-335.
Koppetsch, C. (2006). Das Ethos der Kreativen. Konstanz: UVK.
Lamnek, S. (1995). Qualitative Sozialforschung. Bd. 2. Weinheim: Beltz.
Lash S., Urry J. (1994). Economies of signs and space. Sage: London.
Lazzarrato, M. (1998). Verwertung und Kommunikation. In Negri, A., Lazzarato, M., Virno, P. (Hrsg.). Umherschweifende Produzenten. Immaterielle Arbeit und Subversion. Berlin: 53-66.
Lemke, T., Krasmann, S., Bröckling, U. (2000). Gouvernementalität, Neoliberalismus und Selbsttechnologien. In Bröckling, U., Krasmann, S., Lemke, T. (Hrsg.). Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp: 7-40.
Linstead, S. (2002). Text/Work: Representing Organization and Organizing Representation. London: Routledge.
Loacker, B. (2010). kreativ prekär: künstlerische Arbeit und Subjektivität im Postfordismus. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
Maravelias, C. (2007). Freedom at Work in the Age of Post-bureaucratic Organization. In ephemera. Theory and politics in organization 7 (4): 555-574.
Mayerhofer, E., Mokre, M. (2007). Geniekünstler und Kulturarbeiterinnen – von der Freiheit der Kunst zur Wertschöpfung durch Kreativität. In SWS Rundschau 3 (47): 292-311.
McCabe, D. (2009). Enterprise contested: Betwixt and between the discourses of career and enterprise in a UK bank. In Human Relations 62 (10): 1551-1579.
McGee, M. (2005). Self-Help, Makeover Culture in American Life. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKinlay, A. (2002). `Dead Selves': The Birth of the Modern Career. In Organization 9 (4): 595-614.
McKinley A., Starkey K. (1998). (Eds.). Foucault, Management and Organization Theory. Sage: London.
McKinlay, A., Wilson, R.G. (2006). 'Small acts of cunning': Bureaucracy, inspection and the career, c. 1890–1914. In Critical Perspectives on Accounting 17: 657–678.
McSweeney, B. (2006). Are we living in a post-bureaucratic epoch? In Journal of Organizational Change Management 19 (1): 22-37.
Menger, P.M. (2006). Kunst und Brot. Die Metamorphosen des Arbeitnehmers. Konstanz: UVK.
Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks/CA: Sage.
Munro, I. (2005). Information Warfare in Business. Strategies of control and resistance in the network society. London/New York: Routledge.
Oechsler, W. (2006). Personal und Arbeit. Grundlagen des Human Resource Management und der Arbeitgeber-Arbeitnehmer-Beziehungen. München/Wien: Oldenburg.
O'Leary, T. (2002). Foucault and the art of ethics. London: Sage.
Opitz, S. (2004). Gouvernementalität im Postfordismus: Macht, Wissen und Techniken des Selbst im Feld unternehmerischer Rationalität. Hamburg: Argument.
Osborne, D./Gaebler, T. (1992). Reinventing Government. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
Peiperl, M., Arthur, M., Anand, N. (2002). (Eds.). Career Creativity. Explorations in the Remaking of Work. Oxford: 298-313.
Peters, T. (2001). Reinventing Work. The brand you 50. Or: Fifty ways to transform yourself from an 'employee' into a brand that shouts distinction, commitment, and passion! New York: Alfred A. Kopf.
Pongratz, HJ., Voß, GG. (1998). Der Arbeitskraftunternehmer. Eine neue Grundform der Ware Arbeitskraft? In Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 50: 131-158.
Pongratz, HJ., Voß, GG. (2000). Vom Arbeitnehmer zum Arbeitskraftunternehmer. Zur Entgrenzung der Ware Arbeitskraft. In Minssen, H. (Hrsg.). Begrenzte Entgrenzungen: Wandlungen von Organisation und Arbeit. Sigma: Berlin: 225-247.
Pullen, A., Linstead, S. (2006). Organization and Identity. London, New York: Routledge.
Rabinow, P., Rose, N. (2003). Introduction - Foucault today. In Rabinow, P., Rose, N. (Eds.). The essential Foucault - selections from essential works of Foucault 1954-1984. London: Routledge: vii-xxxv.
Räisänen, C., Linde, A. (2004). Technologizing Discourse to Standardize Projects in Multi-Project Organizations: Hegemony by Consensus?. In Organization 11(1): 101–121.
Raunig, G., Wuggenig, U. (2007). (Hrsg.). Kritik der Kreativität. Wien: Turia + Kant.
Ridder, H.G. (2002). Vom Faktoransatz zum Human Resource Management. In Schreyögg, G., Conrad, P. (Hrsg.). Theorien des Managements. Managementforschung 12. Wiesbaden: 211-240.
Read, J. (2009). A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity. In Foucault Studies 6: 25-36.
Reckwitz, A. (2008). Subjekt. Bielefeld: transcript.
Rose, N. (1991). Governing the soul. The shaping of the private self. London: Routledge.
Rose, N. (1992). Governing the enterprising self. In Heelas, P., Morris, P. (Eds.). The values of the enterprise culture: The morale debate. London: Routledge: 141-164.
Rose, N., Miller, P. (1992). Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government. British Journal of Sociology 43, 173-205.
Salaman, G., Storey, J. (2008). Understanding Enterprise. In Organization 15 (3): 315-323.
Sennett, R. (1998). The Corrosion of Character. The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism, New York: Norton.
Sennett, R. (2004). Respekt im Zeitalter der Ungleichheit. Berlin: Berliner Taschenbuch Verlag.
Silverman, D. (1985). Qualitative Methodology and Sociology. Aldershot: Gower.
Storey, J., Salaman, G., Platman, K. (2005). Living with Enterprise in an Enterprise Economy: Freelance and Contract Workers in the Media. In Human Relations 58 (8): 1033-1054.
Steyaert, C. (2000). Creating Worlds: Political Agendas of Entrepreneurship. LOK: Copenhagen Business School
Steyhre, A. (2007). The Innovative Bureaucracy. Bureaucracy in an Age of Fluidity. London: Routledge.
Tempest, S., McKinlay, A., Starkey, K. Careering alone: Careers and social capital in the financial services and television industries. In Human Relations 57 (12): 1523-1545.

Townley, B. (1998). Beyond good and evil: Depth and Division in the Management of Human Ressources. In McKinlay A., Starkey, K. (Eds.) Foucault, Management and Organization Theory. London: Sage: 191-210.
Weiskopf, R., Loacker, B. (2006). A snake's coils are even more intricate than a mole's burrow'. Individualization and subjectivation in post-disciplinary regimes of work. In Management Review 17 (4): 395-419.
Schumacher, P. (1998). Arbeit, Spiel und Anarchie. In Work@Culture. Büro. Inszenierung von Arbeit. Klagenfurt: Ritter Verlag: 245-254.
Taylor, D. (2009). Normativity and Normalization. In Foucault Studies 7: 45-63.l
Tellmann, U. (2009) Foucault and the Invisible Economy. In Foucault Studies 6: 5-24.
Vandenberghe, F. (2008). Deleuzian capitalism. In Philosophy & Social Criticism 34 (8): 877-903.
Virno, P. (2005). Grammatik der Mulitude. Wien: Turia+Kant.
Weber, M. (1921/1980). Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.