Utilizing the Concept of "Emotional Capital" –

"Family" as an Image and a Narrative in 20th-Century Corporate Communications

Susanne Hilger, Dusseldorf

Work in Progress - not to be quoted.

Emotions are 'hip.' According to David Goleman, 'emotional intelligence' has become the key concept for successfully harnessing primary emotions such as fear, anger, joy, grief, trust, disgust, expectation and surprise.[1] In contrast to this, economic theory has ignored the impact of emotions for too long. According to Thomas Steger, this is due to the 'rationality paradigm' in economic theory.[2] However, emotions turned out to be a decisive aspect not only in terms of investment and stock market decisions but also for corporate business management on a micro level in terms of the creation of "meaning", "sense" and "identity". Elements such as these reach far beyond the corporate system of rationality, that is 'making money'. Emotions, it turns out, goes along with the overall theme of our conference ('Beyond the Firm') as this is an area that precisely goes 'beyond the firm.'

The concept of emotional capital is said to encompass those resources which enable an organisation to inspire and influence emotional 'conditions'. According to Gratton and Goshal (2003), these resources contribute to realizing the business objectives of a company. Apart from human resource policies, these aspects have traditionally played a key role in internal and external corporate communications and corporate culture. This corresponds to this section's masterminds Akerlof's and Shiller's concept of 'animal spirits,' according to which *narratives* are seen to be among the outstanding constituents of an emotionally appealing economic and corporate culture.[3] In their book they identify 'stories' as one of the crucial formative features of an 'industrial psychology,' operating on the levels of motivation and interpretation.[4] Anyhow, from the perspective of cultural studies and cultural anthropology, this is not a completely new story. According to these narratives provide societies with an integrating time-frame, because they explain where people came from, where they started off from and what had been their common goal(s). They offer a conciliatory pattern of reading

the past, understanding the present and making sense of future perspectives.[5] And this may hold for companies, too.

Although Akerlof and Shiller only scratch the surface with their ideas on the relevance of narratives in economics, it is possible to put their approach on an empirical and scientific basis by drawing on numerous examples from business history research. For a long time, companies have used stories and narratives in their human resource policies so as to appeal to both staff and executive management on an emotional level, transcending purely objective relationships. In this context they have used the term family as a metaphor ('Werksfamilie', 'Betriebsfamilie') thus often symbolising a 'second home' as well as 'roots', 'community' and a feeling of 'security'. Not only can this metaphor be found in corporate welfare systems of 19th-century paternalistic companies but appears in the second half of the 20th century, at a time, when the corporate welfare system "from the cradle to the grave" began to change predominantly into monetary benefits.

By using examples of corporate communications in 20th-century German companies such as the chemical producers Bayer, Henkel or the machine building companies Krupp, Henschel, Daimler or Claas, this paper investigates the 'mobilisation' of 'emotional capital' through corporate metaphors with regard to motives, target groups and main instruments. Consequently, I will

1) identify the 'family narrative' as a decisive semantic element of corporate communication and

2) then ask for the communicative mechanisms and contexts which carry this rhetoric.

3) I am interested in the extent to which these elements and mechanisms changed in the wake of the Postwar era, as corporate labour relations became much more objective than they had been before. This is due to the increasing prevalence of monetary services in corporate welfare systems, employee participation and pay policies.

First of all, I will briefly discuss the term 'emotional capital,' then move on to some information on the 19th-century paternalistic company structures, in which the use of family narratives had a prominent place. My main focus will be the corporate communications in West-German companies before and after 1945. Whereas corporate welfare benefits particularly in the aftermath of World War II moved to the monetary level into the realm of the increasing West German public welfare system, immaterial 'offers' in terms of creating

'meanings' and identification increased even on the corporate level.[6] This present paper is *'work-in-progress'*. It is meant to provide first ideas on the role of emotions as an issue of corporate management, so I will be thankful for any discussion.

'Emotional Capital' as a Theoretical Approach – Preliminary Considerations

It is quite clear that the emotional atmosphere in a company has a considerable bearing on its success. It encompasses what we feel while being on the job, working together with colleagues, arguing with superiors, looking at the products of a company or talking about a company. Despite this, it is an area that has been largely neglected by economic research. When considering the company management, emotions often used to be regarded as irrational, as a taboo and were thus ignored. Now, they are one of the key elements of employee motivation and are said to have a bearing on staff turnover and motivation.[7] Research carried out over the past twenty years mainly in business studies and, in particular, in work and organisational psychology has been able to come up with ample proof for the crucial importance of emotions and moods regarding i.e. employee motivation, team work, and the marketing of products.[8]

The term 'emotional capital' can thus be applied to a number of organisational areas, such as staff management, motivating the executive management and marketing, all with the aim of establishing trust and commitment as a basis for realizing business objectives. The term encompasses those resources which enable a company to induce and influence emotional states in such a way as to ensure their formative potential, thus working towards realizing business objectives.[9]

The discourses on 'corporate social responsibility' (CSR) and 'corporate identity' (CI) in sociology and business studies have focussed on the lopsided perspective of corporate functional rationality since the 1980s. As *"a company is always also about people, it is about more than just 'capital', it is also about meaning, about constructing and communicating the meaning of personal relations"*, says Eckart Pankoke, a German sociologist.[10] It is possible to find proof for these intentions in the 19th as well as in the 20th centuries. Most recently, Moon, Crane and Matten have referred to the metaphor of 'corporate citizenship' as a 'label for elements of corporate philanthropy or social responsibility' that has already been applied for decades if not for centuries.[11]

Thus, the 'emotional turn,' that is to say the phenomenon of emotionalising operational processes on a corporate level, can be traced back a long way. Historical research, for instance, can provide numerous examples for mobilising emotional energies within corporate management by using particular semantics. Since the 19th century, company functions, in particular anniversaries, the pride in a product (such as pictures depicting facilities and staff), and the integration of family members of staff have been benchmarks of a meaningful corporate culture.

By using the term 'family' as a metaphor, these benchmarks were harnessed in a similar way up to the 1980s. This metaphor is part of the bigger picture of 'corporate rhetoric,' already documented in Gratton et al (1999), and is what I would like to focus on. The use of the 'family metaphor' in German companies, either family-owned companies or stock corporations, has been part of the development of human resource management (HRM) of industrial business enterprises since the 19th century. Although this has often been referred to as 'empty rhetoric,' a surprising number of companies keep employing this kind of imagery in their communications policies even up to nowadays.[12]

As regards methodology, the cultural anthropologist Irene Götz distinguishes between founding myths, visions, rituals, stories, stereotypes, ideologies and 'other linguistic comments on the world of work' just in order to create 'meaning'. According to Götz, this imagery involves 'the construction of collective identity and community concepts, which are passed on using media or in an institutional context, such as company functions'.[13] The image of family is part of this.

My paper is to show that the 'family narrative' as an interpretive and identity concept traditionally played a central role in implementing a confidence-building corporate culture, all the more so as it did not only relate to staff members but often to their family members too. In many cases, it emanated from the family of the company founder. Staging a 'we-consciousness' among staff is nothing that just develops, but is, according to social theory, linked to processes of raising awareness. These are activated through rituals, symbols and the creation of myths and are regarded as the central mechanisms of manifesting and establishing, of passing on and reinforcing company-specific models.

Shared memories, anecdotes and myths, the collective memory – these are all regarded as having an integrating effect, because they offer and legitimise means of identification through internal channels, such as statements of the company management, corporate gatherings and external activities. In the following, 'family' as 'corporate rhetoric' will be dealt with by looking at the aspects of:

- founding and personal myths
- stories and images
- rituals and symbols.

Categories such as these have up to now been negated by business history research, despite the fact that Werner Plumpe recently advocated an extended definition of economics as a 'co-evolutive complex of semantics, institutions and practices'. According to Plumpe, 'business is shaped by relevance, rules and regulations as well as day-to-day procedures'. Following this, he argued for 'the historical semantics of economics to be taken into account by all means.'[14]

Jack Goody (2002), Andreas Gestrich (1999) and others have dealt with family as a social group organised along the lines of kinship from a historical perspective. So I won't need to go into detail here. What is of interest for the purposes of this paper is the extended concept of family in the sense of the mediaeval 'familia' as a multi-generational household including unmarried relations and servants. This takes up Brunner's term '*ganzes Haus*' ─ including all members of a household ─ which is in itself one of the 'archetypical forms of human existence,' a 'universal institution, present in all places, cultures and throughout history.' Consequently, it can be applied to the sphere of the 19th-century industrial enterprise, too.

It is interesting to note in this context that family in the sense of the entire household ('*ganzes Haus'*) featured in writings of 19th-century conservative theorists, such as Wilhelm H. Riehl, as opposed to, on the one hand, 'the capitalist conditions of production' and, on the other hand, 'socialist ideas and concepts that emerged because of these conditions'.[15] This view tends to ignore that the family image used to be applied to companies in the sense of an ethical regime or as a rhetorical means of management. This has been emphasised by Hartmut Berghoff in his work on Hohner.[16] With regard to the social history of a company this management translated into an almost tribe-like attachment of the staff. From very early on, this was typical for the industrial corporate culture as a momentum of identification when it came to recruitment and dedication of staff and is reflected until well after the Second World

War in terms such as '*Kruppianer*' (i.e. 'Krupp-man') and '*Henkelaner*' (i.e. 'Henkel-man'). Hence, supposedly modern phenomena such as corporate identity and corporate culture can be traced back a long way. Their underlying motives are not so very different from current corporate human resource management aimed at recruiting qualified and motivated staff.

For this reason Thomas Welskopp has stressed the functional aspects of paternalismas a proof of a 'matter-of-fact and modern version of forming corporate social relations that is also in line with the market.' It is, furthermore, a strategy that plays along the lines of the system, is highly optimised and can be found in some way in all Western industrialised countries. As he argues, this strategy was specific to the problems of emerging modern industrial societies, such as staff turnover, a heterogeneous staff and the lack of accommodation and qualified workers but also of discipline, motivation and identification as well as the activities of the trade unions, which led to an increase in the cost of production and threatened the autonomy of the entrepreneur.[17] But as I will try to show this kind of policy is not only a 19th-century-story. Sharing of a collective perception of one's workplace as 'second home' is a model which has been applied in a wide variety of approaches during the 20th century as well.

'Family' as an Image and a Narrative in the Corporate Context

Even today, a decidedly corporate 'community of values' is often the result of a specific rhetoric which picks up on the image of the 'corporate family.' Right up to the present day, this rhetoric is part of internal and external company statements. The 2003 annual report of the CLAAS group, one of the leading German manufacturers of agricultural machinery, draws on the image *'consanguinity'* to stress the fact that all its staff members 'work in concert' while striving for the company objectives: 'The workforce is more than the sum of its individual members. It is a co-operative community with a team spirit and does not end at the factory gates.' In order to stress this bond, CLAAS uses the metaphor of *'green blood running through the veins of each and every Claas-man.'*[18]

The use of family metaphors aims at creating an attachment via the company and its products and creates a shared feeling of togetherness. This shared identity, based on the family image, is an integral part of corporate culture and as such a significant reference system for everyone associated with a company, be it the company management or members of staff. This system makes use of coordinates such as founding narratives, personal myths and rituals, as I am going to show further on.

Founding Narratives and Personality Cult

According to Akerlof and Shiller 'great leaders are first and foremost creators of stories'.[19] Founding and personal myths became a typical feature of the corporate history of the Wilhelmine era, or 'the *Gründerzeit*,' in Germany. This becomes clear in corporate communication policies that were based on 'stories' which can be traced back to the 19th century. As the example of the chemical company Henkel shows, company founder and 'patriarch' Fritz Henkel, born in the mid-19th-century, was at the heart of those narratives (even up to nowadays). A particular imagery was carried across via corporate communication channels, for instance with regard to the ongoing diversification of the company: The following statement was made at Henkel's 1914 company conference: *'Seen from the outside, there are different divisions at Henkel, but inside, we are one ... Whether we work at the Persil (washing powder), glue or P3 (cleaning agent) sections, we are all part of the big Henkel family.'* And there were also additional meetings for any section of the company, such as the sales representatives for example, for which the term *'family day'* was used, too.[20]

There is evidence to suggest that members of staff were responsible for the veneration that the founder, members of the company-owning family or even some top-managers experienced in certain cases. Staff recollections indicate that family gatherings and other celebrations attended by one or more members of the representatives of the top management were regarded as a personal appreciation by the member of staff. Often, the personal story of the founding entrepreneur or even a leading manager was the story of advancement from a modest background and of persevering diligence.[21]

In companies that were still expanding in the mid-19th century, such as Krupp, the company founder served as a reference figure operating on different levels such as on founding traditions, transporting myths, and as 'spiritus rector' of the company as well. These attributes stayed with the family and were even passed on to both his descendents.

Corporate 'Myths'

Company history far before World War II was used as an element both to constitute a *meaning* far beyond the production and sale of goods on the one hand and to market it on the other. In 1927, every Henkel sales representative was expected to 'know something about the history of his company that is to say, when it was founded and by whom, its development, and its leading figures.' This knowledge was supposed to enable them to 'talk on a more personal

level and to refresh memories with those clients who have had business relations with Henkel for many years. Without knowing about the past, the representative will no longer be able to connect with the many of our clients.' By being well informed about the history of the company, the member of staff also acquired 'a sense of belonging to the company, if he knew how it came into being.' 'His personal interest in the company' was meant to be boosted by 'providing him with some information about the owner.' Apart from his sons Fritz and Hugo Henkel, the 'senior boss' was seen as a unifying figure, because *without knowing the senior boss and other leading figures of the company ─ at least by reputation ─, the members of staff will not feel part of the company and will thus not come across to his clients as an integrating member of the company.'*[22]

'Myths of the Beginning'

Apart from people and their personal history, 'myths of the beginning' (R. Gries) were crucial for establishing an identity even in companies. In her work on Krupp, Barbara Wolbring takes a look at the symbolic significance of the very first and modest 19th-century *family home* of the Krupp-family, the so-called 'Stammhaus'. She came across recurrences to the humble background of the company's founder, and these were meant to put him on one level with the workers at Krupp. Nowadays the link between the creation of historical myths and future corporate development is nowhere more apparent than at the currently ongoing construction of the new *corporate headquarters of ThyssenKrupp in Essen*: The redevelopment of the urban area, locally referred to as 'Krupp-Gürtel,' includes a 20 hectare district of Essen to be converted into a place of work for 2,000 staff members and meeting place for people from all over the world, as well as the Krupp park and – the so-called Krupp-'*Stammhaus*'.[23]

Corporate Welfare as a 'Family Affair'

Child and youth welfare as well as caring for the sick were duties that used to fall traditionally into the realm of the entrepreneur's wife and that of other female members of the family such as sisters and daughters. These were obviously to constitute an emotional link between the entrepreneur's family and the employees' private life. Consequently, Bayer's housing estates in Leverkusen for example were named after the first names of some of these ladies: Julia (Kol. I), Anna (Kol. II) and Johanna (III). Because of those role models, charitable foundations were also named after these women, such as the big company-built housing estates of Krupp in Essen-Margaretenhöhe, named after Margarethe Krupp, the wife of Friedrich Alfred Krupp and from the early 20th century onwards temporarily the head of the

Krupp combine. This also holds for Sophie Henschel. She was the head of the machine building company in Kassel from 1894 to 1912. In 1908 she founded the new municipal hospital you even today find at the Sophie-Henschel-Place in Kassel.

For Anne Nieberding, *the training of apprentices* was of particular importance to implementing corporate constructions of meaning. Apprentices were young workers whose primary socialization was not yet consolidated. It was regarded as the entrepreneur's duty to exercise paternal care on apprentices and to provide guidance, similar to instructors in the trades. Foremen or long-serving assistants who were close to the head department often acted as 'integration staff', in particular in expanding companies. As they fulfilled their roles in commitment to the seniority principle, they were both role model and authority at the same time. This proofs the point that constructions of meaning were not solely internalised by owner-entrepreneurs, or by members of the entrepreneur's family, but also members of the company management.

A high potential of identification could be expected of apprentices in those cases where the father or grandfather already worked for the same company. This was not altogether uncommon, and descendents had thus become familiar with personal interpretive patterns of life and work at the company. This applied, for instance, for work in the mechanical engineering industries of south-west Germany. *'Working for Daimler'* was regarded as an honour in the region. Helga Merkel's book on the 'Daimler family' confirms that this and other, similar statements stem from a combination of pride in the trades profession, handed down in the family through generations, and pride in the company itself.[24]

In this context, *pre-socialization through corporate family welfare* is not to be underestimated. Around the turn of the centuries, welfare departments were set up in many companies. In these departments, specially trained nurses and welfare assistants saw to all kinds of family welfare matters. Particularly training measures for female staff were co-ordinated by company-owned housekeeping schools, not least so as to equip women with the necessary knowledge and skills for being housewives and mothers ('family managers'). This follows the conviction of the company management that a 'thorough and respectable housekeeping' on the part of the housewife had an essentially stabilising effect on staff and social structures. This needs to be seen against the backdrop of the *bourgeois family ideal* that was transferred from the corporate sphere to the private lives of staff. It was for this reason that Henkel founded the

first corporate housekeeping school in 1912. This school offered 'a four-month course' to all 'Henkel Mädchen' ('Henkel Girls') so as to make them fit for their role as housewives. From the very start in 1912, the course proved to be very popular. This does not come as a surprise, though, because classes took place during normal working hours 'and wages continued to be paid for the hours spent in class.'[25]

Corporate efforts in terms of providing staff with opportunities and facilities for spending their leisure time can also be investigated in terms of *bourgeois constructions of meaning*. Corporate workers' and factory clubs are one such example and of particular importance in historical socialization research. Associations and clubs used to be a domain of the middle classes, but, from the second half of the 19th century on workers' welfare organisations tended to become more and more active not at least to keep them away from the unions. At the turn of the 20th century, the objective was to ensure that staff made good use of the decreasing number of working hours and of spare time itself, not least in view of the dangers posed by alcohol and socialism. Thus, numerous companies founded singing, athletics and sports clubs as well as further education, reading and horticulture clubs for their employees. The names of these clubs also featured the respective company name (Bayer Leverkusen, Bayer Uerdingen). As Anne Nieberding has investigated in her PhD thesis, the Bayer-based '*Verein Concordia*' (name and program were going hand in hand) was an example for a club that stood for all-encompassing socialization in terms of acquiring and internalising bourgeois moral concepts.[26] The extent of socialization may have been due to the degree of self-administration on the part of the club's members. Company-organized associations and clubs, on the whole, were regarded as a big success: At Bayer, more than half the total workforce had joined a club (1912).

As Markus Raasch has shown for the time up to the 1970s for Bayer *sports were seen as constitutive elements of the "Bayer-Family"*. Corporate sports clubs were thought as "miniatures" of the "corporate family".[27] And Henkel even in the late 1990s celebrated *'family days'* at the corporate sports complex in Niederheid near the company's headquarter. Here board members and department heads wanted 'to get to know Henkel staff members in the midst of their families.'[28]

Supporting 'Family Ties': Rituals

'Management needs Rituals', that is what recent business compendiums tell us.[29] Rites of initiation, of admission (e.g. joining a trade association), of anniversaries, jubilees and leaving ceremonies have been researched extensively by anthropologists such as Clifford Geertz. And Company managements have been taking account of said rites, which are meant to make transformations in society more bearable, for a long time. In the corporate context they feature in the shape of celebrations and festivities, essentially having a harmonising and regulating social function (something that is nowadays referred to as 'strategic mood management'). By strengthening emotional attachment and mutual appreciation, the feeling of belonging is meant to be reinforced. Family imagery often plays a role in this.[30]

Corporate festivities or functions were the main medium for staging 'we-relations,' even prior to the First World War. A function enjoyed by everyone creates closeness and familiarity. Due to their extraordinary character functions promoted a sense of community, regardless whether the occasions were anniversaries, Christmas parties, national festivities (centenaries), company parties celebrating anniversaries, jubilees and Christmas, functions of the entrepreneur's family such as weddings, birthdays, funerals, official opening ceremonies or remarkable work performances. Anne Nieberding has applied the term 'social glue' to the corporate practice of festivities, which is not really eloquent but fitting.[31]

The presence of the company head management, of members of the owner family was regarded as essential on these occasions, too. In recollections, this is positively remarked upon and also seen as personal appreciation. Thus, events were created that stayed with those that had been present and that were reproduced in stories. Anne Nieberding has already highlighted that particular occasions for festivities 'were governed by the same linguistic symbol, that of the family' and were meant to even out social differences: *'Today, distinction of class and profession shall cease, today, we all want to feel as members of one family.'* This is what Karl Duisberg stated at Bayer's first anniversary function for long-serving staff in 1910.[32] In this context, anniversaries commemorating the day of the official company foundation or for long-serving staff were celebrated as *family functions*.

In Christian culture, *Christmas is traditionally the most important family event*. As a consequence, Christmas gained a certain importance in the corporate context too, as it was meant to provide context beyond the corporate background. At Henkel, for example, the

paternalistic relationship between the company founder, his sons and the workforce became palpable once a year at Christmas – already prior to the First World War. On these occasions, Fritz Henkel senior, i.e. the patriarch himself, presented the female secretaries with a cash bonus. By announcing that 'the Christ child had arrived,' Schifferdecker, the office manager, indicated his female staff to come and see the boss. When the obligatory amount of 100 marks was being handed over, the two sons stood at the left and right of their father, wishing a 'Merry Christmas', an image which might elicit associations with Christian iconography.

During the Christmas dinners at Henkel, everyone was committed to the company by way of numerous speeches, anecdotes and jokes.[33] From 1900 on, a Christmas bonus and a 'Christmas bag' were distributed to the factory staff at a Christmas party 'in the big dining hall ... where, beneath the branches of enormous firs, every employee as well as their wives and children were given a useful Christmas gift' ─ often a Christmas stollen – 'and a cash bonus.' Long-serving members of staff, who had already left the company, were still attending the parties as *part of the 'big Henkel company family'*. The same is true for long-term clients who were attached to the company in one way or another.[34] For this reason, Fritz Henkel's 1928 Christmas address would be referred to as 'stakeholder orientation' because the then 80-year old company founder spoke to '*the large number of his loyal children*'.[35] Christmas dinner for the sales department remained a regular feature, though. On these occasions, the 'old man' met up with the sales representatives to talk business and to socialize. Here, to, a community spirit was encouraged through the image of the corporate family, because the *Christmas meeting was built up into a 'family day'*.[36]

It does not come as a surprise that the image of the corporate family seems to fit rather well into the ideals of Nazi ideology condemning the existence of social classes and replacing it by the "Volksgemeinschaft". Accordingly Henkel as other companies since 1933, celebrated the Labour Day on the 1st of May and served the purpose of stimulating the 'Henkel spirit'.[37] Following the contemporary rhetoric of the 'Third Reich', the 'corporate family' all of a sudden featured as a 'community of fate'.[38]

Evidence can be provided for the fact that the family metaphor stayed in use in corporate communications until well after World War II. Apart from factory and company anniversaries, this becomes directly apparent since *open days* ('Tage der offenen Tür') are aiming at the closer and wider neighbourhood of a company and its residents. Following to social

geographic investigations, identification is based on *interaction in closely defined areas and on personal experiences*. Accordingly, open days and family afternoons were to demonstrate closeness and openness. Since the 1980s for instance, the German agricultural machinery manufacturer CLAAS is sending out invitations to what the corporate communications department calls *'family afternoons'* with the aim of 'improving mutual understanding'. On these afternoons, visitors can tour the company premises at Harsewinkel, films are being shown and people can have coffee together. All this is done so as to strengthen the community experience and '*bring some humanity into the rather serious world of work.'* The CLAAS annual report 2009 displays the ‚family theme' quite openly: *„In a family firm such as CLAAS employees often do have a particular relationship to the employer. Often up to two, sometimes three generations of the same family are working for ‚their company. This 'we-feeling' can best be shown at 'family days' and open days"*.[39]

Short Summary

Recent literature on organizational psychology attaches great importance to the mobilization of 'emotional capital'. The more successfully employees were integrated in those corporate constructions of meaning, the more weight was put by them on the success of the company. Being proud of and having trust in one's own achievements was part of this process of integration. This process bases on a certain kind of family rhetoric which has been already used by the 19th-century paternalistic companies. Although business history research up to now does without applying neurological approaches, the fact alone that family rhetoric bore fruit for more than hundred years suggests that it was a means of corporate communication to be taken seriously, right up to the recent past.

And we also may state, that this is a means that it worked: Although one has to admit, that those rhetoric did not at all rule out industrial action, such as the strike in the Bayer's factory in 1904 for example[40], the majority of staff recollections portray an occupation that was meaningful to the member of staff: It was not remembered as having been void of emotion or just in terms of merely fulfilling a contract. The recollections rather reveal identification with the company, in certain cases they even expose an idealised image of cosy warmth and security. These employees quite clearly seemed to define themselves through a company-related 'we-identity'.

It seems that authenticity and credibility were most likely to be carried by the tradition of festivities. This is underlined by an official Prussian survey on corporate 'welfare institutions' in 1876: According to this survey, 'the annual presentation of Christmas gifts to the children of staff, which takes place in the presence of the employer's family members, is the occasion that has most often given rise to a feeling of gratitude on the part of the workers.[41] Documents and material consulted support this view. Furthermore and in comparison to many other similar occasions, the occasion in question has also been less prone to a misinterpretation in terms of its well-meaning character.'

The close relationship between employee and firm becomes even more clear in times of crises when plants are closing down and people are losing their jobs as during the iron and steel crises during the late 1970s and 1980s. If you follow the peoples' statements you may find that they lost their "second home".

Adding "emotional capital" in the history of corporate personnel strategies may reveal much more varied in terms of targets and methods than the traditional labels of 'social disciplining,' 'paternalism' and 'master-of-the-house policy' suggested. It is rather that the ongoing use of family as a metaphor in corporate life indicates a kind of social 'arrangement' between the company and its staff which obviously is supported by the mobilisation of 'emotional capital'.

Prof Dr Susanne Hilger
University Düsseldorf
Department for Economic History
Universitätsstr. 1
D-40225 Düsseldorf
Email: hilger@phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de

References

1   David Coleman, Emotionale Intelligenz, 20th ed. Munich 2008.

2   Thomas, Steger, Was Metaphern über Gefühle sagen – Ein neuer Zugang zu Emotionen auf der Managementebene, in: Georg Schreyögg/Jörg Sydow (eds.), Emotionen und Management (Managementforschung 11), Wiesbaden 2001, pp. 74-109. Cf. recently Christina Stadler, Die Freude am Unternehmertum in Kleinen und Mittleren Unternehmen, Wiesbaden 2009.

3   George A. Akerlof/Robert J. Shiller, Animal Spirits. How Human Psychology drives the Economy, and why it matters for Global Capitalism, Princeton 2009. Cf. also George A. Akerlof/Rachel E. Kranton, Identity Economics. How our Identities shape our Work, Wages, and Well-Being, Princeton 2010.

4   Akerlof/Shiller, Animal Spirits, p. 51.

5   Cf. John Stephens/Robyn MacCallum, Retelling Stories, Framing Culture: Traditional Story and Metanarratives in Children's Literature, Routledge 1998. Cf. Konrad Jarausch/Martin Sabrow, „Meistererzählung – Zur Karriere eines Begriffs", in: ibid. (Hrsg.), Die historische Meistererzählung. Deutungslinien der deutschen Nationalgeschichte nach 1945, Göttingen 2002, pp. 9-32.

6   Cf. Markus Raasch, Wir sind Bayer. Eine Mentalitätsgeschichte der deutschen Industriegesellschaft am Beispiel des rheinischen Dormagen (1917-1997), Essen 2007. Barbara Wolbring, Krupp und die Öffentlichkeit im 19. Jahrhundert. Selbstdarstellung, öffentliche Wahrnehmung und gesellschaftliche Kommunikation, München 2000. Anne Nieberding, Unternehmenskultur im Kaiserreich. J.M. Voith und die Farbenfabriken vorm. Friedr. Bayer & Co., München 2003.

7   Jochen Menges/Lydia Ebersbach, Die Bedeutung von Emotionen und emotionalem Kapital im internen und externen Unternehmenskontext, in: ibid./Christian Welling (eds.), Erfolgsfaktor Emotionales Kapital. Menschen begeistern, Ziele erreichen, Bern et al. 2008, pp. 21-44, 26.

8   Cf. Katharina Scherke, Emotionen als Forschungsgegenstand der deutschsprachigen Soziologie, Wiesbaden 2009.

9   Jochen Menges/Lydia Ebersbach/Christian Welling, Emotionales Kapital: Einführung und Überblick, in: ibid. (eds.), Erfolgsfaktor Emotionales Kapital. Menschen begeistern, Ziele erreichen, Bern et al. 2008, pp. 13-20, p. 15. Wendelin Küpers/Jürgen Weibler, Emotionen in Organisationen, Stuttgart 2005. Martina Trummer, Emotionen in Organisationen, Hamburg 2006. Cf. Lynda Gratton/Sumantra Ghoshal, Managing Personal Human Capital: New Ethos for Volunteering Employee, in: European Management Journal 21, 1, 2003, pp. 1-10.

10 Eckart Pankoke, Corporate Identity, Social Responsibility, Corporate Citizenship. Unternehmensethik zwischen Eigeninteresse und öffentlicher Verantwortung, in: Sozialwissenschaften und Berufspraxis 29, 2006, pp. 279-278, 270.

11 Jeremy Moon/Andrew Crane/Dirk Matten, Can corporations be citizens? Corporate Citizenship as a Metaphor for Business Participation in Society, Research Paper Series International Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility Nottingham University Business School 13, 2003.

12 Cf. Irene Götz, Erzählungen als Indikatoren für Unternehmenskultur. Zur Ethnographie innerbetrieblicher Kommunikation in einem Mittelständischen Unternehmen, in: Clemens Wischermann et al., Unternehmenskultur: die Arbeitswelt einer Großbäckerei aus kulturwissenschaftlicher Sicht, München 1994, pp. 227-242.

13 Götz, Erzählungen, 230.

14 Werner Plumpe, Ökonomisches Denken und wirtschaftliche Entwicklung. Zum Zusammenhang von Wirtschaftsgeschichte und historischer Semantik der Ökonomie, in: JBWG 50, 2009, pp, 27-52, p. 29.

15 Quoted from Burkhard Fuhs, Zur Geschichte der Familie, in: Jutta Ecarius (ed.), Handbuch der Familie, Wiesbaden 2007, pp. 17-35, p. p. 18.

16 Hartmut Berghoff, Unternehmenskultur und Herrschaftstechnik. Industrieller Paternalismus: Hohner von 1857 bis 1918, in: GG 23, 1997, S. 167-204.

17 Thomas Welskopp, Betriebliche Sozialpolitik im 19. und frühen 20. jahrhundert. Eine Diskussion neuerer Forschungen und Konzepte und eine Branchenanalyse der deutschen und amerikanischen Eisen- und Stahlindustrie von den 1870er bis zu den 1930er Jahren, in: Archiv für Sozialgeschichte, 1994, Bd. 34, S. 333-374.

18 Annual report, CLAAS Gruppe 2003, p. 38. Annual report CLAAS Gruppe 2009, pp. 62, 63, translates „family" with „teamspirit".

19 Akerlof/Shiller, Animal spirit, p. 51.

20 Feldenkirchen/Hilger, Menschen und Märkte, Düsseldorf 2001.

21 On Duisberg: cf. Nieberding, Unternehmenskultur p. 264.

22 Russell, Vogt, Welche Einzelkenntnisse kommen für den Reisevertreter in Frage, in: BvH 7, 1927, pp. 46, 47.

[23] Http://www.krupp-guertel.de/Ansichtssachen/BilderHeute/Foto_Krupp_Stammhaus_heute_2006.asp (12.8.2010).

[24] Helga Merkel, Die Daimler-Familie Sindelfingen. Zur Wahrnehmung des soziokulturellen Wandels in einer Industriestadt, Tübingen 1996.

[25] Cf. Feldenkirchen/Hilger, Menschen und Märkte.

[26] Nieberding, Unternehmenskultur, p. 226.

[27] Raasch, Wir sind Bayer, p. 325.

[28] Eine schrecklich nette Familie, in: Henkel Blick 9/1998, p. 11.

[29] Cf. Dorothee Echter, Rituale im Management. Strategisches Stimmungsmanagement für die Business-Elite, Munich 2003.

[30] Götz, Erzählungen, p. 231.

[31] Nieberding, Unternehmenskultur, pp. 245, 246.

[32] Quoted from Nieberding, Unternehmenskultur, 261.

[33] Cf. Blätter vom Hause 7, 1927, pp. 5–7. „Weihnachten bei Henkel", in: BvH 8, 1928, pp. 2–8. On Hugo Henkel's 40th aniversary in : BvH 26, 1948, 8.

[34] „Durch Freude zur Kraft. Bericht über die Weihnachtskonferenzen am Abschluß des Geschäftsjahres 1933", in: BvH 14, 1934, p. 35.

[35] BvH 11, 1931, p. 119.

[36] „Durch Freude zur Kraft. Bericht über die Weihnachtskonferenzen am Abschluß des Geschäftsjahres 1933", in: BvH 14, 1934, p. 35.

[37] Mai-Geist- Henkel-Geist. Bericht über den Feiertag der nationalen Arbeit in den Henkelwerken Düsseldorf und Genthin, in: BvH 14, 1934, pp. 218-226.

[38] So Hugo Henkel anlässlich der Feierstunde für die Werks-Jubilare des Jahres 1934, in: BvH 14, 1934, p. 284. Weihnachten im Henkel-Reich, in: BvH 19, 1939, pp. 102-106. So auch Jost Henkel auf der Feier „unserer Jubilare 1941", in: BvH 21, 1941, p. 84.

[39] „Durch mitarbeiterorientierte Personalarbeit CLAAS-orientierte Mitarbeiter", in: CLAAS intern 44, 1984. CLAAS Geschäftsbericht 2009, p. 62. „In einem Familienunternehmen wie CLAAS haben die die Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter häufig ein besonderes Verhältnis zu ihrem Arbeitgeber. Oft arbeiten zwei, manchmal drei Generationen der gleichen Familie in ‚ihrem' Unternehmen. Dieses Wir-Gefühl zeigt sich besonders an Familientagen und Tagen der offenen Tür …".

[40] Cf. for Bayer Uta Stolle, Arbeiterpolitik im Betrieb, Frankfurt/Main 1980.

[41] Die Einrichtung für die Wohlfahrt der gewerblichen Arbeiter für die größeren gewerblichen Anlagen im preußischen Staate, bearbeitet im Auftrag des Ministers für Handel, Gewerbe und öffentliche Arbeiten, Vol. 1, Berlin 1876.