

How does an Enterprise become an Anti-Social System? A Motivation for the Need of Social and Cultural Capital for Retaining the Corporate Success

Sebastian Bittmann, Oliver Thomas

Information Management and Information Systems, University Osnabrueck
{sebastian.bittmann | oliver.thomas}@uni-osnabrueck.de

Abstract: With an increasing on agility, respectively the adaptation of IT artefacts with respect to changing requirements, a resource with an increasing importance for the differentiation of one enterprise towards its competitors is the human capital. Thereby, in this paper it will be argued that in order to use such human capital, a demanding influence is the social capital of the enterprise. Social capital is defined by the art of interacting or relation between individuals as part of the same social system, namely the enterprise. So, generally, social capital defines the type of culture an enterprise is characterised with. With an increasing importance of autonomous IT-artefacts, in the latter referred as mechanical actors, the social capital decreases, because of the missing social orientation of interactions between human and mechanical actors. While the common notion of this issue is the search for more efficient and less costly processes, the authors argue that every domain, which has become irrelevant loses its potential of innovation with the lack of human interaction and in use of creativity.

An information system, according to [Hei01], can be generally defined by means of three components: The assignment, the technology and the humans. While in the recent decades, the technological aspects evolved in order to become a more important part of information systems and with respect to current research aims that focuses on making machines more autonomous or even "creative", the importance of the human component might lose its relevance. So, increasingly machines become autonomous actors with a specific set of self-detectable and processable tasks relevant to the enterprise. Consequently, in specific domains machine actors have emancipated with respect to the human actors, so that they are equally important for the execution of respective business processes. In consequence, human actors might depend on the machine actors as well as the machine actors might request certain services from human actors. The interdependency between those two actors requires the share of a specifically used language for the communication. However, communicating with a machine requires an unambiguous interpretable language, which is differently to the ever-evolving natural language embodied by human actors. Humans are able to build theories about domains that enable them to perform purposeful actions [Ryl84]. These theories can adapt with respect to internal activities that neither have to be perceived nor expected by others [Web22]. These theories find their purpose in the use of language. Since the human mind has developed language in order to embrace the world [WO90], it is the manner, which he uses to perform or at least plan his actions. However, machines aren't able to perform this described act of creativity [Joa96]. Behaviour of machines is always planned, predicable and static. Nevertheless, there is still the need

for communicating with each other. So the natural language of the human actor has to orientate towards the one language the machine actor is capable of understanding. Hence, the language of the human actor suffers, as it can neither evolve nor enhance. With the denied agility of the language of the human, the development of the personality and the establishment of expertise are denied as well. So a prior valuable of the enterprise, the human capital, might become worthless. For example, the human actor is not able to react properly to upcoming and new challenges, because his frame of action was drastically decreased, as he is forced to use a specific language that is a prerequisite for cooperating with the machine actors. MAX WEBER defines a social act as a behaviour that finds its sense in its direction towards other individuals [Web22]. Although a human actor works for a company and has a specific set of targets to achieve and directives to be followed, he still needs to be capable of adapting his acting to the social needs directed to him by the social system. The human performance of any enterprise activity is a social act according to WEBER, as it is directed to the hierarchical superior individuals as well as those individuals the human interacts with during the performance. More specifically, the human actor has to harmonise his personal values with the enterprise's values directed to him by the management of the enterprise. Thereby, this harmonisation offers a variation by means of the personal values, which are individual and might evolve over time. Ultimately, based on these socially influenced actions with reference to the personal values, the human actors can establish to or contribute towards the *enterprise culture* [Gib87]. Therefore, the human actors of the enterprise have the opportunity for increasing, next to the economic capital, the social and cultural capital of the enterprise [Bou87, Bou12]. However, a machine actor is not capable of adapting his actions, as it does not possess a personality or personal values. The machine actor can only perform his action based on the enterprise's values it has received during its development. So a machine actor, as the enterprise mostly accounts for economic capital, is not capable of contributing to the enterprise's culture and hence, decreases the agility of the enterprise, as the machine actor only has one static, non-creative way of performing a specific action. More importantly, a machine actor is able to adapt his theory neither is it capable of adapting its language. Moreover, with tightly aligning the human and machine actor, the language of the humans suffer as well, as they have to use one specific language, which is understandable by the machines. So with a static language, no possibility for contributing to the enterprise with personal values and respectively, to the cultural capital is given. Unfortunately, being innovative and hence, remaining competitive requires social and cultural capital that enables a change. So, even if an artificial creativity is targeted, such a type of creativity still remains predictable, as it follows a mechanical order. Therefore the only asset an enterprise has, which can sustainably remain the enterprise's competitiveness and success, are humans that can benefit from cultural capital.

References

- [Bou87] Pierre Bourdieu. *Die feinen Unterschiede: Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft*. Suhrkamp, 1987.

- [Bou12] Pierre Bourdieu. Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital. In *Handbuch Bildungs- und Erziehungssoziologie Bildung und Gesellschaft*, pages 229–242. 2012.
- [Gib87] Allan A. Gibb. Enterprise Culture — Its Meaning and Implications for Education and Training. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 11(2):2–38, December 1987.
- [Hei01] Lutz Heinrich. *Wirtschaftsinformatik*. Oldenbourg, München, Wien, 2. edition, 2001.
- [Joa96] Hans Joas. *Die Kreativität des Handelns*. Suhrkamp, 1996.
- [Ryl84] G. Ryle. *The concept of mind (1949)*. Hutchinson, London, UK, 1984.
- [Web22] Max Weber. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1922.
- [WO90] Ludwig Josef Johann Wittgenstein and Charles Kay Ogden. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus: German and English*. Routledge, 1990.