

RESEARCH  
ARTICLE

# Multinational Corporations and the Mechanism for Building an Integrated Organizational Culture in the Knowledge Economy Context

**Nora Haroun**

University - Tissemsilt Ahmed Ben Yahia El-Wancharissi

Algeria

Email: n.haroun@univ-tissemsilt.dz

**Larbi Hadjam**

Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University - Setif 2

Algeria

Email: l.hadjam@univ-setif2.dz

**Tahar Bouzeghlane**

University - Tissemsilt Ahmed Ben Yahia El-Wancharissi

Algeria

Email: t.bouzeghlane@univ-tissemsilt.dz

**Doi Serial**

<https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/8.6.31>

**Keywords**

Knowledge economy, organizational culture, multinational companies.

## Abstract

The global economy is undergoing a radical transformation from the traditional industrial economy to the knowledge economy, which relies on leveraging knowledge, innovation, and scientific research to improve quality of life and address the challenges of globalization and the development of information technology. In this context, multinational companies have emerged as key economic players, investing in various material and human resources worldwide. This study aims to analyse the mechanisms these companies use to build a shared organizational culture within a multicultural socio-professional environment, with a focus on management strategies that balance preserving the original culture and openness to host cultures. The results showed that internal cultural diversity poses a real challenge that may affect the stability of the work environment; however, relying on the knowledge economy through intercultural exchange and building a unifying institutional culture helps contain this diversity and enhance positive interaction, creating a harmonious work environment capable of adapting to the demands of the global market within a balanced dialogue between cultures.

## Citation

Nora H., Larbi H., Bouzeghlane T. (2025). Multinational Corporations and the Mechanism for Building an Integrated Organizational Culture in the Knowledge Economy Context. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(6), 298-309; doi:10.56352/sei/8.6.31. <https://imcra-az.org/archive/364-science->

education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-6-volviii-2025.html

**Licensed**

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the **CC BY** license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Received: 07.02.2025

Accepted: 07.04.2025

Published: 19.05.2025 (available online)

**Introduction**

In recent years, the world has witnessed rapid, successive, and profound global changes in their impacts and future directions. The world has transformed into a small village due to the technological and informational revolution, which led to the emergence of the concept of the knowledge economy. This concept represents a new economic model that differs in its understanding from the traditional foundations and principles of the industrial economy that appeared following the industrial revolution. This new economic model focuses on valuing knowledge and information as the most important resource in the economy. As a result, economic institutions have sought to increase knowledge, develop mechanisms for acquiring, disseminating, and using it to develop societies, achieve economic leadership, and gain the ability to fiercely compete in global markets under rampant globalization, which has led to the emergence of economic blocs and multinational companies.

Accordingly, our focus centered on the economic openness policies adopted by most countries around the world, which witnessed significant changes mainly driven by their desire to integrate into the dynamics of the global economy. It has become necessary to make changes to industrial institutions, seek appropriate means to face fierce competition, acquire competitive advantages, strengthen market shares, and improve their production methods and management systems. This required adopting a partnership strategy with foreign institutions as an effective mechanism to qualify them, enable them to compete in global markets, maintain their continuity and stability, and achieve their set goals of improving performance and increasing production.

Based on the cultural approach to organizations proposed by Sansolio, the workplace is considered a space for the formation of organizational and social identity, in addition to being an institution of socialization that produces an organizational culture supporting social bonds and strengthening the identity belonging of its members. Accordingly, studying cultural dimensions within the institution has become a priority in any analysis that seeks to explain certain practices that may seem obscure within approaches primarily based on purely organizational varia-

bles. The actors within multinational companies, before being members of the company itself, are members of other social units distinguished by multiple and diverse cultures. These cultures deeply influence individuals, and this influence manifests in behaviors and practices that may sometimes conflict with the institution's objectives due to the cultural differences generated by these companies.

Undoubtedly, these multinational companies will bring about radical changes in the socio-professional environment of the economic institution, especially regarding the professional identity of the local worker within it, due to the characteristics and features produced by this partnership in terms of organizational, performance-related, social, and cultural practices. Considering the local worker as a particularly important element inside the institution and generally outside it, Jamal Gharid pointed out in this regard that "the worker holds an essential position in society; he is the one who produces material goods, and the one who spreads new ways of existence, thinking, and working in society. Accordingly, he performs a dual function as both a producer and a mediator." (Jamal Gharid, 2015)

Here emerges the importance of organizational culture for the local worker within the institution, given its significant role in the dynamics of social relations and the social practices of the actors within it. Its role does not stop within the confines of the institution but extends beyond its socio-professional domain, represented by the transfer of certain perceptions, ideas, and social practices to the external environment. This has led us to pose the following problem:

What are the mechanisms and foundations that multinational companies follow to build and rebuild an organizational culture for the local worker that leads to the integration of cultural diversity among workers with their original culture within the framework of the knowledge economy?

**1. Study concepts**

**Knowledge Economy:** The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defines the Knowledge Economy or Knowledge-Based Economy as a

concept that emerged from full recognition of the role that knowledge and technology play in economic growth more than other resources (natural resources, financial resources, unskilled human resources, infrastructures, etc.). Cooke defined it as an emerging economy in which productivity and growth rely less on the abundance of natural resources and more on improving the quality of human capital, creating new knowledge and ideas, and integrating them into individuals and equipment. (Samir Messai, 2014/2015, pp. 92-93)

The knowledge economy is also considered an economy in which knowledge sectors, in all their forms and manifestations—such as technology and intellectual work—occupy a broader and deeper space in terms of scope and scale. Accordingly, from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's concept of *habitus*, this latter is characterized by diverse and distinct features such as habit and repetition, sustainability, communication, inheritance, ingrained dispositions, repression, transcendence, capital, innate qualities, implicitness, adaptation, generation, and creativity. Thus, *habitus* is an innate, creative, hereditary mental system that generates an infinite number of solutions directly derived from social conditions. (Jamil Hamdawi, 2017, p. 29)

This means that the *habitus* of actors in a multicultural socio-professional field generates strategies that align with the social situation imposed by this field. These strategies may correspond to their objective interests, preserving their identity and particularity, while creating a form of balance with the differences produced by this diversity. In other words, the *habitus* creates a kind of dynamism and flexibility in dealing with others.

**Organizational Culture:** The strengths of organizational culture lie in its capacity for change, which is created by the group's ability to innovate new patterns of thinking and behavior in response to emerging and unforeseen problems. This reflects the flexibility of that culture and its ability to keep pace with the evolving surrounding conditions. Additionally, its characteristic of communication and learning ensures continuity in an environment of openness and interaction with newcomers, who bring with them sets of values, standards, and norms. Here, the institution, as a workplace, becomes—like the school and the family—an important source of socialization and a channel for the transmission and circulation of cultural values. It also transforms into a space within which individual and collective identities are exercised and structured, as well as a renewed arena for the processes of producing culture and relearning it. (Renauld Sainsaulieu, 1985, p. 130)

If we focus on Sansolio's perspective, he indirectly addresses the process of acculturation, especially in his statement, "an important source of socialization and a channel for the circulation and transmission of cultural values," and "a renewed space for the processes of producing culture and relearning it." Organizational culture is an integrated structure shaped and activated by spontaneous or deliberate interactions that begin with the group and end with the

individual, reflecting how the individual responds to others based on their perception of them.

**Professional Identity:** According to the sociological theory of the institution, the institution becomes a socialization agency—that is, a place where values and norms are instilled in the worker, ultimately shaping their individual and social personality. It nurtures a sense of belonging to a specific group. As Claude Dubar (C. Dubar) states in his book *Socialization and the Construction of Professional Social Identities*: "Socialization is a process of immersion or construction of a particular identity, which means developing a sense of belonging and building relationships with others at work." It means giving the worker both an individual self and a sense of belonging to the group or feeling of belonging, because identity does not only mean belonging but also the feeling of belonging to the other party. (Mohammed El Mahdi Ben Issa, 2010, p. 239)

According to this definition, professional identity is considered one of the dimensions of a person's psychological and social identity. However, it is at the same time specific to the patterns of interactions of that individual within the social and institutional fields in which they are present and active. Individuals consciously or unconsciously enjoy the freedom to choose in defining their identities within the organization, which allows the individual to use their mind, as they may possess multiple overlapping identities and sometimes have to choose among a set of alternative identities.

**Multinational Corporations:** Also called transnational corporations or identity-lost corporations, they are described by the Arab Labor Organization report as enterprises that own or control productive or service facilities outside the country where their headquarters are located. These companies are characterized by the vastness of their capital, diversity of their activities, and unlimited geographical spread. (Mouloud Zaid Al-Tayeb: 2005, p. 41)

It is noticeable that when these companies move to a country, they do not bring only their material and human resources, but also carry with them the cultural baggage specific to each individual in the company; in addition to the local cultural baggage, this creates a multicultural socio-professional environment. Culture has begun to take on various dimensions according to the aspects of economic globalization and serves as a necessary means to pave the way for societies to accept it. This is because the concept of culture is the essential foundation for building patterns of socio-organizational behavior acquired through the process of acculturation within the multicultural socio-professional environment and transferring it to the external environment.

According to this definition, multinational corporations as social organizations should be viewed as spaces for cultural learning and socialization, which is the aim of the knowledge economy. From this standpoint, multinational

corporations, through their strategies, carry out socialization processes—immersing values, practices, ideas, attitudes, and new and different skills through their general policies set at the top management level. They also engage in acculturation and cultural exchange through daily interactions between culturally diverse actors (local actors and foreign actors). Moreover, the daily interactions between local workers and incoming foreign workers lead, in turn, to the construction or reconstruction of the professional identity of the local worker.

### **Multinational Corporations and Building a Shared Organizational Culture Between Global and Local Workers: What Relationship and What Influence?**

The industrial enterprise is a center for building and rebuilding an organizational culture for its workers. The enterprise is a unified unit, composed of a set of shared values that form the symbolic bond connecting all elements of the organization, and from this emerges the culture of the enterprise as a social field. As Sainsaulieu emphasizes, working conditions are variable and not fixed, thus they influence workers' mentalities. In the case of relative stability that some organizations may experience during a certain period, they can provide individuals with cultural models that are more stable and stereotypical. However, social changes that may occur at any given time cause qualitative shifts that change the nature and image of social relationships, transforming the overall social scene in organizations from one state to another. This can result in shifting cultures and identities that are also subject to changing determinants, represented by criteria of belonging, conflict, achievement, and career path. (R. Sainsaulieu, 1997, p. 42), corporations represent a turning point when they enter any industrial enterprise, due to several considerations:

- **Material**, represented by: technical and technological innovations, production means, etc.
- **Intellectual**, represented by: the vast flow of information about the global economic field.
- **Human**, represented by: labor force, competencies, and various advanced professional skills, etc.
- **Financial**, represented by: the large capital investments made by these companies.
- **Social and cultural**, represented by: social practices, different customs and traditions, diverse ideas and mentalities, new culture, etc.

According to what Sainsaulieu proposed about the qualitative shift that changes the image and nature of social relations, the general social scene within institutions transforms from one state to another, which can result in shifting identities. In the same context, Alain Touraine sees identity as a strategic act and a gradual adaptation process to change. The actor's identity is thus determined by their desire for

development, improving their conditions, expanding their achievements, and diversifying their options. Touraine goes further by emphasizing that the formation of identity as a social reality becomes possible only when the social system, in the individual's view, is not merely a set of relations and institutions existing outside their will, but rather a result of that will. Therefore, searching for identity according to this view is not about discovering social facts such as positions and roles performed by actors, but rather it is the birth of a social movement. (Mirani Hassan, 2006/2007, p. 26) **Accordingly, multinational corporations constitute an educational space that contributes to the reconstruction of the organizational culture of the actors within them, which in turn produces the reconstruction of the professional identity of the local worker. This aligns with the perspective of the knowledge economy.**

### **2- Multinational Corporations and Adopting the Strategy of Interculturalism as an Educational Mechanism to Rebuild the Professional Identity of the Local Worker:**

**Professional Identity according to Sainsaulieu:** It is the definition of the self by the self, in addition to the definition of the self through the other. This identity functions as a set of mental representations that allow individuals to find ways to maintain continuous communication between their present and past experiences, which Sainsaulieu called the "identity of the self" (*identité du soi*). Meanwhile, the identity of the other (*identité d'autrui*) represents difference and distinction in those mental representations that individuals hold about each other. It is therefore a set of points that show us our similarities with some and our differences from others. Accordingly, Sainsaulieu's theory expresses a combination of an internal agreement of the individual and an external one between individuals and the institutions with which they interact, meaning that the process of identity construction is ongoing.

Based on the above, how are the structures of professional identities of the local worker renewed? And how are they reconstructed within the knowledge economy?

The organizational climate in multinational corporations is completely different from that of the local industrial enterprise. This new climate is characterized by modern technologies, high competencies, discipline, and good management. This has led local workers to improve their performance levels and discipline.

In the same context, the local workers' feeling of satisfaction, self-fulfillment, being valued by others, achieving a prestigious social status, and feeling confident and empowered pushes them to use their current and potential abilities and skills to achieve the greatest possible accomplishments.

Based on what has been presented, all activities rely on the actors' ability to understand the characteristics and changes in their structures, then to adapt the behaviors they exhibit accordingly, so that the interaction achieves the intended goal. (Petri Al-Suutari, 2015, p. 132) Some view change in the cultural system and values as merely a simple and logical combination between the imported cultural model and the original model, ignoring that cultural change is not only a result but also a condition for economic change. This entire process depends on the experience and social practice of individuals, starting from different positions in relation to the overall system. (Mohamed El Mahdi Ben Issa, 1995/1996, p. 57)

This process (building professional identity) in the multicultural socio-professional environment can be considered a process of normalization. It is the total of acquired dispositions, perceptions, evaluations, and actions instilled in individuals through the social context. Normalization is theoretically positioned between objective conditions and subjective behaviors; it is simultaneously the result of the interaction between objective conditions on one hand and subjective factors — social practice, personal experience, and its internalization by individuals — not for mere storage but for creative and innovative retrieval in dealing with reality and the environment according to its requirements. (Ben Issa Mohamed El Mahdi, 1995/1996, pp. 57–58)

Although the culture of an organization is a set of values, behaviors, and standards that clarify for individuals what to do and how, what is acceptable, and what is correct, change in the cultural and value dimension has become an urgent necessity. The components and requirements of competitiveness at both the macro and micro levels conflict with the outcomes of performance and organizational stability. (Abdullah Ali: 1999, pp. 124–125) According to the sociological theory of the institution, the institution becomes an entity for socialization—that is, a place to instill values and standards that ultimately give the worker their individual and social personality, nurturing in them a spirit of belonging to a specific group. As Claude Dubar sees it, "Socialization is the process of absorption or construction of a certain identity, which means developing a spirit of belonging and building relationships with others at work." (Mohamed El Mahdi Ben Issa, 2010, p. 238)

As mentioned earlier, multinational companies are characterized by a socio-professional environment different from that of national industrial institutions, which leads them to instill different organizational principles and values in local workers. This process of instillation was termed by Pierre Bourdieu as *habitus*, which is akin to the distinguishing mark that forms the professional identity of the worker. It is a generator of tastes, styles, practices, and experiences; as much as it is a principle of vision, classification, and evaluation that allows the worker to transform the differential power position into a differential difference—meaning a distinctive stance in which the actor stands out from others—by using the principles of vision and differentiation in a new and different way. (Abdelghani Imad, 2006, p. 102)

According to the above, *habitus* is not only linked to individuals' perceptions, personal characteristics, and attitudes, but also to systems of collective dispositions that are transferable, such as patterns of thinking, perception, evaluation, and practice; which can be considered as generative and organizing principles of daily practices and actions.

### 3- Dynamics of Forming a Participatory Organizational Culture in the Environment of Multinational Companies:

**A. The Dialectic of Self and Other in a Multicultural Environment:** Gottlob Frege sees identity as an ontological existential concept that possesses a revealing power to understand the world, including the entities of the self and the other (Ahmed Baalbaki et al., 2013, p. 158).

Based on this, we will attempt to shed light on the dialectic of self and other in the institutional industrial environment with foreign partnerships, where this dialectic clearly appears.

Many viewpoints emphasize the importance of the relationship between the self and the other, especially under globalization, which has swept all fields. This relationship has become inevitable and inescapable. However, it simultaneously raises the paradox of whether the relationship is one of difference or similarity between the two. It has also generated numerous international, regional, and sectarian conflicts and disputes—either to assert the self or to dominate and control the other.

Among these viewpoints is Durkheim's perspective, who linked the individual to the social bond through judging the other based on the self's experience. Sylvie Mesure and Alain Roudaut proposed a framework to clarify the issue of distinguishing between various possible perceptions of the experience of the other, understanding it, and benefiting from it. (Patrick Safidan, 2011, p. 24).

However, the experience of the other does not always have the same form or content for the self, especially in the context of cultural diversity; this other cannot be identical to the self, as each has its own particularities, most importantly the cultural distinction that creates fundamental differences between them. Meanwhile, globalization aims to standardize humanity; it seeks for the self to resemble the other and to spread and uphold global values worldwide. Globalization views individuals in societies as identical and similar, differing only superficially. In other words, cultural, ethnic, religious, and other differences are considered non-essential and marginal (Patrick Safidan, 2011, p. 25).

At the institutional level, this dialectic leads us to talk about diversity and difference, or unity and similarity. Identity pluralism is not about diversity merely as its existence, whether positive or negative. One of humanity's most im-



portant characteristics is the difference and diversity of identities and cultures. Each identity differs from another due to its own historical path and its distinct features that make it unique.

### **So, how can unity and a sense of belonging be achieved among workers within multinational companies despite their cultural diversity?**

And how can the conflicts and disputes arising from this diversity be overcome? Through this discussion, we try to shed light on the dialectic underlying the relationship between the local worker (the self) and the foreign worker (the other), and on the outcomes of their interactions within the economic institution.

From the perspective of the local worker, the internal stability of the institution depends on the foreign worker's respect for the local culture. Accordingly, the deeply rooted and internalized local culture in the minds of the workers is given great priority and importance in their dealings and interactions with foreign workers. This is what researcher Al-Aqbi Lazhar concluded in his study on: local social and cultural values and their impact on the organizational behavior of workers. He noted, "The Algerian worker, when joining the industrial institution, does not detach himself from his local culture with its components and characteristics; rather, it accompanies him wherever he goes, shaping his thoughts, directing his behavior, and imposing related constraints. Therefore, it represents his cultural and social identity within the industrial institution." (Al-Aqbi Lazhar, 2008/2009, p. 246)

Accordingly, identity is the result of the interaction between self-perception and the perceptions of others. Therefore, understanding identity must be based on its history and context. No one is born with a self or identity; these emerge through interaction with reality. As long as the interactive fields in which selves and identities are formed involve differentiation, these selves and identities will also be contingently differentiated. It is clear that the shared commitments to aspects of identity at any given moment will lead to alliances and loyalties in different ways. (Philip Alperson, 2017, p. 103).

Based on the above, local actors within multinational companies acquire a number of professional, social, and even cultural values in accordance with their original culture and integrate them into their daily socio-professional practices. Here, internalisation contributes to shaping the interaction process between the self and the other in a more detailed and complex manner, as the self lives within a cultural environment and is influenced by other selves. Personality is the locus of internalising cultural subjects and elements that affect it due to its connection with others. The relationship between the cultural system and the personality system develops in stages and according to the levels of flexibility and malleability at each stage. Internalisation is

not limited to subjects and elements belonging to the present time but also extends to the past, and it transcends the limits of the visible and lived experience to the realm of the audible, transmitted, and imagined. (Mohamed Abdel-Maaboud Morsi, 2001, p. 85).

This is what Bourdieu pointed to in the concept of habitus, which is the core of personality and the cognitive structure that generates behavior and action. At its core, it is the product of a continuous and ongoing internalization process of the conditions and realities of life throughout the various stages of existence for both the individual and society. According to this view, habitus constitutes the actual energy that guides the behaviors of the individual or group based on a certain reference located within the cognitive structure. (Ali Asaad Wafra, 2012)

This means that habitus is a set of integrated cognitive and perceptual structures produced within a specific social environment. This environment is reproduced through the generative capacity of habitus. Habitus is also the system within which the individual lives in their social environment and which determines what they will do and how they will act. (Jamil Hamdawi, 2017, p. 31)

The local worker can also be seen as having a pragmatic and utilitarian perspective, benefiting from what is available from the other despite cultural differences. Jacques Hermann, in this regard, argues that the social actor is primarily driven by personal interests and a continuous pursuit of private satisfaction. Thus, the dynamics of the social system can be reduced to individual choices; the principle of utility and the calculation of optimal satisfaction assume a rational actor artificially freed from the constraints imposed by their socio-cultural environment. (Jacques Hermann, 2010, p. 120).

In this discussion, we addressed the self and the other as an inevitable reality produced by multinational corporations that cannot be bypassed. No matter how far globalization goes in creating the concept of the global or planetary human—who carries the same traits, values, cultural origins, goals, and aspirations—it cannot transcend the civilizational heritage and cultural diversity. The awareness of the self cannot exist without the other, and the other must recognize the self as an active agent, not merely as a consumer, or reduce it to a subordinate that must comply with its rules. Here, conflicts arise, with both parties seeking to assert their existence and defend their distinctiveness and uniqueness.

Thus, cultural diversity has two dimensions: positive and negative. The positive dimension lies in the knowledge of the self, its foundations, and its deep roots in the souls of its people, in order to invest in it and strengthen cohesion amid diversity and difference from the other. The negative dimension manifests as narrow loyalty, closed-mindedness, withdrawal into the self, and rejection of all forms of dialogue and communication with the other, whether this

other is outside or inside the nation. This leads to fragmentation, disintegration of unity, and collapse. Therefore, the self must be brought closer to the other without fully integrating one into the other; rather, their communication should be possible according to the particularities of each. (Al-Arabi Miloud, 2010/2011, p. 205).

Multinational corporations strive diligently to maintain internal stability and avoid collisions and conflicts arising from cultural diversity, which could lead to instability within the organization. They do this by reconstructing the professional identities of the actors within them and forming an integrative identity that encompasses this diversity. Thus, the local worker, while losing some of their previous professional identity, acquires new, more comprehensive identities that are better able to exist and prominently emerge. This leads to the emergence of new structures, which create the conditions for continuous development. Pierre Bourdieu calls this process "the construction of constructed structures," as it does not stop at one stage but occurs over multiple stages. (Philip Alperson, 2017, p. 116).

According to Claude Dubar, the process of building identities is not a psychological research process nor a result of indoctrination of principles and values, but rather the outcome of a dual process of belonging and giving: one identity for the self and another for the other. (Dalila Badran, 2017, p. 134).

#### 4- Communicative Action in a Multicultural Environment:

David Rasmussen sees action as taking two forms: strategic action and communicative action. The first involves goal-oriented rational action, whereas communicative action is aimed at reaching understanding. Communicative action is a non-instrumental action in the following sense: any understanding reached through communication has a rational basis, meaning it cannot be imposed coercively by either party. (Ian Cribb, 1999, p. 309)

As for Goffman, he believes that strategic interaction still focuses on face-to-face communication, which particularly relies on pre-linguistic expressions such as intonation, facial gestures, and the like—hints that have expressive qualities but are not verbal. People often conceal or fabricate their expressions. (Erving Goffman, 1989, p. 353) Accordingly, strategic interaction is a competitive interaction aimed at controlling others' actions in order to surpass them. It can manifest in explicit debates or implicitly through actions involving symbols, signs, and non-verbal cues. The individual lives in a world of symbols and meanings surrounding them in every social situation and interaction, constantly influenced by and using them daily.

Based on this approach, we tried to focus on communicative action to highlight the impact of symbolic meanings on the interactive process between actors within multinational

companies and how both local and foreign parties deal with it.

**The Concept of Communicative Action:** Interaction mediated by symbolism according to norms that are necessarily valid, which define expectations of mutual behavior. These must be understood and recognized by at least two acting selves. Social norms gain strength through consensus, and the validity of these norms is founded only on the shared understanding of intentions and is confirmed through general recognition of commitments. (Ali Abboud Al-Mahmdawi, 2015, p. 188)

**Stages of Communicative Action:** According to Habermas, communicative action passes through three stages:

- **The stage of interaction mediated by symbols:** This stage involves two actors: the first is the "utterance" and the second is the "action." Through the communicative symbol (the utterance), a desire for certain behavior is expressed, and through the action, that desire is realized. The meanings of the utterance and action define each other.
- **The stage of differentiated discourse concerning its content:** At this stage, the utterance separates from the action. They cannot be relied upon solely concerning the acting individual but rather involve the position of the observer or participant in the dialogue. Here, exchange of perceptions between communicators can occur, allowing coordination between two behavioral desires to form a system of shared and integrated motives.
- **The stage of argumentative discourse:** At this point, the requirements of validity related to the previous two stages are formed. (Ali Abboud Al-Mahmdawi, 2015, p. 187)

As for Bourdieu, in his treatment of the relationship between action and social structures, he focused on the importance of the actor's spatial position, especially in the social field. The actor occupies a position that determines their status within the social structure, so this spatial position becomes one of the factors that must be considered as shaping their behavior and actions. Since this relationship is not deterministic, different pathways of action can be inferred from it, thus it is necessary to rely on the reflective and interpretive aspect. (Ibrahim Issa Othman, 2008, p. 167)

Meanwhile, Ralph Turner sees that the actor adopts symbols — whether gestures, language, bodily or vocal movements, or clothing — in the process of interaction through their perception of the other and their expectations, and what they believe will achieve the desired response. Thus, these subjective perceptions enter into determining the course of action and role performance, but they do so as both an objective and subjective factor in interpretation in shaping the role — not in the sense that culture is a norma-

tive source, but based on the repeated collective regularity of the role and its performance. On this subjective and objective basis, the actor chooses their action assuming that others in the group take the same meaning of the role. (Ibrahim Issa Othman, 2008, p. 145)

Philippe Bernoux also sought to explain that the meaning each actor gives to their action is determined through what he called the "logic of action," which is the way to define the meaning each actor assigns to their action. According to Bernoux, the construction of agreements, the reconstruction of identities, the production of norms, and conformity behaviors result from the way actors represent their roles and their status within institutions, taking into account their past trajectories and the position of the action they are in. The meaning individuals give to their actions is created by the systems of representations they hold, as well as their social positions. In other words, the actor does not act only in light of their position but also based on their experiences and memory. In short, the logic of an actor's action is the product of their past and their actual practice of work through their work situations. (Philippe Bernoux, 1995, p. 37)

In this regard, there have been several positions on the subject; here emerges the influence of workers' external affiliations on their actions within institutions characterized by cultural pluralism, especially their cultural backgrounds and social origins, which play an influential role in their behavioral patterns, primarily in the personal relationships prevailing among them. (Abdel Monem Abdel Hay, 1984, p. 142). This is what Goffman pointed out—that bodily expressions, gestures, and the nature of the action are more truthful indicators of meaning, and human awareness of them makes one try to manage their bodily expressions and actions in a way that presents them in the best light, attempting to hide negative aspects. This makes social interaction a kind of impression management game between sender and receiver; one party tries to discover the truth while the other tries to conceal it. This helps sustain the social process, where each party in the interaction tries to protect their image and presents the best possible version of themselves. (Ibrahim Issa Othman, 2008, p. 137)

He also views social interaction as constrained by the circumstances of time and place, as every encounter has a beginning and an end, making interaction situational. In his approach to self-presentation and impression management, Goffman analyzes interaction from three angles, as explained by Giddens:

- ✓ The individual's ability to understand what they are doing and to use this understanding to guide their action.
- ✓ Interactors demonstrate confidence in bodily control, maneuvering, and the ability to interpret others' communications.

- ✓ The human capacity to read the situation and turn events gives them a sense of value and grandeur.

Based on this, it can be said that the meaning of behavior becomes significant only because people assign meaning to it. Thus, a person does not only present themselves to others but also manages and deals with symbols to leave a specific impression. (Ibrahim Issa Othman, 2008, p. 140) Accordingly, interactors (whether foreigners or locals) try, when performing, to guide themselves according to what they believe are the official values of the field. This may lead the interactor, under certain circumstances, to struggle with conflicting values, trying to subordinate some in favor of others, presenting the best image of themselves while attempting to hide aspects of their self that do not fit this image. In doing so, they present what they want others to believe is their core self. (Erving Goffman, 1989, p. 319)

Therefore, the worker tries to reconcile the official instructions and regulations within the institution by adhering to laws and avoiding irrational practices while performing their duties. At the same time, they also seek to comply with cultural norms by adopting the appropriate facade to convince others that this is their true personality.

This is what the researcher "Al-Ayashi Anşar" pointed out—that the values of rationality are foreign to traditional societies, and their integration results in violent changes in the social structure and the cultural framework of the society. Perhaps the most significant contradiction produced by this process is the one that occurred between the necessary conditions for establishing an industrial base reliant on formal and utilitarian rationality, and social structures that still depend in their dynamics on values and norms rooted in an older cultural system. This duality, which characterizes the social formation as a whole, is strongly present within the world of work — that is, in the industrial institution, where models of representations and actions based on industrial rationality intersect with those belonging to an old cultural framework embodied in the dominance of kinship and patronage relations, reflecting a pre-industrial social structure. (Al-Ayashi Anşar, 2003, p. 155).

In this regard, Bourdieu views the relationship of the actor to the social structure as one that results in actors reproducing this structure. He does not exclude the ability of actors to transform and change the structure, but this requires structural conditions to be met (Khaled Abdel Fattah, 2010). In light of this, Bourdieu means the practice of social action in which actors participate in producing the social structure rather than merely performing roles. In other words, the interactive system in the multicultural socio-professional environment plays a significant and active role through the daily contact and interaction between local and foreign workers in adopting and adhering to the values of rationality within multinational companies.



## Conclusion

Multinational companies currently witness complex transformations within a global economic environment characterized by dynamism and rapid change, due to increasing economic disparities between countries and institutions, the dominance of the market economy, the expansion of foreign investments, and intensified competition among economic actors. This situation has driven many institutions to seek effective strategies that enable them to adapt to these changes. Multinational companies have emerged as a mechanism for international cooperation and the utilization of human and material resources in various countries, aiming to achieve growth, expansion, and strengthen competitive ability. However, despite possessing significant capabilities, these institutions face internal challenges at the organizational and cultural levels, the most important of which relates to the cultural plurality and diversity arising from the varied backgrounds of employees and the differences in their social and cultural references. This diversity may lead to internal conflicts, instability, and weak institutional belonging.

In this context, organizational culture is considered a fundamental element in building internal unity and social cohesion within multinational companies. These institutions seek to overcome cultural differences by constructing a shared organizational culture derived from a mixture of subcultures present within the institution. This is built through a conscious process of intercultural learning aimed at creating an open and balanced work environment that respects particularities while simultaneously enhancing harmony and collective belonging. Daily interaction among employees, exchanging experiences and values, and engag-

ing in joint work are all factors that contribute to building a complex professional identity that responds to the nature of the globalized institution.

Experiences have shown that this cultural diversity, if properly harnessed, represents an important source of creativity and innovation, as it enriches individuals' knowledge, broadens their horizons, and grants the institution the ability to adapt to rapid changes both internally and externally. Building an organizational culture capable of embracing plurality and unifying affiliations within a collective identity does not mean eliminating sub-group affiliations but rather merging them within a broader framework that promotes coexistence and integration instead of conflict.

Accordingly, professional identity within multinational companies shifts from being a fixed given to a dynamic process shaped through interaction and contact. It is influenced by several factors, some local such as values and customs, and others global such as administrative standards and organizational systems. In this context, the importance of qualified human resources emerges—those capable of understanding and assimilating these dynamics and working within a multicultural environment, where adaptability, continuous learning, and active participation become key indicators of organizational success. Based on the foregoing, the success of multinational companies is not measured solely by their economic indicators but also by their ability to create a flexible organizational environment capable of accommodating differences, unifying efforts, and building an organizational culture that represents a collective identity aligned with the aspirations of both the institution and its employees.

## References

1. Abdel Fattah, K. (2010). *Pierre Bourdieu's theory of practice*. Retrieved from <http://kenanaonline.com/users/sociology/posts/155644/practie>
2. Abdel Hay, A.M. (1984). *Industrial sociology: The factory and its social problems*. Modern University Office.
3. Abdullah, A. (1999). *The impact of environment on the performance of public institutions* (State Doctorate Thesis). Faculty of Economic Sciences and Management, University of Algiers.
4. Ali, A.A. (2015). *The political problematic of modernity: From the philosophy of the self to the philosophy of communication* (1st ed.). Difa'a Publications.
5. Al-Aqbi, L. (2008/2009). *Local social and cultural values and their impact on organizational behavior of workers* (PhD Thesis). University of Constantine.
6. Al-Arabi, M. (2010/2011). *Self and otherness in Paul Ricoeur's philosophy* (PhD Dissertation). University of Oran.
7. Al-Ayashi, A. (1999). *Sociology of democracy and rebellion* (1st ed.). Dar Al-Amin.
8. Al-Ayashi, A. (2003). *Towards a critical sociology* (2nd ed.). Diwan of University Publications.
9. Baalbaki, A., et al. (2013). *Identity and its issues in contemporary Arab consciousness* (1st ed.). Center for Arab Unity Studies.
10. Bedran, D. (2017). Professional identity of the worker between integration and job security. *Al-Turath Journal*, 7(4), 134. Retrieved from <http://www.asjp.cerist.dz>
11. Bernoux, P. (1995). *The sociology of enterprises*. Editions du Seuil.
12. Bernoux, P. (2017). *Diversity and society* (O. Al-Johari, Trans.) (1st ed.). National Center for Translation.
13. Bin Issa, M.A.M. (1995/1996). *Sociological analysis of the rationalization crisis in industrial organization in Algeria* (Master's Thesis). University of Algiers.

14. Bin Issa, M.A.M. (2010). *Sociology of organization: From work sociology to institution sociology* (1st ed.). Embaplast.
15. Bouzidra, F. (2013/2014). *Organizational culture and the nature of social relations* (Master's Thesis). University of Oran.
16. Bashir, M. (2018). *Sociologists of organizations and work in Algeria - The first generation* (1st ed.). Dar Kanooz.
17. Cossey, D. (2007). *The concept of culture in social sciences* (M. Al-Saidani, Trans.) (1st ed.). Arab Organization for Translation.
18. Crib, I. (1999). *Social theory from Parsons to Habermas* (M. Hussein & M. Asfour, Trans.). Alam Al-Ma'rifa.
19. Gharid, J. (1997). Elements of approaching the new face of the industrial worker. *Insaniyat Journal*, 1. Retrieved August 2, 2015.
20. Hamdawi, J. (2017). *Pierre Bourdieu and the questions of sociology* (1st ed.). Copyright reserved by author.
21. Herman, J. (2010). *Sociology discourses in social theory* (A. Anzar, Trans.). Dar Al-Maseera.
22. Imad, A.G. (2006). *Sociology of culture: Concepts and issues* (1st ed.). Center for Arab Unity Studies.
23. Ibrahim, I.O. (2008). *Contemporary theory of sociology*. Dar Al Shorouk.
24. Massi, S. (2014/2015). *Knowledge economy in Algeria: Reality and transformation requirements* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Larbi Ben M'hidi, Oum El Bouaghi.
25. Merani, H. (2006/2007). *The social professional identity of public economic institution executives* (PhD Thesis). University of Annaba.
26. Mohsen, S.M., & Mansour, T.M. (2008). *Management and business* (2nd ed.). Dar Wael.
27. Othman, I.I. (2008). *Contemporary theory of sociology*. Dar Al Shorouk.
28. Sainsaulieu, R. (1978). *Cultural learning at work: What will work become?* Modern Enterprise Publishing.
29. Sainsaulieu, R. (1997). *Sociology of the enterprise*. Presses de Sciences Po and Dalloz.
30. Savidan, P. (2011). *The state and cultural pluralism* (A. Hassouni, Trans.) (1st ed.). Dar Boutqal.
31. Sotari, B. (2015). *Social theory and human reality* (A. Farghali, Trans.) (1st ed.). National Center for Translation.
32. Watfa, A.A. (2012). Habitus in Bourdieu's sociology. Retrieved August 16, 2017, from <http://www.annabaa.org/nbanews>
33. Zatlin, I. (1989). *Contemporary theory in sociology: A critical study*.
34. Zayed Al-Tayeb, M. (2005). *Globalization and social cohesion in the Arab world* (1st ed.). National Books House.