Justyna Dziedzic

University of Social Sciences,

Lodz, Poland

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8292-0892

UE Organizational Identity.
From the Motto *Veritate Concordia*
to Neo-bureaucratic Management

ABSTRACT

Objective: The concept of organizational identity appears mainly in the context of a symbolic-interpretive view of an organization's functioning in its many dimensions. This article aims to analyze to what extent previous knowledge about the existence of an EU organizational identity is a distinct category in the context of neo-bureaucratic management. It seems particularly interesting to draw attention to the identity context in organizations operating under intercultural management conditions. Their character and disposition may be more complex than in the case of homogeneous organizations. For this reason, the European Union is asking itself questions about its identity in the context of cultural unification and policy issues, and management solutions related to the institution's functioning at many levels. Therefore, it seems interesting to draw attention to these issues in light of the different contexts of influence. One is the neo-bureaucratic view of the EU institutions' governance dimensions, which should be regarded as complex organizational identities. They are subject to the modern influence of management visions and benefit from intercultural management processes' achievements. The EU's supranational structure, influenced by bureaucratic organizational arrangements, speaking the language of diplomacy, and setting policy for the Member States, constitute a unique organizational identity globally, which is worth verifying through the prism of neo-bureaucratic influences and cultural conditions of European identity.

Methodology: The article is based on a critical analysis of literature dealing with the sense of European Union organizational identity. Provided a theoretical background on orgzniataional identity in neo-bureaucratic management on a European level.

Findings: In its institutional dimension, the European Union faces the dilemma regarding its own identity due to diplomatic disputes over cultivating indigenous cultures and diversity. It is, therefore, a rare phenomenon on the world stage of supranational institutions. Its procedural nature and purpose are also important to harmonize the Member States' various policies. It is already possible to outline its unique organizational identity. However, it cannot be transferred to territorial and social land, as Europe cannot be a hybrid of cultures or unify its perspective in the face of historical pasts and ethnic representations.

Value Added: Critical discourse on the theory of bureaucratic management and organizational identity. Presentation of the role of European Union identity in management process and giving the organization common values that solidify its form.

Recommendations: Neo-bureaucratic management is an interesting phenomena to explore in cross-cultural discourses. There are several directions for analysis: forms of modern bureaucracy based on practices drawn from the experience of corporations; abuse of the power of supranational organisations; network management in international organizations.

Key words: organizational identity, European Union, neo-bureaucracy, Europe identity, civil society

JEL codes: M12, M14, O15

Introduction

There is a discourse about organizational identity as a segregated theory with an ever-stronger research background in the teachings of management. Because of the growing interest in intercultural governance competencies, international organizations are also emerging. It is subject to critical analyses of its corporate

dimensions or the national contexts of influence subject to aspects such as patriarchal cultures, gender inequality, cultural prejudices, or stereotypes.

On the other hand, the analysis of an intercultural organization's identity may also refer to the increasing importance of behavioral and humanistic aspects of governance, attempting to include the psychological, cultural, and anthropological spheres into the organizational context (Sułkowski & Dziedzic, 2020, pp. 29–30). It also touches on the development of workers with intercultural competencies, with attention to their well-being and development opportunities. Therefore, identity contexts appear in different research directions in other specifications, trends, cultural meanings, or professions in an organizational context. Identity analysis can also be influenced by how organization members accept, interact with, and deal with phenomena in the professional environment.

- This article aims to analyze to what extent previous knowledge about the existence of an EU organizational identity is a distinct category in the context of neo-bureaucratic management. The following research questions were asked:
- In what areas can the existence of an EU organizational identity be indicated?
- What is the role of civil society policy in this process?
- What is the European identity category's significance for the EU's organizational identity?

Solutions of identity in both collective and individual contexts should be sought in the early works of interactionism. A symbolic view allows a broad view of the organizational context of the individual's role (Sułkowski, 2013, p. 26). Quite extensively, identity contexts appear from anthropological sciences, cultural studies, and sociology, but based on management science, they favor the reception somewhat beyond treating it solely within the social framework and clarifying the discourse on the organizational sphere (Sułkowski, 2013, p. 26).

Since Albert and Whetten proposed that organizational identity be understood as the result of a search for consensus in the Union, precisely its consensual

nature can be viewed from that Union's perspective (Albert & Whetten, 2004, p. 90). This inclusive project has succeeded precisely because of the agreements reached through debate and dialogue. At present, its bureaucratic framework is well-established and its organizational nature is quite transparent, which can foster its members' sense of EU identity (Albert & Whetten, 2004, p. 90).

The EU's organizational identity can be seen as a distinct and independent institutional form that stands out from other transnational organizations. Therefore, it is separate and competent, with external identification of the internal construct of its unique personality and decision-making processes, which are a form of its institutional response and organizational behavior.

The importance of the discourse of European identity in the context of the concept of EU organizational identity

European identities are dealt with in many sciences, including to a large extent cultural studies, anthropology, sociology, European and international studies, and governance issues. The diversity of views and debates raises unresolved questions about Europe's identity contexts, for they can manifest themselves in ambiguity and a variety of historical views and cultural, religious, and ethnic heterogeneity. There are threads of cultural nostalgia, civilizational growth, public cultural discourse, or analysis of transcultural processes. An interpretation of the Europe's identity is insufficient considering simply the context of history and territoriality. Continental Europe's identity amounts to heterogeneity, which creates the need to traverse the language of policymakers or representatives of a regulatory, economic and cultural project such as the European Union. Contemporary European discourses concern the issues of identity, borders, and understanding of the center, culture, and space and stem from changes that create a world structure that is not described by clear criteria (Marinković & Ristić, 2018, p. 166).

An attempt to understand the multiplicity of views on Europe's identity issues can be interpreted by trying to understand its manifestations in the public message. Marta Wójcicka analyzed the Polish discourse in the context of the concept of European identity (Wójcicka, 2019, pp. 25–40). From her research, we learn that this "European identity" combines geopolitical tradition, and a culture of Europeans. Thus, this identity discourse goes beyond Europe's context and becomes a form considered appropriate for the EU institutions in a symbolic public space. In addition, the author distinguished different views on this issue from the point of view of different worldviews. The centrist view of European identity is equated with Europeans, Europe, the community, and the Union. In right-wing discourse, on the other hand, it is equated only with an EU identity. In both cases, however, there is a recognition of its crisis as a Union problem. It also reveals a conflict of national identity treatment concerning European identity in two ways, namely equivalent or opposing. These views differ precisely depending on the ideas of worldview and political representation.

Nevertheless, finding the values discussed and recognized in a consensus common to the EU plan is also possible. The correctness of organizational identity is linked to the main beliefs that the EU preaches in an axiological dimension. Among them, ideas such as freedom, civil rights, and pluralism can be considered main. The EU values language also refers to the Polish Solidarity movement, for exemple spreading the principles of democracy, defending the dignity rights and interests of employees, and defending universal humanitarian values (Wójcicka, 2019, pp. 25–39).

Values serve to self-identify, and although it takes place at the level of their own experiences and beliefs, in the EU, it is created in the context of dialogue and recognition of events. This point cannot be without tensions and broad debates about ideas, which need to be discussed. For example, this concerns the question of recognizing Christianity as the foundation of European culture, which is incessant and is seen in debate on the EU's Constitution, mainly concering the question of religion (Frydrych, 2003).

Linguistic and religious diversity shows the non-homogeneity and complexity of the EU. However, it is based on collective memory. It tries to choose from historical facts common to creating its organizational foundations, like a nomad

who recalls many different historical events he encountered during the journey as he considers his own identity experience.

Thomas Pellerin-Carlin makes an interesting argument, recognizing that Europe's identity must be discussed from a cultural rather than a geographical perspective, which also applies to the EU notes' crises (Pellerin-Carlin, 2014, pp. 73–84). Nevertheless, to understand these dependencies, it is necessary to recall the division of Europe into Eastern European culture (shaped by the influence of the Orthodox Church) and Western European culture (shaped by Catholic forces). However, Western Europe favors the creation of the EU, but it is not sufficient to create a political identity. While this political aspect causes a dissection in terms of political integration, a common cultural code can unite it in the context of the possibility of creating an identity within the organization with its crises. However, it is impossible to separate the reflection on Europeans from the EU's organizational identity. EU should be seen more as a cultural and economic project than a strictly peaceful one. Europe's existence is still artistic, and the EU exemplifies its consensual integration strategy. It is based on the idea of solidarity, which it cites as a kind of cultural foundation of the Union. The level of political unification can also condition the degree of its integration (Pellerin-Carlin, 2014, pp. 73–84).

Europe's public space is a huge field of discourse on symbolic representations. Identity discourses are therefore torn by meanings relating to the historical genotype of individual countries and regions. The Union does not refer to them in its organizational identity; it uses language closer to the corporate system. It creates its organizational communication, independent of the achievements of European civilization. An inclusive EU is therefore independent of European cultural circles and identity implications. Its nature largely has a regulatory dimension. It seems to be taking the discourse of how to relate to the regulation. It even takes up the subject of Managing Europe, as expressed in the 2001 White Paper (European Commission, 2001).

The public sphere is based on the assumption of its independence from the state and the market, rather than as a forum for debate and democratic control (Habermas, 2022). Looking at the reception of the issue of public inspection in the organizational identity of the Union, it is a closed project. The shape of

European policies is socially indebted, but its internal foundation is no longer. It is a separate zone of influence, more bureaucratic than open to public debate.

The European Union as a neo-bureaucratic organization

The nature of EU action is based on a bureaucratic way of working, an attribute of its identity. In the face of social criticism, which has fallen not only on the bureaucratic legacy of Weber's recognitions but also on the strict bureaucratic nature of EU action, there is a reaction to the change like the EU's institutional activities.

The existence of neo-bureaucracy appears as a response to the development of supportive democracy and changes in the environment of public institutions (Farrell & Morris, 2003, p. 130). There have been changes in the implementation of social policies and structures that have evolved over the decades due to the support of users, customers, and stakeholders of bureaucratic organizations. These changes fall under the word 'post-bureaucracy' and even "beyond-bureaucracy" (Farrell & Morris, 2003, p. 130). New forms of government that reduce hierarchy affect not only the community that exists outside this bureaucracy but also the professionals working in the public sector. Therefore, the neo-bureaucratic direction is combined with the philosophy of managerialism, public services, and new public management, replacing the past hierarchy, the rule of power, and objectivity in relations with clients. Images of new management include; project-based, change-focused, out-of-the-box, and stylish consulting actions. Neo-bureaucracy removes barriers between elements of organizations that were considered oppositional, such as centralization vs. decentralization and; the public vs. private sector. Michał Możdżeń draws attention to the trends of change and evolution, which undoubtedly affect public policies (Możdżeń, 2016, p. 63).

It can be considered that neo-bureaucracy is the result of a certain evolution in thinking about the meaning and role of bureaucracy in the organizational

environment, in terms of its form, structures, and the role it assumes as significant (Table 1).

Table 1. Organizational ideal types

Rational bureaucratic organization (RBO)	Post-bureaucratic organization (PBO)	Neo-bureaucratic organization (NBO)	Example
Specialisation	Collaboration	Functional integration	Multi-functional projects
Standardisation	Flexibility	Managed improvisation	Change programs and adapting methods
Formalisation	Negotiation	Structured organisational politics	Relationship/ client and change management methods
Centralisation	Dispersal (decentralisation)	Delegated autonomy	Quasi market structures, leaderism
Depersonalisation	Personalisation	Networked "meritocracy"	Added-value and personal credibility
Collectivisation	Individualisation	Dual identities	Conditional commitment, professionals as managers

Source: (Sturdy et al., 2016, pp. 184–205).

Nevertheless, modernizing the procedural and bureaucratic nature of the EU's functioning brings many new considerations of public administration possibilities and the updating of it. Neo-bureaucracy, therefore, seems to be a more appropriate concept for the EU's organizational identity. It re-affirms bureaucratic solutions such as procedural decision-making, strengthening the administrative apparatus, and approval for competent clerical staff.

Nevertheless, it faces the possibility of turning its form into a corporate administrative model and turning towards specific solutions appropriate to managerial philosophies and using new technologies and network management solutions. It is also likely to be transformed by criticism of bureaucracy, which amounts to dehumanizing the EU in its public opinion, which stems from

the procedural nature of the procedure, the language of its standards, and the rules' paramount to its activities (Możdżeń, 2016, p. 63).

Science has a kind of critical debate about the system of bureaucracy. However, its positive dimensions are highlighted – such as the attachment of citizens to its traditions, the formation of the general order, the arousing of confidence in the superficial apparatus's operation, the continuity of its operation, or standardization. These characteristics promote an international organizations' functioning under their rights due to complex decision-making processes, complex intercultural management processes, transnational communication, law, and budget management. It is difficult to come up with a different model of action than a rights-based bureaucracy that would be supported by a consensus between nations and representatives of different ideas and worldviews. However, organizations like the EU are supported by concepts and develop from modern management trends such as New Public Governance (NPM). It largely means adopting solutions from the business world consisting of decentralization, flattening organizations, focusing on processes that create value for citizens, applying results management, modern information technologies, and functioning in the network system of links. These trends used in decentralization have also been criticized in implementation processes. In the context of management decisions, such arrangements are a sure way to pull off solutions to improve work in the face of developing employees' capacity and general processes for improving work. As table 1 shows, there are different ways of viewing NPM that can be graphed into model diagrams and the European Union adopts various solutions from models (Table 2). Its policy of transparency means it; monitors work outcomes, benefits from the teamwork philosophy, determines the organization's mission and the image of its employee and also implements quality management ideas.

Table 2. New Public Management model

Model	Basic features of the model
NPM Model 1. Increasing efficiency	The increase in the importance of financial control. They are maximizing effects while reducing costs. They are setting transparent goals and monitoring results. Development of economic and substantive audit. They are promoting the use of questionnaires as a tool for assessing activities and exposing the responsibility of service providers to customers. Increasing market and customer orientation. Implementing new good governance patterns. The increased role of the management staff. Management staff account for the results of their work.
NPM Model 2. Limiting the size of the organization and decentralization management	Development of public service quasi-markets. They are increasing the role of contracting and limiting the role of hierarchical management in favor of contract management. Importance of teamwork. Focus on „management through impact". Departing from providing standardized services towards forms characterized by diversity and flexibility.
NPM Model 3. In search of perfection	Radical decentralization and evaluation through the results obtained. Focus on organizational development and organizational learning. Intensive training programs for managers. Emphasis on charismatic management methods. They are determining the mission of the organization and the image of its employee.
NPM Model 4. Public service orientation	It is achieving excellence in the process of providing public services. Implementation of quality management. It focuses on the development of knowledge about public services among citizens, for example, by assessing social needs and organizing community tasks.

Source: (Młodzik, 2015).

In the concept of New Public Governance, it is important to redefine the idea of legitimacy and social responsibility. The role of citizens is increasing, and even the type of satisfaction with the activities of the administration increases, the number of arrangements between institutions increases, and the role of institutional theory and network theory and the part of self-organization are important. It is possible to question whether the public sector can truly function based on collaborative networks and eliminate hierarchical management. Nevertheless, the EU uses the New Public Governance philosophy. It strengthens its relationship with citizens by involving them in discussions about the shape of specific policies and strategies. Nevertheless, still standing in the wide reception of EU citizens, it may seem like a rather distant Kafka

Castle, operating in the rigour of placement and obligations (Ćwiklicki, 2015, pp. 15–26).

The communication strategy with citizens is also based on market rights in the EU, using solutions known from marketing activities. Using modern contact solutions with the Member States, the EU also conducts brand strategy using brand communication tools. A brand communication strategy is a specific package of activities designed to reach the audience of a given product, project, organization, cultural good, person, or product (depending on what constitutes that brand). This is done on three levels: verbal, visual, and relational (Lembrych-Furtak, 2015, p. 67). Verbal communication is a specific oral dimension; at the graphical level it is an optical identification system; at a relational level it involves employees' behavior inside and within organizations, which also express an organizational culture. Importantly, each of these spheres is identifiable in the context of EU organizations (Lembrych-Furtak, 2015, p. 67).

The essence of the EU brand, expressed in language code, represents a set of rules governing the style of bureaucratic language of verbal communication. This applies to the brand communication's legislative and diplomatic vocabulary and how external texts are typed. The EU brand's main language association is the motto *Veritate Concordia* (United in Diversity or Unity in Diversity) (Dziedzic, 2020). The motto was announced at the official session of the European Parliament. It has an identity dimension and refers to the neo-bureaucratic nature of language. This motto is used in official documents.

The substantive content of the language code refers to an organization's axiological language, whose exemplification is community. The emphasis on unity and inclusive ideas indicates a willingness to build a community of beliefs and values. This vocabulary refers to both its internal activities and external verbal representations.

The second level of EU marketing action may be its image value. A well-designed visual identification system makes it easy to consolidate the desired image by unifying all the graphic elements. Thanks to efficient brand visualization tools, it is possible to distinguish it from other brands and facilitate certain information transmissions. Although this type of identification is associated with the private sector, comparisons cannot shape activities in favor of the EU

brand, which is expressed in blue colors and has a whole stack of identifying graphic designs included in the constellationof stars. For citizens, it is a clear receptive code – it appears. e.g., as an information board on the resulting infrastructure from EU funds. This policy quickly identifies this brand, but it is also a clear symbolic representation for the organization's employees (Lembrych-Furtak, 2015, p. 67).

The relational nature of the brand, which refers to organizational culture, is full of symbolic, normative, and axiological aspects of identity. The clear ideas to the EU members become the foundation of their daily work and give transparency to its bureaucratic activities. The essence of these ideas in communication makes it offices to believe in the legitimacy of EU culture. This idea allows it to continue, especially as it is extremely difficult in intercultural governance.

Identity has its roots in and refers to experience and the historical genotype. The EU organization has laid the foundations for this identity based on the construct of the so-called "founding fathers". The historical heroes are: Altiero Spinelli, an Italian politician, one of the founding fathers of the EU; Paul-Henri Spaak, the so-called founding father of the EU, former Prime Minister of Belgium; Jean Monnet, a french politician, and economist; Konrad Adenauer, the First Chancellor of the Federal Republic of German; Italian politician Alcide De Gasperi; Robert Schuman, a french foreign minister, is a key figure in shaping post-war Europe (Dziedzic, 2020). The "founding fathers" are an integration myth that builds the EU's organizational identity and their views are euro-ideas (Dziedzic, 2020). Cultural assumptions have their representation in Platonic supernatural beings, and the ways of ideologizing work can be described as precisely euro-ideas. They operate at both terminology and meaning levels.

Shared values and recognized heroes give a sense of professional identity. Cultural ideas allow for the merging of the working environment and provide an attempt to further functioning. A cultural agenda is an attempt to belong to a particular group beyond the framework known to members of cultural organizations and constitutes a separate identity that is also manifested externally.

EU identity in the context of civil society policy

The policy of shaping civil society is one of the most important strategic directions for strengthening pro-democratic attitudes in the European Union. No wonder the EU's identity is shaped on its basis. It is the political foundation for shaping European strategies. It is also the EU's formal response to the progress of democratization processes. For this reason, the idea of civil society is particularly significant concerning countries which are young democracies in European Union. The formation of identity ideas in the organizational context has a special dimension in the EU integration of post-totalitarian countries. The post-totalitarian past may reinforce the imperialist attitudes that give way to the new democratic and pro-civic order. Shaping the EU's identity also involves negotiating past perspectives formed over the years and the newly formed society. This society, which integrates within the Union, strengthens its community and EU affiliation by referring to the main idea of integration processes: human rights, the rule of law, and democracy. Thus, especially for post-totalitarian states, integration processes were important because they changed the tendencies of the dominance of one ideology to shape a society of consensus and diversity of beliefs.

On the one hand, this was to refer to cultural issues and the shape of the diversity of thought of the different societies; while, on the other hand, the spread of economic pluralism. The democratic ideal of the state was to build the shape of the post-totalitarian European reality; the Union played an important role in this process (Andrusiak, 2014, p. 189).

The EU does not impose solutions on the shape of the authorities on the Member States but enforces issues related to the rule of law and democracy. Turning the attention toward an EU identity based on the idea of civil society, it is, therefore, necessary to mention post-totalitarian states. In Central and Eastern Europe, the scheduling of democratic attitudes was intended to limit the state's omnipotence in favor of a community of citizens (Andrusiak, 2014, p. 189). Legal, economic, libertarian views and market awareness is the foundation of the EU's civil society identity; post-totalitarian societies faced many consequences from the former regime. First of all, they were rebuilding their

value. They changed all forms of active civic life, free from initiatives that had previously been associated only with party institutions. These included the main importance of power; however, throughout the processes of democratization and the progressive integration policy, they were to come to believe in the idea of citizenship. Returning to these processes, it is worth recalling the Polish philosopher Tischner's words. He mentioned that the reaction to totalitarianism was to discover the ethos of solidarity as a pluralistic group of people. The European Union also builds its identity based on a tradition of solidarity. The main square in front of the European Parliament building is called "Esplanade Solidarity 1980". Pluralistic and solidarity ideas are the main ideological pillar for shaping policies and building strategies for EU civil society (Tischner, 2014).

Along these lines Orzeszyna argues, "Insert original quote" (2009, p. 99) ["The concept of civil society is nowadays associated with freedom, as in the republican and liberal traditions, but unlike the former, it is not political freedom based on active citizenship – although it also has its meaning – but individual freedom guaranteed by law"].[1] The EU refers to the contemporary understanding of this concept of citizenship. There is a strong discourse of civil society in the EU, which is expressed in the vision of Europe as a strictly civic circle, especially in the context of the capabilities of its inhabitants (Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee C329 17.11.1999). For nationals of Member States, this means, in particular, the possibility of practicing as a person working in a Member State other than that in which they obtained their professional qualification (Dyrektywa 2005/36/WE 2005, p. 22).

A society shaped in the sense of citizenship of the EU is understood in terms of the identity of dialogue. This should precede all political decisions and create a kind of political culture. Social dialogue also becomes a decision-making procedure that brings the various organizations and associations that lobby their interests and represent their rights in the relevant branches of economic, social, and cultural life (Dyrektywa 2005/36/WE 2005, p. 107). Therefore, the European Union treats civil society as a key tool in the process of democratization

---

[1]   Translation provided by the author of this article.

and social capital to help economic development) (Carbone & Lister, 2006, p. 110). It is also intended to strengthen the ability of executives to solve problems (Quittkat & Kohler-Koch, 2013, p. 3).

The inclusive concept of civil society also has many obstacles. Among them is the questioning of the general idea of a fully integrated Europe and the problem of identifying a common sense of the social identity of its citizens. This applies, for example, to the careers of leaders of European organizations, who are an important capital of the EU. Political actors in the field of Eurocracy are a challenge to EU identity (Jayeon & Scaramuzzino, 2020, p. 94). The lack of well-supported political processes and the lack of common European media are also barriers to development (Bozzini & Bee, 2010, p. 116). Important challenges in shaping a pluralistic EU civil society are phenomena such as the politicization of the EU, individual acts of participation, litigation between citizens and EU organizations, and the processes of strengthening national identity while weakening the EU's identity (Liebert & Gattig, 2013, p. 2).

Conclusions

In its institutional dimension, the European Union seeks to enter an order, known to its members for its bureaucratic nature, of founding states such as France and Germany. However, it still faces the same dilemma regarding its own identity due to diplomatic disputes over cultivating indigenous cultures and diversity. It is, therefore, a rare phenomenon on the world stage of supranational institutions. Its procedural nature and purpose are also important to harmonize the Member States' various policies. It isn't easy to describe these searches for a clear path to EU identity, even though it is already possible to outline its unique organizational identity. However, it cannot be transferred to territorial and social land, as Europe cannot be a hybrid of cultures or unify its perspective in the face of historical pasts and ethnic representations. The UK's departure from the EU has become an additional incentive to take a more thorough look at the phenomenon of EU identity.

Concerning the dilemmas posed by the nature of geographical divisions, one can ask whether island states have a stronger structure of territorial independence and a sense of geographical and social distinctness, which would, in a sense, be one of the causes of *Brexit*. This phenomenon may paradoxically unify the attempt to understand its supranational distinctness. It is also an important to warn that any peaceful structure, regardless of its traditions, may be threatened. Today the EU faces important questions about the limits of unification, the professionalization of work in the face of dehumanizing procedural processes, and the inability to transfer organizational identity to a broader geopolitical perspective. Karol Jakubowicz draws attention to the integration deficit in the context of identity issues and the EU's sense of identification. As he writes, "both European civic identity and constitutional patriotism were intended to oppose classical ethnonationalism" (Jakubowicz, 2010, p. 110). The post-national assumption has failed and even reversed these trends, which has led the EU to redefine European ideas. How does the EU's organizational identity relate to these trends? It can strengthen its sense of distinctness, maintain its personality and give it a sense of continuity of action and relative procedural stability.

References

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (2004). Organizational Identity. In M. J. Hatch, M. Schultz, *Organizational Identity. Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Andrusiak, T. (2014). Tendencje rozwojowe myśli politycznej i prawnej w społeczeństwie posttotalitarnym. Na przykładzie doświadczeń ukraińskich. In M. Maciejewski, M. Marszał, M. Sadowski, T. Kruszewski, *Tendencje rozwojowe myśli politycznej i prawnej*. Wrocław: Wyd. Wydział Prawa, Administracji i Ekonomii Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Bozzini, E., & Bee, C. (2010). *Mapping the European Public Sphere*. Farnham: Routledge.

Carbone, M., & Lister, M. (2006). *New Pathways in International Development*. *Gender and Civil Society in EU Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ćwiklicki, M. (2015). Towards neo-bureaucracy: bureaucracy in contemporary public management concepts. In R. Wiszniowski & K. Glinka (Eds.), *New Public Governance in the Visegrád Group* (V4) (pp. 15–26). Toruń: Wyd. Adam Marszałek.

Dziedzic, J. (2020). *Kultura organizacyjna a unijny sektor audiowizualny. Międzykulturowe aspekty zarządzania w instytucjach Unii Europejskiej.* Łódź: Wydawnictwo Społecznej Akademii Nauk.

Farrell, C., & Morris, J. (2003). The Neo-Bureaucratic State: Professionals, Managers and Professional Managers in Schools, General Practices and Social Work. *Organization*, *10*(1), 129–156.

Frydrych, M. (2003). *IGC to carry on Christianity debate, euobserver*. Brussels, 13.06.2003. Retrieved from euobserver.com. Access: 20.09.2022.

Habermas, J. (2022). Reflections and Hypotheses on a Futher Structural Transformation of the Political Public Sphere. *Theory, Culture and Society*, *39*(4), 145–171.

Jakubowicz, K. (2010). *Unia Europejska a media. Między kulturą a gospodarką.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Naukowe i Profesjonalne.

Jayeon, L., & Scaramuzzino, R. (2020). Can EU Civil Society Elites Burst the Brussels Bubble? Civil Society Leaders' Career Trajectories. *Politics and Governance*, *8*(3), 86–96.

Lembrych-Furtak, R. (2015). Strategiczne aspekty zarządzania marką. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, Sectio H. Oeconomia*, *XLIX*(1), 63–70.

Liebert, U., & Gattig, A. (2013). *Democratising the EU from Below*? Abingdon: Routledge.

Marinković, D., & Ristić, D. (2018). Regional Heterotopia of Central Europe: 'Lost' Identity in the Process of Deterritorialisation of Europe. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, *21*(1), 146–171.

Młodzik, E. (2015). Założenia koncepcji New Public Management. *Współczesne Problemy Ekonomiczne*, *11*, 185–193.

Możdżeń, M. (2016). Public Policy in the Neo-Weberian State [Cykl polityk publicznych w państwie neoweberowskim. *Zarządzanie Publiczne*, *3*(37), 62–79.

Orzeszyna, K. (2009). *Społeczeństwo obywatelskie w Unii Europejskiej*, Teka Komisji Prawniczej, t. II (pp. 94–108). Lublin: Polska Akademia Nauk w Lublinie.

Pellerin-Carlin, T. (2014). EU 10 Years After Its Biggest Enlargement: Europe's Identity Crisis Looking in the Black Box of European Cultural and Political Identities. *The Poznan University of Economics Review*, *14*(3), 73–84.

Sturdy, A., Wylie, N., & Wright, C. (2016). Managers as Consultants: The Hybridity and Tensions of Neo-bureaucratic Management. *Organization*, *23*(2), 184–205.

Sułkowski, Ł., & Dziedzic, J. (2020). Scientist organizational Identity – the Diversity of Perspectives. *Journal of Intercultural Management, 12*(4), pp. 29–48.

Sułkowski, Ł. (2013). Kultura jakości w zarządzaniu, czyli pomiędzy tożsamością a kulturą organizacyjną. *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie, XIV*(8), II, 25–37.

Tischner, J. (2014). *Idąc przez puste Błonia*. Kraków: Znak.

Wójcicka, M. (2019). Tożsamość europejska w polskim dyskursie medialnym (2015–2018). Rekonesans. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Linguistica*, *53*, 33–46.

Quittkat, Ch., & Kohler-Koch, B. (2013). *De-Mystification of Participatory Democracy: EU Governance and Civil Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Documents

European Commission (2001). European Governance. A White Paper. COM(2001) 428 final. Brussels: European Union.

Dyrektywa 2005/36/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 7 września 2005 r. w sprawie uznawania kwalifikacji zawodowych (Dz.U. L 255 z 30.9.2005), pp. 22–142.

Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on "The role and contribution of civil society organisations in the building of Europe", OJEC, C329 17.11.1999.