Journal of Management Studies 39:7 November 2002
0022-2380

DRESS AND IDENTITY: A TURKISH CASE STUDY*

Michael Humphreys

Andrew D. Brown

University of Nottingham

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how dress can be implicated in contests regarding individual and organizational identities. Identities are understood as being constituted within discursive regimes, and to be subjectively available to people in the form of self-narratives. The pluralism and polyphony that characterize organizations means that collective self-narratives are likely to be fractured, contested and multi-layered. It is in this context that attire is an important object symbol that conveys information about the individual and collective self. Here we focus on aspects of dress, especially the Islamic headscarf, and its role in the dynamics of collective identity maintenance and challenge in one all-female Turkish university department. Our ethnographic approach yielded multiple, related and sometimes overlapping story lines centred on dress. These we have chosen to represent as a single though multi-voiced faculty narrative in order to facilitate analysis of what was a particularly rich symbolic milieu. The principal research contribution of this paper is as a discussion of participants' clothing in the constitution of individual and organizational narrative identities, and its importance for understanding the dynamics of identity conflicts.

INTRODUCTION

How is dress linked to contests regarding group and organization identity? Given that dress is a potent object symbol (Trice and Beyer, 1993, p. 86) which is both peculiarly visible and malleable (Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997, p. 890), this is an important but under-researched and under-theorized question in management studies. This paper focuses on the identity-narrative of an all-female Turkish university faculty of vocational education to provide an analysis of the key role that attire can play in continuing processes of collective identity construction. In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to issues relating to group identity in general (e.g., *Academy of Management Review*, 2000; Parker, 2000; Tajfel, 1972; Tajfel and Turner, 1986) and narrative approaches to identity in particular (e.g., Baumeister

Address for reprints: Michael Humphreys, The University of Nottingham, Business School, Jubilee Campus, Wollaton Road, Nottingham NG8 1BB (Michael.humphreys@nottingham.ac.uk).

and Newman, 1994; Brown, 1998; McAdams, 1996). The study of dress in organizations, despite being a relatively minor theme, probably has a lengthier pedigree (Becker et al., 1961; Goffman, 1959; Simmel, 1971; Singer et al., 1965; Stone, 1962; Veblen, 1899). This paper argues that interpretive research that is analytically concerned with issues of dress and group narrative identities may yield insights into how people come to understand and attribute meaning to their work organizations.

In specific terms, we highlight some of the ways in which dress is involved in contests regarding individual and organizational identity narratives. Our emphasis on dress and narrative, we argue, provides valuable analytical tools for advancing our understanding of the dialogical nature of collective identity development (e.g., Lamiell and Weigert, 1996, p. 338). While theorists such as Davis (1993, p. 5) have argued that clothes cannot be grammatically parsed like a language but 'communicate in a manner closer to music . . . "undercoded" . . . [and] expressive of mood', our case suggests that there are contexts within which items of attire can have palpable and quite literal meanings for organizational participants. There can be few better examples of this than in Turkey, where the 'symbolic linkage of dress with political and religious values has been a matter of public policy . . . for centuries' (Jirousek, 1996, p. 58). We also seek to illustrate some of the constraints under which élites attempt to exert control over the authorship of collective narrative identities. In particular, we argue that the daily juxtaposition in classrooms and workshops of Atatürk images and students wearing headscarves represented the partial failure of those nominally in control of the university 'to construct and present desired organizational images to stakeholders' (Scott and Lane, 2000, p. 48).

Our arguments are predicated on a brief review of the literatures focused on narrative approaches to identity (e.g., McAdams, 1996; Polkinghorne, 1991), and dress as symbol and performance in organizations (e.g., Goffman, 1959; Rafaeli and Pratt, 1993). In brief, we suggest that identities are constituted within discursive regimes and that they are subjectively available to individuals and to groups in the form of identity narratives (e.g., Ricoeur, 1991). While individuals can be expected to author what are generally relatively coherent and integrated self-narratives, organizations are composed of many differing accounts, some competing, some overlapping, which are embedded in conversations that occur simultaneously and sequentially (e.g., Ford, 1999). These narratives, and the object symbols such as dress that are associated with them, are one means by which power and control are exercised in organizations. Dress is an especially privileged symbol that is key to understanding how people constitute and represent themselves both as individuals and as group members (e.g., Rafaeli and Pratt, 1993).

This paper develops these ideas in the context of an all-female departmental faculty of a Turkish university in which attire, especially in the form of the Muslim headscarf, was a particular concern. In line with our narrative approach, the analysis of the roles that dress plays in defining and sustaining individual and collective identities is accomplished by means of the construction of a faculty identity narrative (or, rather, fragments of one). This fragmentary narrative was pieced together by the researchers from the many stories featuring attire as a significant source and symbol of inter-group identity-conflict that individual respondents authored in formal interviews and informal conversations. Finally, the implications of the case for our understanding of issues linked to dress and identity are discussed and some conclusions reflexively drawn.

NARRATIVE, IDENTITY, AND DRESS

Individual and collective identities are constituted within discursive regimes that 'provide social actors with important symbolic resources for identity negotiation and for the legitimation of everyday social and bodily practices' (Read and Bartkowski, 2000, p. 398; cf. Dellinger and Williams, 1997; Stombler and Padavic, 1997). These discourses offer discursive positions, or epistemological spaces, for individuals and groups to occupy. Subjective identities are constituted by the identity-narratives that an entity (individual or group) reflexively authors in its efforts to come to terms with 'the reconstructed past, the perceived present, and anticipated future' (McAdams, 1996, p. 307; cf. Ezzy, 1998; Maines, 1993; Polkinghorne, 1991). Such identity narratives are quasi-fictions (Ricoeur, 1991) that synthesize synchronic and diachronic elements in ways that render life intelligible (MacIntyre, 1981), and bestow on entities a sense of unity and purpose (e.g., Bruner, 1990; McAdams, 1996) in the face of the 'contradictions and multiplicities of modernity' (Frosh, 1991, p. 5; cf. Giddens, 1991). While the power of discursive practices affects everyone, because there are competing discourses socialization into any one discourse is never complete, and resistance to specific discursive regimes is thus possible (Bailey, 1993; Foucault, 1980, 1988). Narrative identity is, nevertheless, a power effect, a complex outcome of processes of subjugation and resistance that are contingent and perpetually shifting (Jermier et al., 1994, p. 8; Clegg, 1994, p. 275).

As organizations themselves 'are not discursively monolithic, but pluralistic and polyphonic, with many conversations occurring simultaneously and sequentially' (Ford, 1999, p. 485; cf. Fairclough, 1992; Hazen, 1993), so their identity-narratives tend to lack the coherence of their individual-level counterparts. Organizational identity narratives are more likely to be fractured, contested and multi-layered. Multiple identity narratives associated with different stakeholders frequently co-exist within the same organization, and contests between them are an important dynamic (reciprocal and iterative) of organizational life (Pratt and Foreman, 2000; Scott and Lane, 2000). The organizational self, much like the individual self, is a reflexive project that the collective 'works on' within a matrix of discursive opportunities and constraints. As Gioia et al. (2000, p. 64) note, organizational identity is 'a potentially precarious and unstable notion, frequently up for redefinition and revision by organization members'. One potentially important symbolic means by which groups seek to undermine, defend and champion their preferred organizational identity narrative is dress.

Organizational symbols and symbolic activity are important indicators of group and organizational identity narratives. A symbol may be defined as any material object, action or event to which meaning is attributed by participants in their efforts to understand the social world, and which expresses the identity of the organization, stimulates an emotional response and forms part of the matrix of opportunities and constraints that condition action (e.g., Gagliardi, 1990). In addition to dress a large number of different types of symbol have been researched including company products and logos (Daft, 1983), the actions of leaders and groups (e.g., Brown, 1994; Johnson, 1990), rites and rituals (e.g., Trice and Beyer, 1984), and forms of language in multiple guises such as slogans, myths, metaphors and jokes (e.g., Boje et al., 1982; Borman, 1983; Pondy et al., 1983). These symbols and symbolic activity are a significant aspect of 'the ongoing processes that constitute

organisational life' (Putnam, 1983, p. 40). Furthermore, they are important means by which power is exercised and play crucial roles as boundary-markers between different and often competing groups (e.g., Cohen, 1974; Dandridge et al., 1980; Pettigrew, 1979).

While academics have long been interested in dress (e.g., Veblen, 1899) much recent scholarship in this field has its origins in the contention of Goffman (1959) and Stone (1962, pp. 86–8) that symbolic interactionism had a discursive bias that neglected the presentation of self. Their argument that the choice and wearing of dress is a performance, i.e. purposeful behaviour designed to convey information regarding themselves to others, and which facilitates their engagement in social interactions and social systems, has been described as a 'landmark' insight in social psychology (Hunt and Miller, 1997, p. 69; cf. Rafaeli et al., 1997). In contemporary studies, 'dress' tends to refer to the clothing (e.g., skirts, trousers) and other artifacts (such as name tags and jewellery) that participants in organizations wear at work (Rafaeli and Pratt, 1993). While de la Haye and Wilson (1999, p. 2) note '. . . the sometimes marginalized position that dress is given within academia and museology', research which has been undertaken suggests that dress in organizations performs multiple functions, notably those associated with control (Becker et al., 1961; Janowski, 1984; Joseph, 1986; Lurie, 1981). As Lurie (1981, p. 18) argues, 'No matter what sort of uniform it is – military, civil or religious . . . to put on such livery is to give up one's right to act as an individual.'

Our particular interest in attire is as an aspect of impression management associated with 'identity work', where identity work is understood as invoking a '"universe of discourse" that communicates a particular world view through verbal and nonverbal communication, including dress and appearances' (Hunt and Miller, 1997, p. 70; cf. Mead, 1934). At the level of the individual, dress provides information regarding, for example, important professional and gender identities (Barnes and Eicher, 1992; Brewis et al., 1997; Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997) and, more generally, work roles and feelings (Rafaeli et al., 1997). Attire is also a marker of status (political, economic and religious) and power (El Guindi, 1999). Dress, though, is not merely an abstract object-symbol and static icon of cultural identity. It is also a form of 'practice', a 'technique of the body, a set of attitudes and dispositions to the self and the world, a habitus' (Durham, 1999, pp. 390–1; cf. Bourdieu, 1977; Mauss, 1973).

So intimate are the connections between dress and identity that for some theorists the self does not exist independently of the clothes that one wears (Negrin, 1999; Silverman, 1986). Always remembering, of course, that dress may be used to *camouflage* as well as to define identity (Rosen, 1985, p. 34). Dress is equally significant at the level of the collective. Some professions, particularly medical professions and the military, are especially noted for their distinctive attire (e.g., Abbott, 1988; Becker et al., 1961; Campbell-Heider and Hart, 1993). Within organizations participants' dress can be a significant symbol of those characteristics (especially values and beliefs) believed to be central, enduring and distinctive of them (Abbott, 1988; Becker et al., 1961; Cialdini et al., 1976; Davis, 1992; Fussell, 1983; Hall et al., 1982; Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997; Solomon and Douglas, 1983, 1987). Such displays of cultural categories and social structures are redolent with meaning, suggesting that the human body is 'available for articulated forms of expression that can be both divisive and ideological' (Durham, 1999, p. 392).

Perhaps the most interesting issues that a focus on identity and dress helps to surface are those bound up with power and control. It has frequently been observed that the assumption of an identity stems from a primordial urge for control, while the attribution of social identity ('. . . naming the Other by reference to the dominant group's classification') is an act of power (Campbell and Rew, 1999, p. 11). Similarly, much of the interest in dress can be traced to claims that it can legitimate the terrain of the powerful, signal and disguise status differences, create communion, and foster integration (e.g., Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997; Rosen, 1985). These arguments build on well-established feminist critiques of nineteenth century women's fashions as impractical, detrimental to health and signifying subservience to men (Baker, 1984; Brownmiller, 1984; Coward, 1984; de Beauvoir, 1975; Loos, 1982; Oakley, 1981; Tickner, 1984). In this paper we are especially interested in the ways in which dress is implicated in 'the dynamics of identity conflicts' (Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997, p. 890) within organizations. The specific item of clothing that constitutes our primary object of attention is the headscarf.

The headscarf is one of many types of clothes that veil part of the body, the phrase 'the veil' (or *hijab*) ambiguously referring to many such items of dress (El Guindi, 1999). Theories of discourse suggest that the meanings attributed to the Muslim veil are not intrinsic to it but produced through competing cultural discourses such that it has become 'a site of struggle and contestation' (Read and Bartkowski, 2000, p. 397). Muslim clergy and Islamic élites tend currently to prescribe veiling as a custom in which virtuous Muslim women should engage in order to militate against unregulated sexual contact, as a demonstration of obedience to the tenets of Islam, and as a reminder to women that their proper place is in the home (e.g., Afshar, 1985; Al-Swailem, 1995; Philips and Jones, 1985; Siddiqi, 1983). Scholars such as El Guindi (1999) are sympathetic to veiling practices because of their association with female sanctity, privacy, dignity, sanctuary and respect, and more specifically, resistance to Western materialism, consumerism and commercialism. In contrast, some Muslim commentators and Western feminist theorists oppose the veil as a symbol of oppressive hierarchies and blanket male domination (Ahmed, 1992; Gole, 1996; Karam, 1998; Mernissi, 1991; Odeh, 1993; Yegenoglu, 1998). Our understanding resonates with that of Franks (2000, p. 918), who argues that 'the headscarf is, of itself, neither liberating nor oppressive, and that the power relations with which it is associated are situated not only in the meaning with which it is invested but also in the circumstances under which it is worn'.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This research was designed and conducted from a broadly interpretive perspective ('inquiry from the inside') between February 1995 and May 1996. The primary objective of the study was to produce an ethnographic account of the working lives of those engaged in the faculty of vocational education at Hero University[1] in Ankara, Turkey. Our main data source was a set of semi-structured interviews, of which 42 were conducted in two phases. Twenty six interviews were undertaken between February and May 1995, and 16 interviews were held 12 months later from February to May 1996. In addition, one 'formal' interview session was undertaken with a group comprising a Head of Department, two teachers and a research

assistant. Key informants such as the two faculty Vice Deans and the Head of Department of Child Development were interviewed in both 1995 and 1996, and a semi-retired teacher, who had more than 40 years experience at the school, was interviewed three times. Those interviewed were thus past and present members of the faculty, students, and administrative staff. The gender composition of our informants reflected the almost exclusively female composition of the faculty. The only male members of the organization, the Dean and the Head of student affairs, were both interviewed. The 42 formal interviews, which often evolved into 'conversations [with] "embedded questions"' (Fetterman, 1989, p. 49), were of between 40 minutes and two hours duration with a median time of 73 minutes. Each interview took place with the assistance of an interpreter, was recorded on micro-cassette, and then fully transcribed into English.

In addition to these interviews, scores of informal conversations were held with participants in the faculty of vocational education. Informal conversation and discussion was also taped whenever possible. On those occasions when participants indicated that the conversation was not to be taped, the researcher recorded onto micro-cassette his personal impressions of the interaction as soon as possible after the event. Our analysis was also informed by the study of documentation, including: Internet web pages; published articles; committee minutes; letters; memos; newspaper and magazine reports and a wide-ranging, scholarly review of the history of modern Turkey and the evolution of the Turkish system of higher education. Much interesting data was also gained from observations of the locale in which the faculty worked, its buildings and support facilities, the attire worn by individuals, and especially the interpersonal interactions between faculty members, administrative staff, and students.

All the data were collected by one researcher, who was at this time employed by the British Council and the World Bank to evaluate the work procedures of the faculty. During the course of the study the researcher became increasingly aware of the importance that respondents attached to dress in general and on the wearing/not wearing of the Islamic headscarf, and this became an important ethnographic focal point. There are obvious potential difficulties associated with attempts to combine the roles of both ethnographer and evaluator, not least of which is that respondents/informants might be more guarded in their disclosure of information and circumspect in their voicing of opinions. In this instance, however, there was no evidence to suggest that this combination of roles was in any way problematic, probably because the 'evaluation' activities undertaken were not perceived as 'threatening' but 'assisting' by the faculty members. Thus no one refused to be interviewed, no questions went unanswered, and respondents were seemingly uninhibited in their display of emotion and the expression of personal views. This said, there were practical problems imposed by the lack of a common language between the researcher and the faculty under study. To a considerable degree the linguistic and cultural 'distance' between the researcher and those researched was bridged by an interpreter who came to understand the nature of the research being undertaken and to act as a reflexive cultural insider (Wright, 1996). With her assistance, respondents were coaxed into providing detailed responses to questions, and to agree to their interview being recorded on micro-cassette. While time constraints militated against transcription in the field, we were fortunate in securing the services of a bilingual secretary in the UK who fully transcribed each interview into English.

In the conduct of this research we were sensitive of the need for critical self-reflexivity, not least to challenge what have been identified as the deep-seated inequalities in the ethnographic relations between fieldworkers and informants (Callaway, 1992; Hastrup, 1992; Hertz, 1997; Jaschok and Jingjun, 2000; Okely, 1992). Cross-cultural ethnography, and in particular studies of Eastern and Islamic cultures, has attracted criticism centred on the notion of cultural imperialism (Said, 1978, 1981). Indeed, Jaschok and Jingjun (2000, p. 34) contend that cross-cultural debates regarding 'sameness' and 'difference' have tended to be '"internal to western culture", thus "exclusionary" of the critical presence of "other anthropologies", [and] thus of epistemological, conceptual and ethical viewpoints'. Such critiques parallel feminist observations that gender-biased discourses offer naïve and denuded insights into the phenomena they purport to represent (Gherardi, 1995). These were all relevant considerations for this research, underscoring the fact that the researcher was an outsider, and the extent of the psychic distance between the ethnographer and those researched. After all, the researcher was not just a Westerner in the East and a European in Asia, but also an English male in an all female Turkish faculty, and a Christian in a nominally secular state with an Islamic population. This said, and while we are in agreement with Denzin and Lincoln's (1998, p. 25) observation that 'any gaze is always filtered through the lenses of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity', it may be worth noting that our research account was also subject to the filter of the secular Turkish female gaze of our interpreter.

In our efforts to produce 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) our transcript material was subject to a form of grounded theory analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) in which coded categories were derived in an inductive process of interaction and integration of theory and empirical data (Putnam, 1983; Silverman, 2000; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Our analysis was particularly influenced by Hatch's (1993, p. 677) cultural dynamics model which we employed as a means of gaining 'a greater appreciation of cultural complexity and dynamism' in the research site. Rather than present our case material in terms of this model, which might have placed too great an emphasis on what is a heavily critiqued representational strategy (Deetz, 1996; Putnam, 1996; Van Maanen, 1996), we have instead chosen to represent our case data as fragments of a faculty narrative. While all case studies have certain narrative properties the narrative and rhetorical conventions adopted and deployed by authors often remain latent in their work (Czarniawska, 1997; Van Maanen, 1988). The decision 'to draw attention to the inherent storylike character of fieldwork accounts' (Van Maanen, 1988, p. 8) has been influenced by suggestions that man is 'essentially a storytelling animal' (MacIntyre, 1981, p. 201) and appositely described as *homo narrans* (Fisher, 1984, p. 6; see also Barthes, 1977; Bruner, 1990; Burke, 1968). Our approach both embodies and reflects a distinctive linguistic turn in organization studies (Alvesson and Karreman, 2000) that is symptomized by ideas from literary theory being increasingly applied in organizational contexts (e.g., Barry and Elmes, 1997; Boje, 1991; Morgan, 1980; Yannow, 1992).

The presentation of our case data as a narrative should be understood in the context of the '*crises of representation and legitimation*' that ethnographers face in seeking to authentically account for the experience of the Other (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p. 576). One (our) response to these crises has been to explicitly recognize that 'fieldwork is a creative endeavour' (Wagley, 1983, p. 16) and that

researchers as writers are bricoleurs (Levi-Strauss, 1966, p. 17) who fashion texts in artful ways (e.g., Atkinson, 1990; Watson, 1995) in order to attain a particular audience affect (e.g., Denzin, 1994; Jeffcutt, 1994). There is 'no fixed, final, or monologically authoritative meaning' in ethnographic research (Marcus, 1994, p. 566), in part because 'All texts are personal statements' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p. 578). In authoring our text we were very much aware that the illusion generated by our case that faculty members actually speak for themselves is, inevitably perhaps, illusory. It is an authorial strategy that leaves 'traces' (Bruner, 1993, p. 2) of us in our case together with the voices of our respondents. Our perspective dictates a need for us as researchers/authors to acknowledge our 'own participation in the construction of social reality' (Knights, 1992, p. 515), and, to an extent, permit 'the audience to see the puppet's strings as they watch the puppet show' (Watson, 1994, p. 78). Such is the purpose of this research design section which is, like the rest of this paper, a rhetorical artifact designed to persuade as much as it is to inform (e.g., Nelson et al., 1987). We nevertheless hope that our approach is sufficiently rich to raise new questions in terms of the symbolic significance of dress in the construction and maintenance of identity within organizations, and 'suggest a new way forward for theorising' (Butler, 1997, p. 939).

DRESS AND IDENTITY: A TURKISH CASE STUDY

Prolegomena

The republic of Turkey was proclaimed on 29 October 1923, with Mustapha Kemal Atatürk as its president. Atatürk's single-party regime introduced a vast programme of reforms 'designed to transform Turkey into a modern, Westernised, secular nation state' (Macfie, 1994, p. 136) which included the banning of the fez and veil and the adoption of Western dress in the so-called 1925 'Hat Laws'. As Gülalp (1995, p. 175) puts it, 'Turkey has ever since been regarded as the paradigmatic model for the Westernisation of a Muslim country'. Despite the municipal and provincial 'anti-veiling laws' of the early republic, Jirousek (1996, p. 50) notes that the reform of women's dress was primarily facilitated by example:

> In the early republic leading women, particularly wives of political leaders, embraced European dress in public, adopting stylish hats instead of the traditional enveloping yaşmak. The idea was thus established that to be a woman of the new Turkish nation was to be a woman in European dress. Acceptance of this notion spread among the more educated strata of the urban population. Professional women such as teachers were expected to provide an example of enlightenment in their appearance as in other ways.

Since Atatürk's death in 1938, Turkey has been characterized by political instability, religious intolerance, and military intervention in the political process (Pope and Pope, 1997; Zurcher, 1993). Turkish universities have often featured centre-stage in these conflicts. For example, when in 1980 the military assumed political power for the third time since Atatürk's death, it sought to purge the universities of '. . . anyone who had expressed even vaguely leftist (or in some cases Islamist) views . . .' (Zurcher, 1993, p. 294). In order to preserve the secular nature of uni-

versities as 'strongholds of Atatürk's reforms' (Guruz, 1998) the Higher Education law 2547 was enacted making universities subject to a Higher Education Council (YÖK)[2] rather than direct ministerial (and thus possibly Islamist) control.

In Turkey, the highly charged symbolism attached to dress and appearance reaches back to the beginning of the Ottoman empire and the sumptuary laws of Suleyman the Lawgiver when 'Dress was a means of defining the structure of Ottoman society . . . maintaining distinctions of religion, gender, and occupation fundamental to the political administration of the empire' (Jirousek, 1996, p. 49). By the 1970s in an urban environment riven by violent street clashes between political factions, an awareness of dress codes was considered essential to survival[3] and '. . . even the curve or droop of a man's moustache was carefully calibrated for its political significance' (Olson, 1985, p. 163). At this time, in line with a resurgence of Islam across the Middle East there was an effort on the part of Islamists to legitimize so-called 'traditional' Islamic dress reinforcing existing divisions along the lines of 'Turkish nationalism versus Muslim identity' and 'secularism (laicism) versus an Islamic society'. In 1980 the 'Dress and Appearance Regulation' was brought into force which explicitly prohibited employees in public institutions (including universities) from wearing, in the case of men, moustaches, beards, and long hair, and in the case of women, mini-skirts, low-necked dresses, and headscarves (Olson, 1985). The significance of dress in Turkish society persists according to Norton (1997, p. 149), who suggests that for most Turkish people 'A glance at what a stranger is wearing is often enough to tell them that person's religious and political stance'.

In very recent times the headscarf first became an issue in Turkish universities in July 1984. The Ankara-based *Daily News* then published a series of articles regarding students and an assistant professor at the University of Ankara who insisted that they had the right to wear the headscarf. The university professor took her case to court and lost. Local politicians and the rector of the university were reported to be in favour of such a ban, arguing that there were set rules proscribing such attire in force since the time of Atatürk. Pope and Pope (1997, p. 328) write of one female law student who, although 'expelled from law school for wearing a headscarf managed eventually to finish her studies. But strict rules against lawyers wearing Islamic headgear in court prevented her from registering at the Istanbul bar Association.' In 1998 Kemal Guruz, the then Head of YÖK, was reported as saying: '. . . students who are religiously dressed are an army and the dress is a kind of uniform. It threatens other secular students and the state. It is a challenge backed by the Islamic Party that is why we must enforce the law now.'

It is in the light of these events on a national stage that our respondents felt that their narratives needed to be understood. Interestingly, while there were dissenting voices, most faculty members seemed to share similar views regarding the dress laws and the wearing of certain attire, notably the headscarf. It is this consonance between the storylines, related by many different respondents, that has encouraged and permitted us to author a single narrative that incorporates their views on dress. For completeness, the dissonant voices of the students and the ambiguous position of at least one faculty member have been incorporated into the narrative that follows. Our decision to label our account 'fragments' of a faculty narrative is meant to indicate that no single text can (or should pretend to) be a complete and uncontestable version of events.

Hera College: Fragments of a Faculty Identity Narrative

We (faculty members) trace our origins to an independent teacher training institution called Hera College which was founded in 1934 in order to 'train women according to the principles of Atatürk' and to instil in our students 'patriotism and national ethics' (40th Anniversary Prospectus, 1974). The College was in the vanguard of efforts initiated by Atatürk to 'change the education for women' (Assistant professor Clothing), and soon became regarded as a finishing school for high status young women: 'the students were all children of top level families. At the same time as receiving an education they were taught to become housewives and elegant' (Art Professor). At that time we played a key role in Atatürk's efforts to modernize, secularize and Westernize our country, and were the embodiment of Atatürk's claim that 'We shall emphasize putting our women's secondary and higher education on an equal footing with men' (Atatürk, 1922, in Aksan, 1982, p. 55). We quickly became a symbol of the more valued status of women and their new role in society: we 'had a mission . . . to train modern women – an army of women' (Vice Dean).

Our College was housed in a large and prestigious architect-designed building in the centre of the new Turkish capital (Ankara). Our principal was appointed directly by the Minister of Education so that we were connected at the highest political level. For the next 47 years the College expanded its curriculum, established relations with similar-type high quality educational institutions abroad, and developed a cohesive culture and congenial atmosphere in which we and our students thrived. With a student/staff ratio of 8:1, a national and international reputation for excellence, and superb facilities, competition for entry was intense, and applicants were subjected to a rigorous and lengthy selection procedure including up to ten days of interviews and examinations. Some of the original teachers were sent abroad to study by the government. Over time the teaching faculty renewed itself from the cream of the student body, ensuring a continuity of ethos and objectives:

> Our new government picked more than 20 young girls aged between 13 and 15 and they sent them to Belgium. They studied in Brussels for 8 years without coming back to Turkey . . . They became lecturers in our school and were very westernized and I am so lucky to have studied with this kind of teacher. (Fashion Instructor)

> . . . at that time the College was very well known within other institutions. It had the status of [a] VIP college and visitors from foreign countries visited this College. (Vice Dean)

In 1982, Higher Education Law 2457 resulted in our College being subsumed into the new Hero University in Ankara as the Faculty of Vocational Education. We were moved out of our building and into drab, low quality, prefabricated structures. We lost our close working relationship with the Ministry of Education and became, instead, subject to the administrative rules of a university regime. A male Dean replaced our female principal, and all the 'teachers' were re-designated as 'instructors', 'assistant professors', 'associate professors' and 'professors': 'we woke up and found we had all become professors overnight' (Vice Dean). It soon became apparent to us that we were the lowest status faculty within the university, and that

from then on we would be starved of resources. In addition, we are now required not merely to teach but to conduct research, publish articles in journals and gain proficiency in a foreign language if we want to progress in our careers. This is not easy because our specialisms are mostly practical, our library resources limited, and our teaching highly demanding:

> We don't even have a workshop here and due to the budget we don't even get the equipment we need. When our students go to schools for teaching practice, they come across new equipment that they have never seen before. (Ceramics Instructor)

> I give lectures 28 hours a week, I am also doing some research on the kind of Turkish thread which is called Yagan and is a special kind of silk. I can get promotion only through taking an English exam. I am taking private English courses and I pay for it myself. (Art Instructor)

> There are too many students that we have to deal with. We don't have the opportunity to deal with them one to one, we don't even know them. (Assistant Professor in Child Development)

While we, the faculty, still subscribe to the vision of Atatürk, a large and growing proportion of our students may not. The most obvious symbol of this resistance is the headscarf, which some students now choose to wear in contravention of the rules. Most of our staff see this as a regressive phenomenon:

> In Ankara when I was a student, we were like models for the rest of the people, but today the school is full of people wearing scarves. The mentality has changed and we are going backwards and the fundamentalists are now getting a hold on training and education in Turkey. (Art Professor)

While no action is taken by the university authorities against students who wear headscarves in our classrooms, they are not permitted to wear them when they go into the vocational schools on teaching practice. Indeed those students who have refused to alter their attire when engaged in teaching practice, have had to leave the university. Students are also banned from wearing headscarves during graduation ceremonies with the result that we have had no graduation ceremonies in this faculty for two years.

> We do have academic dress. Now we can't use it because of Islamic scarves, if you try to force them to wear the cap and gown they won't. (Assistant Professor in Fashion)

However, on a day-to-day basis we have been warned by the university management that the Higher Education Council (YÖK) has prohibited us from interfering with students who wish to wear Islamic dress:

> I am against Islamic fundamentalists. But because of political pressure I have to be moderate when changing things . . . This is one of my main duties here in this Faculty. (Dean of Faculty)

We can clearly see that the number of headscarf wearers is increasing, with most student groups having at least 50 per cent and some up to 80 per cent wearing headscarves. Despite this, our university prospectus which is full of pictures of students in all faculties, in laboratories, in classrooms, at social events and ceremonies such as graduation and sports days, contains not one image of a student wearing a headscarf. The management of our faculty appears very confused on this issue. This is exemplified by one of our own Vice Deans who always wears an Atatürk brooch at work, is vehement in her antipathy to students wearing Islamic dress, and yet is married to an Islamic Refah party member who actively and publicly promotes the rights of women university students and staff to wear headscarves. While we acknowledge that 'It's what is in the head that counts not what is on the head' (ex-student and ex-member of staff), we nevertheless see the wearing of headscarves as an affront to Atatürk: 'He [Atatürk] was the *true* prophet – but we are not allowed to talk like that any more' (Head of Textiles).

Dress is also an issue for men at our university, who were, for a time, banned from wearing beards. Now dress rules for both men and women are being unofficially relaxed as Islamic fundamentalists gain in political power and influence over university senior management:

> Up until 1980 university staff had freedom to wear beards, then 1980–85 they were totally banned. The professors then began to reject this and now they can wear them, but it is still illegal. The same applies to headscarves. It is accepted that no-one will speak about it. (Professor of Engineering Education)

> If you go to the University of Ankara, they don't let the students have garments [headscarves] like that, but here in our faculty and our university, they can even come to the class like that. I think it is a matter of administration or whatever you call it . . . they don't say anything and sometimes they encourage them. (Associate Professor Child Psychology)

We find it hard to understand why our management cannot control the number of students blatantly breaking the dress rules when they are so strict in their enforcement of rules for administrative staff: 'I like to wear a scarf but for workers even if they wear scarves outside work when they arrive they must take it off. There is no such rule for our students' (Faculty Clerk). Some of us believe that there has been direct political intervention with the university management. It is generally acknowledged that 'There are eight or ten deputy parliament members behind the ones who wear scarves' (Art Professor) and some of us think that it is a waste of energy trying to enforce the dress code: 'there are a lot of students that wear scarves. I ask staff not to make a problem with this and have given up on the rule' (Head of Educational Technology).

We feel that our original role of training 'new teachers to turn away from everything that hinted of the past and to present the new ideal of a "civilised Turkey"' (Allen, 1935, p. 100) is being directly threatened. 'When you look at the students you wish that they were not wearing scarves . . . the feeling is there that the government is paying me to train the people against the current government' (Clothing Instructor). It is hard for us to sustain our collective self-image as models for Turkish youth or to maintain our old standards of excellence. This is particularly distressing for us because of our close historical association with Atatürk. For

example, our old building was located very near to the Ethnographic Museum where Atatürk's body lay in state before being transferred to his mausoleum[4] in 1953 and it was the students and staff of Hera College that embroidered the Turkish flag that draped over his coffin.

> . . . there was a great emphasis on Atatürk at the school. Since I was in the student association we had commemorations in the name of Atatürk. The emphasis on Atatürk was the way of our lives. (Ex-student of Hera College)

> I am a child of Atatürk. (Retired Teacher)

This said, we of course recognize that what is happening here is a microcosm of Turkish society, that Islam is resurgent and gaining in political power, and that the issue of headscarves has to be dealt with sensitively: 'Being an Islamic country does not mean wearing scarves because it is not a symbol of modern religion, it is something political and we don't like it' (Professor of Nutrition).

> Two years ago I had a student who wasn't wearing the scarf but in the third year she started putting on long coats and even gloves . . . Fundamentalists had told her that they would get her a job at the nursery school with good money but that she had to wear the scarf and to pray. (Retired Teacher)

Dress is linked to two further issues that currently affect us. First, our vocational curriculum emphasizing domestic specialisms such as embroidery and making artificial flowers has begun to look increasingly old-fashioned to prospective students. This partly explains why, while our original student intake was drawn from élite families, they now tend to be from the relatively impoverished and underprivileged villages and towns of rural Turkey. These young women are more susceptible to 'Islamic groups which encourage women to attend the university in Islamic dress and stress the importance of traditional Islamic gender roles' (Malik, 1995, p. 188). Hence, our student intake has changed greatly and the feeling is that 'poor people's children come here' (Embroidery Instructor). Second, our student/staff ratio has changed from 8 : 1 to 21 : 1, our contact teaching hours have increased, and we have new pressures on us to learn a foreign language and to research and publish.

> When I started the whole college had mostly 750–800 [students]. I could know them, know their name, where they came from, what are their interests and their personalities. Now it is impossible because we have so many students. (Retired – now part-time – Teacher)

> I work like a high school teacher. I have 30 hours teaching [per week] . . . I [also] need much time to do research. (Head of Basic Pedagogy)

These factors have disrupted the formerly intimate nature of our relationship with our students, and made it more difficult for us to communicate our values and establish a shared ethos. Staff-student relationships had been a major strength within our faculty, but the pressure on both parties has caused a degeneration in the quality of education and increased the incidence of stress related problems:

> Our teachers are too serious and they are always shouting at the students and we don't like this behaviour . . . Plus, we are too nervous because we are under pressure in the workshops, we don't have help with anything . . . Because the time is limited and the teacher has to communicate to 50 students she cannot give enough interest to her students. (Fashion and Clothing Students)

> The [original] aim was to train both a perfect housewife and a professional teacher. Since becoming part of the university our students have become more crowded. Student quality is lower because of the university entrance exams and it is difficult for us to teach them because they don't understand. There is an extraordinary pressure on you to do everything at the same time. Teachers are worn out, all of them are trying to do their best but, as you know they all feel exhausted. (Head of Clothing Department)

We were brought up to both obey and enforce rules but, although we are compelled to obey the rules of academic progression, we are now being prevented from enforcing the rules regarding dress. Every day we see an increase in the number of students wearing Islamic dress in classrooms and workshops where Atatürk's portrait reminds us constantly of the principles of the Turkish republic. The lack of action on this issue has placed us in an extremely uncomfortable position, disappointed with the university administration and frustrated with our own lack of authority. Since the 1982 merger we have lost our status as a special college, our resources have been depleted, our physical working conditions have been allowed to deteriorate and our relationship with our students has been damaged. The problem with students wearing the headscarf symbolizes our opinion that gaining university status has been a backward step for us. We feel powerless and have a sense of foreboding that our future as a teacher training institution is bleak.

DISCUSSION

In this discussion, five specific aspects of our case are elaborated upon. First, we locate universities as sites of political and cultural struggle and discuss the deployment of dress as symbolic challenge and political instrument. Second, we consider the extent to which attire features in debates centred on organization-level politics and identity. Third, an examination of the constraints on élites' efforts to author collective narrative identities provides a context in which we argue that dress is associated not merely with issues of control and organizational beliefs and values, but a broad range of levels and dynamic processes. Fourth, contrary to Pratt and Rafaeli (1997), we suggest that differences regarding dress may not merely foster a sense of legitimacy and internal integration in organizations, but codify and reinforce antagonisms. Finally, we speculate that dress may assume the guise of a defensive manoeuvre that functions to support a stable identity narrative in a postmodern world of disparate images, fragmentation, and ambiguity.

This case is an exemplification of Mohanty's (1994, p. 147) argument that educational sites tend naturally to be political and cultural sites 'that represent accommodations and contestations over knowledge by differently empowered social constituencies'. In a heteroglossic world of contestable and contested meanings

attire sparkles with alternate meaning and value possibilities (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 277). In organizations and society various competing groups engage in a 'struggle for the sign' (Hebdige, 1979, p. 17) and these centrifugal tendencies are counteracted by centripetal processes in the form of officializing strategies and individual creative acts of self-conception (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 270–2, 293). There is considerable evidence that in political terms Atatürk himself was personally aware of the symbolic potency of dress.

> When he decided to abolish the fez, a head gear considered by the people to be a symbol of Islam, he simply put on a Western hat to attend a meeting and drove into one of the most conservative towns in Anatolia. (Evliyagil, 1973, p. 16)

In general terms, it is clear that the increasing ascendance of Islam in Turkey, as with many new social movements in different national contexts, has been as much concerned with the production of symbolic action and cultural conflict as its own material reproduction (Melucci, 1988, 1994, 1995). Headscarves (together with beards, moustaches, jewellery, and other items of attire) have been deployed as 'a symbolic challenge' (Mirza and Reay, 2000, p. 524), the intent of which has been to generate 'oppositional meanings' (Mueller, 1992), and more instrumentally 'new "types" of professional intellectuals', whose role it is to 'carry cognitive praxis of the movement on into the larger society' (Eyerman and Jamieson, 1991, p. 166). Headscarves in particular arouse such intense passion in Turkish universities because the wearers are members of the highly educated élite and hence assumed by other university members to share with their critics the same commitment to 'Atatürk's principles'. As Olson (1985, p. 167) observes, '. . . the headscarf-wearing professor and students are seen as "betraying the faith", as threatening the very ideological wellsprings of Turkish culture and society'. Moreover, as Jirousek (1996, p. 58) notes, the return to Ottoman style dress was also threatening because for educated female professionals, such as our respondents, it seemed to signify 'an attempt to take away rights that women have gained in law and daily practice in twentieth century Turkey'.

One interesting feature here is the extent to which attire is implicated in debates over organization-level politics and identity, and its importance as a marker of the ambiguities associated with questions such as 'who has power?' and 'who is in control?' (cf. Mirza and Reay, 2000; Mohanty, 1994). The faculty interpreted the apparent inability of the university élite to curb the number of students who wore headscarves as a failure to exert effective administrative control. However, bureaucratic inaction might also in this instance be interpreted as a managerialist effort on the part of university administrators to engineer their organization's identity through the incorporation of Islamist symbology, and symptomatic of what Pettifer (1997, p. 48) refers to as the 'long march of Islamic activists through the institutions'. This is in line with suggestions that the law of requisite variety implies that identity plurality is required in order to meet the expectations of multiple internal and external stakeholders (e.g., Eccles et al., 1992; Nkomo and Cox, 1996; Pratt and Foreman, 2000). From such a perspective a degree of internal conflict in the conversations that 'are and provide the very texture of organisations' (Ford, 1999, p. 485) may well be seen as a necessary price to be paid for ensuring the continued successful existence of the organization in a situation in which power-

ful stakeholders placed competing demands upon it. The rise in the number of students wearing headscarves may thus be interpreted as symptomatic of a 'managed' shift in the network of conversations through which social reality is constructed (Holmes, 1992; Lyotard, 1979). Though we should note that this movement from a monological concern with Kemalism[5] to a dialogical focus on the competing rhetorics and dress requirements of both Kemalism and Islam was, of course, one that the university élite felt coerced into. That the faculty was aware of this dynamic tension was indicated by an Art Professor who commented that 'Everyone in the university is scared of the ones wearing scarves'.

Our analysis of events has highlighted the limited scope of élites in authoring collective narrative identities. The two main constraints on the extent to which organizational élites are able to author collective identities illustrated here are the extra-organizational nature of the discursive regimes to which they are subject, (e.g., rural versus urban, the West versus the East, Islam versus Kemalism), and the capacity for resistance among individuals and other groups within an organization. Some theorists have argued that because of their privileged position, and because they associate more closely with organization identities than do other participants, senior managers are more able and more motivated to exert control over the authorship of organization identities (e.g., Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Cheney, 1991, p. 9; Pratt and Foreman, 2000). However, in this instance students seemed equally concerned with the re-definition of the identity of the university in Islamist terms as the faculty and administrators were to preserve its Kemalist ethos. This insight is important in the context of a literature on organizational dress, which has tended to emphasize that it is associated with assertions of organizational control, the projection of organizational values and beliefs, and individuals' engagement and execution of role schemata (e.g., Lurie, 1981; Rafaeli et al., 1997). Such analyses enormously under-state the multiple, dynamic processes (cognitive, social, and political) and range of levels (from the individual to the trans-national) in which dress can be implicated. What our study suggests is the variety and complexity of different, sometimes related, and often conflicting meanings with which a single item of attire can become saturated. These meanings may be regarded as cognitive links which situate actors, settings and events in extraordinarily dense webs of significance (Geertz, 1973), structuring action (Giddens, 1979) and fostering individual and collective identities. Evidently, organization identity should not be regarded as 'an enduring reified concept' but a dynamic, negotiated, and reflexive narrative-in-progress (Brown, 1998; Gioia et al., 2000).

A number of theorists have suggested that symbols (such as attire) permit organizational members to cope with the contradiction, ambivalence and ambiguity inherent in social life, not least by compartmentalising potentially difficult identity conflicts (e.g., Feldman, 1991; Linstead and Grafton-Small, 1992; Pratt, 1994; Smith, 1968; Swann, 1987). Pratt and Rafaeli (1997, p. 890), for example, discuss a case study of a rehabilitation unit in which the advocacy of two distinct dress styles helped to contain conflict 'by legitimising both sides of the debate' and providing 'integration without consensus'. Our case suggests that there are also contexts in which, rather than being a means for conflict attenuation and organizational coherence, dress is a vehicle for the expression of explicit political agendas that reinforce antagonisms. In this respect there is an interesting parallel

between various forms of non-standard dress (such as female 'power dressing') in Western organizations and headscarf wearing in Turkey. As with headscarf wearers in Turkish universities Western women who power dress (i.e. wear clothing and hair styles that emphasize putatively masculine traits such as height and broad shoulders), may be interpreted as a threat by others and 'experience negative reactions to their chosen costume' (Brewis et al., 1997, p. 1292; cf. McDowell and Court, 1994; Sheppard, 1989; Polan, 1994). Both these examples suggest that it is not always the case, as Albert et al. (2000, p. 14) have argued, that there is now 'more tolerance of identity diversity' in and of organizations.

If, from a post modern perspective, organizational identity is nothing more than a necessary illusion (Rosenau, 1992), 'a comforting falsification intended to maintain a sense of consensuality' (Gioia et al., 2000, p. 73), then it is, as in this case, an illusion prone to failure. It was in this sense that for our faculty the headscarf was in some ways more than a mere uniform, icon of cultural difference or tradition: it was a divisive and ideological statement. The narrative identity so cherished by faculty members with its emphasis on Kemalism was in danger of fracturing under the influence of disparate images, of which the headscarf was the most potent. Two faculty members expressed their identity-vulnerabilities in these terms:

> I have four of them [student teachers] that have left the course . . . It is not my fault if the manager of the vocational schools won't let them come into the building like that for teaching practice. If they want to continue they have to take the scarf off or I can't take them to that building. One of them even told me that she had to talk to her lawyer, they even have lawyers. Two weeks later she came and said that she couldn't open the scarf and then she dropped the course. (Embroidery Teacher)

> Years ago I had one student who covered and when I talked to her she said 'my parents want me to put the headscarf on and I have to', but now it is not like that, there are hundreds of them and they are very aggressive. I was observer at an exam at the university and they always tell us to look at their identification. One girl arrived in black with just the eyes showing, how can I tell if she is this person or not? I asked her to open her scarf so that I could look at her but she left the examination and wouldn't let me look. She was very angry. (Child Psychology Lecturer)

Perhaps the anxieties felt by the faculty in part stemmed from a tacit recognition that their identity – individual and collective – was not continuous and persistent but a reflection of the images of the present moment as constructed and transmitted by the mass media and professional communicators, notably Islamists (e.g., Perniola, 1982). In Frosh's (1991, p. 187) terms, the lack of an unambiguous Turkish national identity meant that the discovery/construction of individual and collective 'centres of consciousness and growth' had 'become an impossible task'. From this perspective the faculty's identity narrative is a defensive manoeuvre in danger of being overwhelmed by their collective experience of contradiction, fluidity, and multiplicity which characterized their particular experience of modernity (e.g., Frosh, 1991; Giddens, 1991; Gubrium and Holstein, 1994).

CONCLUSION

This case study has supported Pratt and Rafaeli's (1997, p. 887) claim that dress can 'serve as a vehicle for *representing* . . . a web of multiple and contradictory identity-related issues' and elaborated on their notion of dress as a site of identity '*negotiation*' by illustrating how a single article of attire had become a symbolic node in the dynamics of identity challenge and conflict at an individual, organizational and national political level. The specific discursive regimes that participants referenced as the most significant resources in the construction of their identities were those associated with Atatürk and Islam. The tensions between the competing hegemonic claims of these two ideologies were most palpably manifested in conflicts over dress, notably the headscarf which had, in effect, become the symbolic location of an ideological battleground for identity and power within the faculty and throughout the Turkish republic. This said, as we have sought to emphasize in this paper, it is important that we do not analytically reduce what were complex and multi-layered social contests to a single dualism. As Durham (1999, p. 391) has noted, though in a different context, 'Each attempt to define . . . dress engages dialogically with a myriad of other possible perspectives'. In this context the headscarf was not just a symbolic vector for the opposing narratives of Kemalism and Islam but also for the polarizations between, for example, urban and rural Turkey, the secular and the religious, the old and the young, élite and mass models of education, and the distinctive claims of Western transnationalism and indigenous localism. By locating attire in organizations in these debates our case has indicated how research on dress can provide a focus for the study of multiple identity dialogues within organizations and shed light on the dynamics of pervasive and systemic identity conflicts (e.g., Brown and Humphreys, 2002; Humphreys and Brown, 2002).

Finally, we should note that ethnographic research is 'an experiential process' that at its best 'is informed by a critical self-reflexivity in order to challenge the deep-seated inequalities in the core ethnographic relations of fieldworker and informant, home and field' (Jashock and Jingjun, 2000, p. 33; cf. Callaway, 1992; Hastrup, 1992; Hertz, 1997; Okely, 1992). In this respect it is appropriate for us to acknowledge that our decision to author our case material as an identity narrative reflects a conviction that this representational strategy would most appositely permit 'the exposition of the intersubjectivity of organizational life' (Rhodes, 1997, p. 12). Stories are inevitably artful products that are designed not merely to inform but to persuade and as such are in no sense 'neutral' or 'objective' but rather one of many different accounts that could have been told (e.g., Atkinson, 1990; Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Watson, 1994). As with other research that speaks to excursions across cultures, the most we could, or would want to claim, is that our account is (hopefully) an interesting and plausible narrative that can serve as a point of origin for others interested in the dynamic processes which connect issues of dress and identity.

NOTES

*The helpful advice of Sandra Dawson and John Hendry, and the anonymous *JMS* reviewers is gratefully acknowledged.

[1] A pseudonym.
[2] YÖK Yuksek Ögretim Kurulu; The Higher Education Council. A body made up of seven members selected by the president of Turkey; seven members selected by the Council of Ministers; one member selected by the armed forces; two members selected by the Ministry of Education; and seven members selected by the Inter-University Council. All members must be confirmed by the president of Turkey.
[3] Left-wingers tended to wear longer hair but not so long as to be considered decadent. Green parkas with fur-trimmed hoods and corduroy trousers were favoured. Factions could tell themselves apart by the bushiness of their moustaches. Right-wingers favoured short hair and long drooping moustaches and wore suits and blazers. The pro-Islamists who, in general, preferred to stay out of the fighting, preferred a straight moustache and bigger trousers (Pope and Pope, 1997, p. 132).
[4] Atatürk's mausoleum dominates Ankara, a huge Parthenon-like building, protected 24 hours per day by a rigidly disciplined ceremonial guard. It contains his tomb and a display of artefacts including his cars, clothes, library, cigarettes, rowing machine and photographs. His portrait hangs in every office, classroom and lecture hall in Turkey. Throughout the republic his statues and busts feature in front of municipal buildings and in town squares. He appears on postcards, currency, carpets, wall hangings, calendars, sets of photographs, slide packs, brooches, cuff links, key-rings, lapel badges, television screens, university prospectuses. He died over 60 years ago but his symbolic presence is maintained by the national industry supplying his likenesses.
[5] Synonymous with Atatürkism.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A. (1988). *The System of Professions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Academr of Management Review (2000). Special topic forum on organizational identity and identification. **25**, 1.

Afshar, H. (1985). 'The legal, social and political position of women in Iran'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, **13**, 47–60.

Ahmed, L. (1992). *Women and Gender in Islam*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Aksan, A. (1982). *Quotations from Mustafa Kemal Atatürk*, Translated by Yilmaz Oz, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ankara.

Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E. and Dutton, J. E. (2000). 'Organizational identity and identification: charting new waters and building new bridges'. *Academy of Management Review*, **25**, 1, 13–17.

Allen, H. E. (1935). *The Turkish Transformation*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Al-Swailem, S. A. A. (1995). 'Introduction'. In Abdullah, H. B. (Ed.), *A Comparison Between Veiling and Unveiling*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Dar-us-Salam.

Alvesson, M. and Karreman, D. (2000). 'Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research, challenges, responses, consequences'. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, **36**, 21, 136–58.

Ashforth, B. and Mael, F. (1989). 'Social identity theory and the organization'. *Academy of Management Review*, **14**, 20–39.

Atasoy, Y. (1996). *Islamic Revivalism and the Nation State Project: Competing Claims for Modernity*. http://www.iol.ie/%7Eafifi/Articles/revival.htm

Atkinson, P. (1990). *The Ethnographic Imagination*. London: Routledge.

Atkinson, P. (1991). 'Supervising the text'. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, **4**, 2, 161–74.

Ayata, S. (1996). 'Patronage, party and state: the politicisation of Islam in Turkey'. *Middle East Journal*, **50**, 1, 40–56.

Bailey, M. E. (1993). 'Foucauldian feminism: contesting bodies, sexuality and identity'. In Ramazanoglu, C. (Ed.), *Up against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions between Foucault and Feminism*. London: Routledge, 99–122.
Baker, N. C. (1984). *The Beauty Trap*. New York: Franklin Watts.
Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Trans. M. Holquist (Ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas.
Barnes, R. and Eicher, J. B. (Eds) (1992). *Dress and Gender: Making and Meaning in Cultural Context*. Oxford/Providence: Berg.
Barry, D. and Elmes, M. (1997). 'Strategy retold: toward a narrative view of strategic'. *Academy of Management Review*, **22**, 429–53.
Barthes, R. (1977). 'Introduction to the structural analysis of narratives'. In Heath, S. (Ed.), *Image-Music-Text*. New York: Hill and Wang, 79–124.
Baumeister, R. F. and Newman, L. S. (1994). 'How stories make sense of personal experiences: motives that shape autobiographical narratives'. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **20**, 676–90.
Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C. and Strauss, A. (1961). *Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Boje, D. M. (1991). 'The story-telling organization: a study of performance in an office supply firm'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **36**, 106–26.
Boje, D. M., Fedor, D. B. and Rowland, K. M. (1982). 'Myth making: a qualitative step in OD interventions'. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, **18**, 1, 17–28.
Borman, E. G. (1983). 'Symbolic convergence, organizational communication and culture'. In Putnam, L. L. and Pacanowsky, M. E. (Eds), *Communication and Organizations, an Interpretive Approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 88–122.
Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brewis, J., Hampton, M. P. and Linstead, S. (1997). 'Unpacking Priscilla: subjectivity and identity in the organization of gendered appearance'. *Human Relations*, **50**, 10, 1275–303.
Brown, A. D. (1994). 'Politics, symbolic action and myth making'. *Organization Studies*, **15**, 6, 861–78.
Brown, A. D. (1998). 'Narrative, politics and legitimacy in an IT implementation'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **35**, 35–58.
Brown, A. D. and Humphreys, M. (2002). 'Nostalgia and the narrativisation of identity: a Turkish case study'. *British Journal of Management*, **13**, 2, 141–59.
Brownmiller, S. (1984). *Femininity*. New York: Linden Press, Simon and Schuster.
Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Bruner, E. M. (1993). 'Introduction: The ethnographic self and personal self'. In Benson, P. (Ed.), *Anthropology and Literature*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1–26.
Burke, K. (1968). 'Definition of man'. In Burke, K. (Ed.), *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and the Method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 3–24.
Butler, R. (1997). 'Stories and experiments in social inquiry'. *Organisation Studies*, **18**, 6, 927–48.
Callaway, H. (1992). 'Ethnography and experience: gender implications in fieldwork and texts'. In Okely, J. and Callaway, H. (Eds), *Anthropology and Autobiography*. London: Routledge.
Campbell, J. R. and Rew, A. (Eds) (1999). *Identity and Affect: Experiences of Identity in a Globalising World*. London: Pluto Press.
Campbell-Heider, N. and Hart, C. A. (1993). 'Updating the nurse's bedside manner'. *Image: Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, **25**, 2, 133–9.
Cheney, G. (1991). 'The ontological foundations of rhetorical theory'. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, **3**, 97–108.

Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S. and Sloan, L. R. (1976). 'Basking in reflected glory: three (football) field studies'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **34**, 366–75.

Clegg, S. (1994). 'Power relations and the constitution of the resistant subject'. In Jermier, J. M., Knights, D. and Nord, W. R. (Eds), *Resistance and Power in Organizations*. London: Routledge, 274–35.

Cohen, A. (1974). *Two Dimensional Man: an Anthropology of Power and Symbolism in Complex Society*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Coward, R. (1984). *Female Desire: Women's Sexuality Today*. London: Paladin.

Czarniawska, B. (1997). 'A four times told tale: combining narrative and scientific knowledge in organization studies'. *Organization*, **4**, 1, 7–30.

Daft, R. L. (1983). 'Symbols in organizations: a dual content framework for analysis'. In Pondy, L. R., Frost, P. J., Morgan, G. and Dandridge, T. C. (Eds), *Organizational Symbolism*. Greenwich, CN: JAI Press, 3–35.

Dandridge, T. C., Mitroff, I. and Joyce, W. F. (1980). 'Organizational symbolism: a topic to expand organizational analysis'. *Academy of Management Review*, **5**, 1, 77–82.

Davis, F. (1992). *Fashion, Culture, and Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Davis, M. S. (1993). *Smut, Erotic Reality/Obscene Ideology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

de Beauvoir, S. (1975). *The Second Sex*. Middlesex: Penguin (orig. 1949).

de la Haye, E. and Wilson, E. (1999). 'Introduction'. In de la Haye, E. and Wilson, E. (Eds), *Defining Dress, Dress as Object, Meaning and Identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1–9.

Deetz, S. (1996). 'The positioning of the researcher in studies of organizations: De-Hatching literary theory'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **5**, 4, 387–92.

Dellinger, K. and Williams, C. L. (1997). 'Makeup at work: negotiating appearance rules in the workplace'. *Gender and Society*, **11**, 151–77.

Denzin, N. K. (1994). 'The art and politics of interpretation'. In Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 500–15.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). 'The fifth moment'. In Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 575–86.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). *Strategies of Qualitative Enquiry*. London: Sage.

Durham, D. (1999). 'The predicament of dress: polyvalency and the ironies of cultural identity'. *American Ethnologist*, **26**, 2, 389–411.

Eccles, R. G., Nohria, N. and Berkley, J. D. (1992). *Beyond the Hype: Rediscovering the Essence of Management*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

El Guindi, F. (1999). *Veil, Modesty, Privacy and Resistance*. Oxford: Berg.

Evliyagil, N. (1973). *Turkey, 50th Anniversary of the Republic*. Turkey: Ajans-Turk.

Eyerman, R. and Jamieson, A. (1991). *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Ezzy, D. (1998). 'Theorizing narrative identity: symbolic interactionism and hermeneutics'. *Sociological Quarterly*, **39**, 239–52.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Feldman, M. (1991). 'The meaning of ambiguity. Learning from stories and metaphors'. In Frost, P., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C. and Martin, J. (Eds), *Reframing Organizational Culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 145–56.

Fetterman, D. M. (1989). *Ethnography Step by Step*. London: Sage.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). 'Narration as a human communication paradigm: the case of public moral argument'. *Communication Monographs*, **51**, 1–22.

Ford, J. D. (1999). 'Organizational change as shifting conversations'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **12**, 480–500.

FOUCAULT, M. (1980). In Gordon, C. (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester.
FOUCAULT, M. (1988). In Kritzman, L. D. (Ed.), *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984*. New York: Routledge.
FRANKS, M. (2000). 'Crossing the borders of whiteness? White Muslim women who wear the *hijab* in Britain today'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, **23**, 5, 917–29.
FROSH, S. (1991). *Identity Crisis, Modernity, Psychoanalysis and the Self*. Hampshire, UK: Macmillan.
FUSSELL, P. (1983). *Class*. New York: Ballantine Books.
GAGLIARDI, P. (1990). *Symbols and Artifacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
GEDIKOGLU, T. (1995). 'Changing models of university government in Turkey'. *Minerva* (*Review of Science Learning and policy*), **3**, 2, 149–69.
GEERTZ, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
GERGEN, K. J. (1971). *The Concept of Self*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
GHERADI, S. (1995). *Gender, Symbolism and Organizational Cultures*. London: Sage Publications.
GIDDENS, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. London: Macmillan.
GIDDENS, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
GIOIA, D. A., SCHULZ, M. and CORLEY, K. G. (2000). 'Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability'. *Academy of Management Review*, **25**, 1, 63–81.
GLASER, B. G. and STRAUSS, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine Publishing.
GOFFMAN, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
GOLE, N. (1996). *The Forbidden Modern: Civilization and Veiling*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
GUBRIUM, J. F. and HOLSTEIN, J. A. (1994). 'Grounding the postmodern self'. *Sociological Quarterly*, **35**, 4, 685–703.
GÜLALP, H. (1995). 'The crisis of Westernisation in Turkey: Islamism versus Nationalism'. *Innovation*, **8**, 2, 175–82.
GURUZ, K. (1998). 'Rectors face beards crisis'. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 15 May 1998.
HALL, E., LAMB, M. E. and PERLMUTTER, M. (1982). *Child Psychology Today*. New York: Random House.
HASTRUP, K. (1992). 'Writing ethnography: state of the art'. In Okely, J. and Callaway, H. (Eds), *Anthropology and Autobiography*. London: Routledge.
HATCH, M. J. (1993). 'The dynamics of organizational culture'. *Academy of Management Review*, **18**, 4, 657–93.
HAZEN, M. (1993). 'Multiplicity and change in persons and organizations'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **7**, 6, 72–81.
HEBDIGE, D. (1979). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. New York: Methuen.
HERTZ, R. (Ed.) (1997). *Reflexivity and Voice*. London: Sage.
HOLMES, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
HUMPHREYS, M. and BROWN, A. (2002). 'Narratives of organizational identity and identification: a case study of hegemony and resistance'. *Organization Studies*, **23**, 3, 421–47.
HUNT, S. A. and MILLER, K. A. (1997). 'The discourse of dress and appearance: identity talk and a rhetoric of review'. *Symbolic Interaction*, **20**, 1, 69–82.
JANOWSKI, M. J. (1984). 'My love affair with uniforms'. *American Journal of Nursing*, August, 1241–4.
JASCHOK, M. and JINGJUN, S. (2000). '"Outsider within", speaking to excursions across cultures'. *Feminist Theory*, **1**, 1, 33–58.

JEFFCUTT, P. (1994). 'From interpretation to representation in organizational analysis: postmodernism, ethnography and organizational symbolism'. *Organization Studies*, **15**, 2, 241–74.

JERMIER, J. M., KNIGHTS, D. and NORD, W. R. (Eds) (1994). *Resistance and Power in Organisation*. London: Routledge, 102–27.

JIROUSEK, C. A. (1996). 'Dress as social policy: change in women's dress in a south-western Turkish village'. *Dress*, **23**, 47–9.

JOHNSON, G. (1990). 'Managing strategic change: the role of symbolic action'. *British Journal of Management*, **1**, 1, 183–200.

JONES, D. (1998). 'Staff face ban for Islamic activities'. *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 3 November, 13.

JOSEPH, N. (1986). *Uniforms and Nonuniforms: Communication Through Clothing*. New York: Greenwood Press.

KARAM, A. M. (1998). *Women, Islamisms and the State: Contemporary Feminisms in Egypt*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

KAZANCIGIL, A. (1991). 'Democracy in Muslim lands: Turkey in comparative perspective'. *International Social Sciences Journal*, **43**, 343–60.

KINROSS, P. (1964). *Atatürk: the Rebirth of a Nation*. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.

KNIGHTS, D. (1992). 'Changing spaces: the disruptive impact of a new epistemological location for the study of management'. *Academy of Management Review*, **15**, 3, 225–50.

LAMIELL, J. T. and WEIGERT, S. C. (1996). 'One step forward, two steps back'. *Psychological Inquiry*, **7**, 335–9.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, C. (1966). *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LINSTEAD, S. and GRAFTON-SMALL, R. (1992). 'On reading organizational culture'. *Organization Studies*, **13**, 3, 331–56.

LOOS, A. (1982). 'Ladies' fashion'. In *Spoken into the Void: Collected Essays 1897–1900*. Cambridge: MIT Press (orig. 1902).

LURIE, A. (1981). *The Language of Clothes*. New York: Random House.

LYOTARD, J. (1979). *The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge*. Translated by G. Bennington and B. Massumi. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota University Press.

MACFIE, A. L. (1994). *Atatürk*. London: Longman.

MACINTYRE, A. (1981). *After Virtue*. London: Duckworth.

MAINES, D. (1993). 'Narrative's moment and sociology's phenomena'. *Sociological Quarterly*, **34**, 17–38.

MALIK, L. P. (1995). 'Social and cultural determinants of the gender gap in higher education in the Islamic world'. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, **30**, Parts 3–4, 181–93.

MARCUS, G. E. (1994). 'What comes (just) after "post"? The case of ethnography'. In Denzin N. K. and Lincoln, S. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 563–74.

MAUSS, M. (1973). 'Techniques of the body'. B. Brewster trans. *Economy and Society*, **2**, 1, 70–88.

MEAD, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MCADAMS, D. P. (1996). 'Personality, modernity, and the storied self: a contemporary framework for studying persons'. *Psychological Inquiry*, **7**, 4, 295–321.

MCDOWELL, L. and COURT, G. (1994). 'Performing work: bodily representations in merchant banks'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, **12**, 727–50.

MELUCCI, A. (1988). 'Social movements and the democratisation of everyday life'. In Kean, J. (Ed.), *Civil Society and the State*. London: Verso.

MELUCCI, A. (1994). 'A strange kind of newness: What's "new" in social movements'. In Larana, E. et al. (Eds), *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Melucci, A. (1995). 'The new social movements revisited: reflections on a sociological misunderstanding'. In Maheu, L. (Ed.), *Social Movements and Social Classes: the Future of Collective Action*. London: International Sociological Association/Sage.

Mernissi, F. (1991). *The Veil and the Male Élite: A Feminist Interpretation of Women's Rights in Islam*. Trans. M. J. Lakeland. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Mirza, H. S. and Reay, D. (2000). 'Spaces and places of black educational desire: rethinking black supplementary schools as a new social movement'. *Sociology*, **34**, 3, 421–544.

Mohanty, C. T. (1994). 'On race and voice: challenges for liberal education in the 1990s'. In Giroux, H. A. and McLaren, P. (Eds), *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge, 145–66.

Morgan, G. (1980). 'Paradigms, metaphors and puzzlesolving in organization theory'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **25**, 605–22.

Mueller, C. M. (1992). 'Building social movement theory'. In Morris, A. D. and Mueller, C. M. (Eds), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Negrin, L. (1999). 'The self as image, a critical appraisal of postmodern theories of fashion'. *Theory, Culture and Society*, **16**, 3, 99–118.

Nelson, J. S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. N. (1987). 'Rhetoric of inquiry'. In Nelson, J. S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. N. (Eds), *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 3–18.

Nkomo, S. M. and Cox, T. (1996). 'Diverse identities in organizations'. In Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W. R. (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 338–56.

Norton, J. (1997). 'Faith and fashion in Turkey'. In Lindisfarne-Trapper, N. and Ingham, B. (Eds), *Languages of Dress in the Middle East*. London: Curzon with the centre of Near and Middle Eastern Studies, SOAS, 149–77.

Oakley, A. (1981). *Subject Women*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Odeh, L. A. (1993). 'Post-colonial feminism and the veil: thinking the difference'. *Feminist Review*, **43**, 26–37.

Okely, J. (1992). 'Anthropology and autobiography: participatory experience and embodied knowledge'. In Okely, J. and Calloway, H. (Eds), *Anthropology and Autobiography*. London: Routledge.

Olson, E. A. (1985). 'Muslim identity and secularism in the contemporary Turkey: "the headscarf dispute" '. *Anthropology Quarterly*, **58**, 4, 161–71.

Parker, M. (2000). *Organizational Culture and Identity, Unity and Division at Work*. London: Sage.

Perniola, M. (1982). *Dazzling Images*. Aahus, Denmark: Sjakalen.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). 'On studying organizational cultures'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **24**, 570–81.

Pettifer, J. (1997). *The Turkish Labyrinth: Atatürk and the New Islam*. London: Viking.

Philips, A. A. B. and Jones, J. (1985). *Polygamy in Islam*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: International Islamic Publishing House.

Polan, B. (1994). 'Baby dolls with a tough message'. *The Financial Times*, London, 19 March.

Polkinghorne, D. (1991). 'Narrative and self-concept'. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, **1**, 135–54.

Pondy, L., Frost, P. J., Morgan, G. and Dandridge, T. C. (1983). *Organizational Symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Pope, N. and Pope, H. (1997). *Turkey Unveiled: Atatürk and After*. London: John Murray.

Pratt, M. G. (1994). 'The Happiest Most Dissatisfied People on Earth: Ambivalence and Commitment Among Amway Distributors'. Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Pratt, M. G. and Dutton, J. E. (1996). 'Owning Up or Opting Out: On Ambivalence, Identity Extension, and Collective Action'. Working Paper, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Pratt, M. G. and Foreman, P. O. (2000). 'Classifying managerial responses to multiple organizational identities'. *Academy of Management Review*, **25**, 1, 18–42.
Pratt, M. G. and Rafaeli, A. (1997). 'Organizational dress as a symbol of multilayered social identities'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **40**, 4, 862–98.
Putnam, L. L. (1983). 'The interpretive perspective, an alternative to functionalism'. In Putnam, L. L. and Pacanowsky, M. E. (Eds), *Communication in Organizations, an Interpretive Approach*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 31–54.
Putnam, L. L. (1996). 'Situating the author and text'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **5**, 4, 382–6.
Rafaeli, A. and Pratt, M. G. (1993). 'Tailored meanings: on the meaning and impact of organizational dress'. *Academy of Management Review*, **18**, 32–55.
Rafaeli, A., Dutton, J., Harquail, C. V. and Mackie-Lewis, S. (1997). 'Navigating by attire: the use of dress by female administrative employees'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **40**, 1, 19–45.
Read, J. G. and Bartkowski, J. P. (2000). 'To veil or not to veil? A case study of identity negotiation among Muslim women in Austin, Texas. *Gender and Society*, **14**, 3, 395–417.
Rhodes, C. (1997). 'The legitimation of learning in organizational change'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **10**, 1, 10–20.
Ricoeur, P. (1991). 'Narrative identity'. *Philosophy Today*, Trans. M. S. Muldoon, Spring, 73–81.
Robins, K. (1996). 'Interrupting identities: Turkey/Europe'. In Hall, S. and Du Gay, P. (Eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, 61–86.
Rosen, M. (1985). 'Breakfast at Spiro's: dramaturgy and dominance'. *Journal of Management*, **11**, 2, 31–48.
Rosenau, P. (1992). *Post-modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Said, E. W. (1981). *Covering Islam: How the Media and Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. Routledge: London, Kegan and Paul.
Scott, S. G. and Lane, V. R. (2000). 'A stakeholder approach to organizational identity'. *Academy of Management Review*, **25**, 1, 43–62.
Sheppard, D. (1989). 'Organizations, power and sexuality: image and self-image of women managers. In Hearn, J., Sheppard, D. L., Tancred-Sheriff, P. and Burrell, G. (Eds), *The Sexuality of Organization*. London: Sage, 139–57.
Siddiqi, M. I. (1983). *Islam Forbids Free Mixing of Men and Women*. Lahore, Pakistan: Kazi.
Silverman, K. (1986). 'Fragments of a fashionable discourse'. In Modleski, T. (Ed.), *Studies in Entertainment*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 139–54.
Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research: a Practical Handbook*. London: Sage.
Simmel, G. (1971). *On Individuality and Social Forms: Selected Writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Singer, J. E., Brush, C. A. and Lublin, S. C. (1965). 'Some aspects of deindividuation: identification and conformity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **1**, 356–78.
Smith, D. (1968). 'Dogmatism, cognitive consistency, and knowledge of conflicting facts. *Sociometry*, **31**, 259–77.
Solomon, M. R. and Douglas, S. P. (1983). 'The power of pinstripes'. *Savvy*, March, 9–62.
Solomon, M. R. and Douglas, S. P. (1987). 'Diversity in product symbolism: the case of female executive clothing. *Psychology and Marketing*, **4**, 184–212.
Somers, M. (1994). 'The narrative constitution of identity. *Theory and Society*, **23**, 605–49.
Stombler, M. and Padavic, I. (1997). 'Sister acts: resisting men's domination in black and white fraternity little sister programs'. *Social Problems*, **44**, 257–75.
Stone, G. P. (1962). 'Appearance and the self'. In Marshall, R. A. (Ed.), *Human Behavior and Social Processes: An Interactionist Approach*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 86–118.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Swann, W. B. (1987). 'Identity negotiation: where two roads meet'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **53**, 1038–51.
Tajfel, H. (1972). 'La categorisation sociale'. In Moscovici, S. (Ed.), *Introduction a la psychologie socilae*. 1, Paris: Larousse, 272–302.
Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1986). 'The social identity theory of intergroup behavior'. In Worchel, S. and Austin, W. G. (Eds), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, **2**. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 7–24.
Tickner, L. (1984). 'Why not slip into something a little more comfortable?' In Rowe, M. (Ed.), *Spare Rib Reader*. London: Penguin.
Trice, H. and Beyer, J. (1984). 'Studying organizational cultures through rites and ceremonials'. *Academy of Management Review*, **9**, 4, 653–69.
Trice, H. and Beyer, J. (1993). *The Cultures of Work Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the Field: on Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Van Maanen, J. (1996). 'On the matter of voice'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **5**, 4, 375–81.
Veblen, T. (1899). *The Theory of the Leisure Class: an Economic Study of Institutions*. New York: Macmillan.
Wagley, C. (1983). 'Learning fieldwork: Guatemala'. In Lawless, R., Sutlive, V. H. and Zamora, M. D. (Eds), *Fieldwork: The Human Experience*. New York: Gordon and Breach. 1–17.
Watson, T. J. (1994). *In Search of Management: Culture Chaos and Control in Managerial Work*. London: Routledge.
Watson, T. J. (1995). 'Shaping the story: rhetoric, persuasion, and creative writing in organizational ethnography'. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations, and Societies*, **1**, 301–11.
Wright, L. L. (1996). 'Qualitative international management research'. In Punnet, B. J. and Shenkar, O. (Eds), *Handbook for International Management Research*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Yannow, D. (1992). 'Supermarkets and culture clash: the epistemological role of metaphors in administrative practice'. *American Review of Public Administration*, **22**, 2, 89–110.
Yegenoglu, M. (1998). *Colonial Fantasies: Towards a Feminist Reading of Orientalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zurcher, E. J. (1993). *Turkey: a Modern History*. London, I.B. Tauris and Company.