

Please cite the publisher's version:

Andrzej Klimczuk, *Experts and Cultural Narcissism: Relations in the Early 21st Century*, LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Saarbrücken 2012, 88pp.

Contents

Introduction	1
1 Expert Systems and Knowledge Society.....	5
2 An Outline of the Cultural Phenomenon of Narcissism	11
3 Fundamental Relations of Experts with Cultural Narcissism	17
4 Dilemmas of the Development of Knowledge Society.....	27
5 Choosing Between Substitutes of Trust and Its Reconstruction Methods	35
6 Social Stratification and Its Transformation	39
7 Choice of the Development Path.....	49
Conclusion.....	57
Bibliography	59
Index	75

Introduction

The complexity of contemporary social processes makes the possibility for their in-depth analysis and understanding significantly reduced. Dynamic changes in many areas and at different levels of social, economic, and political relationships make the reality being seen from the perspective of individuals and communities less transparent. At the same time, explanations provided in both traditional and modern ways are subjects of the multilateral criticism.

At the beginning of the 21st century, we are dealing with the formation of the “late modernity” societies in which human activities are extensively transforming the world. The effects of this activity have a feedback impact on the people, by shaping new forms of trust and risk, social situations, and processes of global interdependence. The process of undertaking reasonable and calculated goals is related to the establishment and development of abstract systems, which are increasingly combined with human activities. What is more, this process needs a correct, predictable, and controlled operation as well as individuals with specialized knowledge. Such systems constitute complexes of devices and forms of organization with a technical and social nature. These include, for example, the telecommunications systems, transportation, financial markets, transnational corporations, the armed forces, mass media, and energy networks. Usage of those complex systems carries within itself several advantages by solving many social problems and increasing the quality of human life. Simultaneously, these systems are forcing their direct and indirect users to take responsibility for their maintenance, which in consequence leads to increase the diversity of new categories of experts that are trying to satisfy the identified needs and generate the next necessities. This dependence on the experts contributes to the birth of “culture of narcissism,” which is mainly characterized by the withdrawal of individuals into their personal realms. The

realms in which they can allow themselves to be physical and mental self-improvement.

The aim of this book is the analysis of the ongoing changes in relationships between expert roles and the cultural phenomenon of narcissism. Undertaking this subject seems to be important in describing the shaping of the knowledge societies and knowledge-based economies in the developed countries, and moreover their transformations towards the societies and economies based on creativity and wisdom (see Zacher 2007; Klimczuk 2009; Kukliński, Pawłowski, Woźniak 2009; Kukliński 2011).

The book is based on the content analysis of the literature. In particular on the works of researchers from social psychology and creativity psychology, sociology of development, sociology of risk, sociology of networks, sociology of knowledge and sociology of social capital, and philosophy of science and technology. The undertaken research work aims to indicate the most important topics from the perspective of the development of a separate discipline that is called the sociology of expertise and intervention (cf. Cooke 1991; Irwin 1995; Kurz-Milcke, Gigerenzer 2004; Rich 2004; Ericsson et al. 2006; Stilgoe et al. 2006; Collins, Evans 2007; Evans 2008; Boswell 2009; Fischer 2009; Eyal, Buchholz 2010; Eyal, Pok 2011). The fundamental assumption in this approach is the recognition of experts and expertise as separated roles and phenomena that require more detailed analysis going beyond the existing approaches associated with the analysis of occupations, access to resources, power inequalities, and distribution of most important social positions. These include identification of factors affecting the achievement of expert status, properties related to the preparation and presentation of expertise, and capabilities of promotion and implementation of their guidelines and recommendations in the public sphere. Presented work embeds these issues in combination with a particular kind of ideology of individualism that is called narcissism.

This book consists of seven chapters. Chapters' 1-3 brings an approach to the essential features of expert systems; cultural narcissism; an expert role as a participant in social change; model types and kinds of experts; and types of their initiations into ontological and epistemological structures of the social world. The chapters' 4-7 covers the discussion of the four selected contemporary issues, which contains present mutual relations of the experts and the phenomenon of cultural narcissism. Those are dilemmas inseparably connected with the development of the knowledge society; the selection between trust substitutes and its reconstruction methods; transformations of social stratification; and the choice of development paths. On each of these levels, it eventually comes to competition between particular visions of expected social reality and social forces that are supporting those ideas. In conclusion, the discussion concerning potential directions for further empirical research has been described.

The publication is addressed not only to scientists studying the phenomena of narcissism and the cult of expertise, but also to all those who are interested in a modern democracy, consumption, and the determinants of regional development.

1 Expert Systems and Knowledge Society

At the heart of the concept of “late modernity” developed by Anthony Giddens (2002) lays the assumption that there are three factors of modern institutions’ dynamism: a separation of time and space; disembedding mechanisms; and the institutional reflexivity (Giddens 2002, 23–30). At a glance they refer successively to the establishment of formal approaches to time measurement and ordering of space, which enables maintaining of social contacts on a global scale; separation of interactions from the properties of a particular location; and makes extensive use of knowledge in conducting social activities and conversion of substantive attitudes to nature possible.

In the context of the undertaken topic, disembedding mechanisms deserve particular attention. They are leading to blowing up of social relationships from local contexts and reconstruct them on the vast expanse of space and time. Giddens (2002, 26) indicates two kinds of such mechanisms: symbolic tokens, for example, “are media of exchange that have standard value, and thus interchangeable across a plurality of contexts. The prime example, and the most pervasively important, is money,” and expert systems that are “systems of expert knowledge, of any type, depending on the rules of procedure transferable from individual to individual” (Giddens 2002, 317).

Both of these mechanisms taken together are known as “abstract systems” binding time and space through transactions of individuals who are not meeting each other physically. All of this is possible due to the development of technical and social knowledge. In other words, it happens by formulating and using expertise made by scientists, technicians, engineers, doctors, consultants, therapists, and other skilled professionals. The crucial factor that affects these systems’ activity is trust. This is the value that is “the vesting of confidence in people or in abstract systems, made based on a ‘leap into faith’ which brackets ignorance or lack of information” (Giddens 2002, 318).

The concept of expert systems, however, requires further explanation. In terms of management science, these are software programs (or software agents and artificial intelligence) that utilize the encoded heuristic knowledge of experts. The primary task of an expert system is the automation of the application process so that in case of difficulties in obtaining advice from an expert (because of absence or high costs) a software agent could obtain professional advice (Stefanowicz 2002, 51–68). An expert system reflects the processes of human decision making—an expert, professional, for example, within the tasks related to banking, medicine, materials engineering, and military and intelligence services such as analysis of the credit applications, the insurance risk analysis, the analysis of the customer profile, searching for optimization in production processes, and controlling the manufacturing processes and procedures (Goodwin, Wright 2011, 452–468). However, sometimes an expert system is also a human expert who is using specialized software for analysis or forecasting (for example, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita 2011).

Giddens (2002, 28) presupposes that, although the expression of trust and confidence might be the result of intentionally taken decisions, under most circumstances they depend on the personalities of individuals and unwittingly they have adopted a sense of security: belief in the stability and order of events. These assumptions are made complicated by the fact that, on the one hand, abstract systems are expanding the areas for safety and security. On the other hand, they carry a risk and create at the same time new risks, threats, and dangers in locally and globally scale, such as traffic accidents, roofs of buildings that are falling under the weight of snow, epidemics, chemical spills, explosions of nuclear reactors, climate change, but also data leaks from public, commerce and non-government institutions, corruption scandals, and financial crises.

It should also be mentioned that Daniel Bell (1973) previously described the “late modernity” societies as postindustrial or information societies—those

in which the crucial role is no longer played by the raw materials, commodities, and energy, the exploitation and manufacturing processes, societies that benefit from labor-intensive or a capital-intensive technology. In postindustrial societies, the emphasis is placed on the collection, usage, and processing of information. The primary objective of such social formations is no longer the “game against nature,” which was appropriate to pre-industrial societies or the “game against a fabricated nature” relevant to the industrial societies, but the “game between individuals” concerning the achievement of power and authority between, for example, politicians and voters, teachers and students, doctors and patients. In other words, contemporary man has problems predominantly in relations with oneself and with others while relations with nature may be perceived as less problematic.

Moreover, the concept of Bell concerned the ideology of meritocracy and technocracy. In the first case, it is assumed that a high position in the social hierarchy is used to be provided for those who have the most exceptional merits, talents, and efforts in the particular profession or branch. This creates the illusion of efficiency and social justice. However, the implementation of this concept leads in practice to the reduction of individual freedom and creates inequalities, as this conception is incoherent since it brings the income inequality within itself, condemning and unfairly harming all those who were less “gifted by nature” (White 2008, 75–106).

In the second case (technocracy), however, the highly skilled people, particularly those associated with the development of technologies (organizations in the field of research and development) are seen as those who should govern and solve social problems and conflicts through actions connected with implementation of technical progress. The implementation of this idea refers to a model of democracy in which the relationship between politicians and experts is developing into bureaucracy, statism (French: *étatisme*), and state intervention (Dusek 2006, 38–52; Held 2006, 125–157).

Concepts of technocracy and meritocracy are similar because they justify individualism, and the result of the implementation of their principles would be gaining and governing expert power. Such type of power is characterized by domination through discursive formations, and it is based on confidence and entrusting to expert knowledge or wisdom by their subordinates (Scott 2006, 25, 32–34, 116–137).

Contemporary, we observe the processes of formation of the knowledge society. Thus, hypotheses, explanations, and theories that have been already developed are becoming the foundation of actions and their formation, dissemination, and application are surrounded by a particular concern (Chmielecka 2004, 60). Those societies are connected to the knowledge-based economy that is distinguished by business enterprises whose competitive advantage is based on information, knowledge, and innovations (Zorska 2007, 62). It can be assumed that those processes will be a favor to the emergence of new abstract systems composed of symbolic means and expert systems.

Indicators of that socio-economic changes may include the dissemination of higher education, increased commercial expenditure on research and development, and the adoption and promotion of new technologies as well. It goes further into the names of new positions in organizations' covering the broad masses of experts, otherwise "agents of change," for example, analysts, advisors, consultants, administrators, diagnostics, designers, evaluators, and specialists in various matters.

It is also supposed that it will be more and more often necessary to take a high individual and collective risk, which can be understood as the probability of failure and adverse effects of different activities. These risks ought to be balanced by activities based on the high level of trust and confidence—the crucial type of social capital, which may be described as the conviction and action based on it, or as the situation in which uncertain future actions of other

people or facilities and institutions will be beneficial for other social actors (Sztompka 2007, 69–70, 244).

Thus, governance of expertise and exposure to it becomes a mass phenomenon. Adaptation of individuals, groups, and institutions on this condition are used to be enabled by disciplines developed in the early 21st century such as crisis management, risk management, and trust management (Zelek 2003; Kaczmarek 2005; Grudzewski, Hejduk, Sankowska, Wańtuchowicz 2007, 2009).

At the same time, critique studies on the application of recommendations derived from these concepts have been already developed. They are conducted predominantly by continuators of research on biopower and biopolitics, which are developing three fundamental models: (1) governmentality or government of living beings started by Michel Foucault; (2) sovereign power and bare life by Giorgio Agamben; and (3) capitalism and the living multitude by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (Lemke 2011). However, their description lies beyond the scope of this book.

2 An Outline of the Cultural Phenomenon of Narcissism

Referring to Christopher Lasch (1991, 34), we can define a cultural narcissism as a collective phenomenon of personality disorders, which is occurring to representatives of highly developed societies from the circle of Western civilization. Essential for this phenomenon are skills, interests, attitudes, needs, motivations, values formed in the process of biological, mental, and social development (socialization) during which individuals identify themselves. They express their identity and distinguish from the representatives of other contemporary civilizations: Latin American, Orthodox, African, Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist, Chinese, and Japanese (see Huntington 2007). Narcissism in terms of Lasch can be considered as individuals' reaction to the growing scale of risks generated by the abstract systems (cf. Lasch 1991, 50; Giddens 2002, 234–237; Aldridge 2006, 95–99).

The awareness (more or less conscious) of the possibility of apocalyptic events leads to the withdrawal of individuals from the public life, to them focusing on the privatized “survival strategies” and closing in the personal worlds dominated by the obsession of physical and psychological self-improvement. People start to realize that they are surrounded by a multiplicity of risk forms that earlier generations have not met. Moreover, people lose their sense of historical continuity, cease to be interested in the past and future, and focus on the present events, in which they are seeking psychological security and a sense of self-fulfillment. So here, they are balancing between addressing the primary and higher-order needs. The personal pursuit of narcissistic attracting attention includes even such practices as monopolization of the conversation, consumerism, buying attention, excessive concentration on work, and creating an excess of obligations and therefore unavailability for others (Derber 2002).

Moreover, narcissism, according to Christopher Lasch (1991, 33), is characterized by:

- Hatred of individuals to each other; self-loathing.
- A rebellion against the childish dependence on the others.
- Poor ability to recognize the needs of others.
- Feelings of being a man of success accompanied at the same time by a sense of emptiness and inauthenticity.
- Permanent concern for obtaining expressions of admiration and approval for being attractive, beautiful, and modern.
- Search for an immediate intimacy along with an absence of the ability to create permanent relationships.
- Constant concern about their health, fear of old age and death as well as resistance to therapy, in which the individual becomes the center of attention and reflection.

It is assumed here that the development of narcissism phenomenon is intensified by consumer capitalism, which allows individuals to at least temporary narcissistic satisfaction of their desires thanks to the possibility of purchasing and using appropriate goods and services.

Lasch (1991, 169–182, 218–232) sees the birth of cultural narcissism in the collapse of the patriarchal family and the disappearance of traditional leaders and wise men's, whose authority is replaced by the cult of expertise.

“The new experts are an intrinsic part of the therapeutic culture of narcissism. A ‘new paternalism’ has arisen in which experts of all type ministers to the needs of the lay population. Many modern forms of expertise do not derive from the fulfillment of genuinely felt needs; in some large part, the new experts have invented the very needs they claim to satisfy. Dependence on expertise becomes a way of life” (Giddens 2002, 236–237).

In his concept Lasch, as pointed out by Anthony Giddens (2002), presents the individual being passive to external forces, particularly to the institutions of consumer capitalism, which is the commercialization of experience and is supported by persuasive advertising remittances. This phenomenon exaggerates the tendency of people to withdraw from public life. It also underestimates the relationship between consciousness and the body—taking care of the quality of personal appearance, dress, diet, performed gestures, and personal development “for the show” (the “conspicuous consumption”). It also determines opportunities for protection of individuals’ “local life” against the impacts of large systems and organizations (Giddens 2002, 239–244, 252, 273–274).

According to Giddens, sources of narcissism can be found in the failure of the primary education of trust. When the child is not able to regard sufficiently the autonomy of essential career, and consequently, clearly distinguish a border of the one’s psyche. When this is happening, the feelings of omnipotence in the self-worth are alternating with the opposite feeling of emptiness and despair. These features moved into the adulthood, signify an individual who is neurotically dependent on others, particularly on the issue of the self-assessment, but he or she has too little autonomy in order to communicate effectively with others. It will be hard for such a person to be reconciled with the need to take into account the risk that is a feature of the modern social world. Therefore, he or she while trying to control possible life dangers will be hanging on cultivating the physical attractiveness or the personal appeal (Giddens 2002, 243).

What is of key importance here—according to Giddens—is the feeling of shame, which makes the identity of the individual fragile and vulnerable to changes. Therapy with a narcissistic patient itself is considered to be an expert system, which is a methodology of life planning and although it may lead to dependency and passivity, it also provides opportunities for support activity and monitoring of their fate. Therapies for a narcissistic patient require time and

money, and to a certain degree can be seen as entertainment cultivated by privileged classes of people (Giddens 2002, 246).

This reasoning allows assuming that it comes to the interdependencies between different expert systems and that the well-paid professionals who represent such systems frequently manifest narcissistic personality characteristics, as well as the use of various forms of therapy. However, there is a specialization appropriate to expertise, so those who are experts in some subjects are laypersons in most situations (other topics). There is no one who is directly in control over all factors influencing the life that is created by the abstract systems. Precisely this effect is a fundamental feature of the phenomenon of risks on a large scale (Giddens 2002, 190).

Criticism of the concept of cultural narcissism will not be complete if we omit the particular characteristic of “late modernity,” which is “institutional reflexivity.” Anthony Giddens (2002, 29–30) proves that the new information and new knowledge generated to a large extent in expert systems are already routinely included in the operating conditions, which rebuild and reorganize social life. On the one hand, therefore, it seems that the living conditions are becoming increasingly predictable, and one can try to predict the course of events. On the other hand, however, we are often unable to determine the complex side effects and hidden functions of activated processes (the boomerang effect or spillover effects). Criticism and doubt in the adopted goals as well as objectives undermine the safety and permanently justify the efforts leading to building comprehensive trust and confidence. However, it is not a universal approach.

Giddens (2008, 95–97) distinguishes four typical attitudes towards uncertainties and risks adopted by the people. The attitudes are as follows:

- (1) Pragmatic acceptance, which consists of concentration on solving everyday tasks and displacement of risks and uncertainties from the sphere of consciousness.

- (2) Sustained optimism, which is the belief that the risks and uncertainties can be avoided and defeated thanks to providence, good faith, science, and technology or human rationality.
- (3) Cynical pessimism that consists of accepting the inevitability of risk, shortening the time horizon for the present, and benefiting from the hedonistic pleasure.
- (4) Radical commitment, which is opposing the sources of threats through the mobilization of opinion, propaganda, or social campaigns, and by the creation of social movements (for example, the movement for environmental protection).

It seems that—with the exception of the last attitude—all attitudes and actions can be considered as survival strategies compatible with the objectives of the cultural phenomenon of narcissism. It is difficult to find them as constructive ways that require the involvement of the broader communities of individuals to resolve issues that are surrounding them in the contemporary world.

3 Fundamental Relations of Experts with Cultural Narcissism

Further discussion requires a brief description of the role of the expert as a participant in social changes as well as analysis of transformations of this role. According to Janusz Goćkowski (cf. 2001, 185–215; 2009, 123–152), it is assumed that this role is qualitatively different from the role of the theorist. In the most general terms, the theoretician influences the decision-makers in understanding the structure of the social world, the imagination, and inventiveness of policy-makers, creation of the techniques for social engineering with the knowledge and resourcefulness of citizens, and provides a scientific foundation for activities of experts as well (Goćkowski 2001, 214).

Meanwhile, the role of the expert is to provide services in the form of consultation (advice), diagnosis (an analysis of the situation and possible options for the future), projects (operational plans and specifications of the strategies for achieving the objectives), as well as an assisting or obstructing the decisions of policy-makers concerning the process of “running the game“ of the present time—in order to preserve the status quo, to carry out reforms or to initiate the alternative governance. The correct playing of an expert role requires the cooperation with decision-makers and technical personnel, self-determination on the question of ideological disputes, discerning in their axiology and technology, and to have knowledge about their objectives and the measures (2001, 211–214).

An expert could be the holder of scientific competencies, engineer, or practically oriented scholar or manager, says Joanna Kurczewska (1997, 250–251). Scientists are becoming experts if they are recognized as authorities by laypersons, the creators, and holders of common knowledge, with which they have immediate and extensive contacts or for those whom they work for. It is assumed here that the roles of experts can be understood only within the context of the principal institutions and the audience of other scientists and audiences of

novices. The importance of experts in knowledge communication—which is structured collections of information on specific topics—is so high that they have grown to the rank of “independent social institutions,” sanctioned by social norms, manners, and rules of behavior aimed at meeting of particular needs.

Kurczewska (1997, 257) introduced six assumptions to this concept. Namely:

- (1) The number and diversity of experts are unlimited, depending on the diversity of social and organizational contexts.
- (2) An expert is always for someone: for another scientist, for the principal or a layperson audience or another expert, but never only for oneself.
- (3) Expert, regardless of type, is always playing the role of intermediary between the world of social science and the world of common knowledge.
- (4) Intimidation is expressed in the combined character of consciousness, for example, by combining scientific knowledge with common knowledge.
- (5) The identity of the expert is not a community identity, and it is not the result of reaching a consensus with other experts. This knowledge is developed by disabling of one’s from broader communities of scientists and technicians and permanent concern with a new individual identity.
- (6) Expert in thinking and acting is subordinated to the principal for at least a significant part of one’s personality.

It should be noted, however, that experts do not work alone. There are some forms of expert communities described as an epistemic community and communities of practice.

Epistemic community, according to Peter M. Haas (1992, 3), is a network of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area.

The professionals may master in different disciplines and come from various backgrounds, but they all must have:

- (1) A shared set of normative and principled beliefs, which provide a value-based rationale for the social action of community members.
- (2) Shared causal beliefs, which are derived from their analysis of practices leading or contributing to a central set of problems in their domain and which then serve as the basis for elucidating the multiple linkages between possible policy action and desired outcomes.
- (3) Shared notions of validity that is intersubjective and internally defined criteria for weighing and validating knowledge in the specific domain of their expertise.
- (4) A common policy enterprise that is a set of standard practices associated with a set of problems to which their professional competence is directed, presumably out of the conviction that human welfare will be enhanced as a consequence.

Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger define communities of practice as groups interconnected by informal relationships that consist of people who share their professional experiences (Mikuła 2006, 182–183). They are part of the organization and are formed because of members' interest in a particular topic. This passion leads to resolve problems and the improvement of the knowledge and experience in the field chosen by the group. The people who make the community do not necessarily cooperate with each other every day in the formal structure. However, they meet because they discovered the value coming from shared interaction. They spend their time together, share information, opinions, and provide advice. They can build new standards, tools, projects, manuals, and documents. The main features of those communities are a community of the goals and membership with fluid and self-organizing nature.

At this point, we should return to the issue of cultural narcissism. On the one hand, the expert has to show others certain elements of social reality that he

or she should be identified by, which can lead to an obsession of self-improvement. On the other hand, he is dependent on the others and not always can simply give up providing them with services. The personality of an expert can, therefore, acquire narcissistic features, which will adversely affect the quality of services, diagnosis the needs of contractors, and could increase the risk of failure of projects that he or she created or gave opinions. However, putting accurate and reliable diagnoses may contribute to the influx of words of admiration and appreciation. There is no inconsistency with this if the expert takes care of his or her physical attractiveness and personal appeal. It can be even believed that these characteristics together with its surroundings (for example car, house, occupied district, furniture, features of a spouse, friends) are the image of an expert and can demonstrate its reliability (Sztompka 2007, 226; Goffman 1981, 156–195). Meanwhile, the image is next to the reputation and actual performance of the individual an indicator by which people choose to trust others.

Theoretically, there are three types of social institutions that are a form of objectification of an expert and one's consciousness: expert as an informant-agent, expert as an interpreter, and expert as a steersman (Kurczewska 1997, 249–255). In the first case, an expert mediates communication between the “mountains” and “pits” in circles of knowledge; informs others about the competence of scholars, contractors, or laypersons. By living on the borderline of colloquial and scientific knowledge, he or she may be an “involuntary regulator of access” to these types of knowledge. An expert is a partner for others as he does not attempt to exploit his privileged positions, additionally in terms of communication. Such expert does not play an active, positive, or negative role in the meetings with clients and the public. It is known as “transmission belt” and “a byproduct of the process of communication.”

Expert as an interpreter is already more active individual, who even when he is subordinated to his client's objectives, uses a dual-favored privilege of

one's position. These advantages result from the comparison of its position to the scientists of the highest circles of knowledge and comparison of its positions to the users of common knowledge. The translator creates interpretations of reality or its certain aspects, produces its visions of science and common knowledge, as well as providing other institutions with information about others. This expert formulates two limited language codes of his own, one pointing down into "the low" competence in interpreting the world and the other "facing up," which is limited to the fact that experts depend on the imprecise ordinary language.

Moreover, expert as an interpreter can encrypt and decrypt communications of diverse types of knowledge. Thereby such type of experts allows the circulation of knowledge to happen but regulates the nature of resources and knowledge base as well. Their activities are performed not unconsciously, but in an "intentionally limited" way, since they include in parenthesis their dependence by presenting their interpretations. Besides—in contrast to the agents or intermediaries—they benefit from the generated "surplus value" and obtain the identity in the offering resistance to principals, as self-interpretation of their objectives is becoming "the work of itself."

The expert as a steersman—the third type of an expert—is the product of principals and laypersons audiences, and it may be the intended or unintentional effect of work. The steersman is necessary to rationalize the position of participants of the shared knowledge among social reality. Such expert can be perceived as the creation of process consisting in waiting for the authority, which may take a different form of various types of an ideal scientist: hero of science, the martyr of knowledge, leader of public opinion, educator, and strategist. These images may be based on images, models, and ideas of people who are unrelated to scientific knowledge. Creation of steersman institution has been a process full of contradictions primarily because of frequently conflicting expectations on the part of direct contractors and a more comprehensive range of

laypersons. It is important here to underline the phenomenon of the alienation of an expert from the consciousness of those who create and impose on others image of this expert. As a result, the same expert as a steersman could have the impression of one's complete independence from the employer or principal. The employer can be the subject of the expert's image to such a degree that they could believe in one's autonomy. This phenomenon makes the experts to be perceived as individuals free from people coming from the outside of the world of science. Thus, experts may sometimes even be seen as social institutions.

Paradoxically, however, experts as steersman are also potential scapegoats for the principals and the audience. The collective responsibility for failures, disasters, and misfortune can be passed on as a form of distinguishing experts from others. This can occur both when the opposition party comes to power, as well as, for instance when the atomic bomb was thrown, or ineffective economic and educational programs have been implemented. Any case such as mentioned above discloses the fact that since the expert as a steersman was given authority by people outside the world of science, then they can also perform control over this power. It turns out, however, extremely complicated since nonprofessional's communication with the expert, as a steersman is usually strong and well protected.

It is important to mention three kinds of "initiations of experts" in the ontological and epistemological structure of the social world defined by Joanna Kurczewska. It is assumed that:

"The mystery is born from the asymmetrical relationship between experts and laypersons in the field of science and technology. Nature of this relationship results from the intellectually challenging access for laypersons to the findings of the nature of the natural and social world that is being made in sciences. It leads to a situation in which laymen are not

allowed to make their choices from among those findings: they may only—so to speak—blindly entrust them” (Kurczewska 1997, 314).

Initiations of experts correspond to the types of experts (Kurczewska 1997, 314–317). Expert as an informant or agent participates in the induction into the knowledge of other people—informs scientists about what is necessary to the layman, but little understanding. Such expert also informs laypersons about problems of academic researchers in explaining the mysteries of nature and human beings. One, however, does not create any secrets and mysteries.

The expert as an interpreter becomes the creator of one’s self-induction into knowledge and builds its authority. One’s initiative comes from a unique place in the system of social communication—from the transformation of one interpretation of the world to the other. The mystery, which is formed in this process, serves first to underpin convictions about his or her self-sufficiency, independence, and uniqueness. Secondly, the mystery serves for protection or strengthening of a conviction of others about the expert’s competencies in the conversion of information of others into the language understandable to their audience.

The initiation of an expert as a steersman results from the human need for unquestionable authority and the natural, spontaneous, and unconditional obedience. It is not the result of the expert’s actions, but laypersons and principals who expect the assistance from one’s in their faith in their abilities. This initiation causes an effect of creating the “image not so much a professional as rather the image of a priest—a certain representative of the temple of science, a credible commentator of the initiation book of nature and society. The third initiative pursues the reasonable objectives even though it is not developed by the means corresponding to the models and postulates of rational, scientific, and technical knowledge.” (Kurczewska 1997, 316). By using the values similar to

the religious and moral, an expert as a steersman can monopolize the authority of science and technology.

The fact that the scientific rationality will be complemented by the induction into knowledge involves a “new enchantment of the world.” The more initiations an individual has, the more likely it will become a full-technocrat, or a person carried out by its competence in publicly declared political aspirations or ideologies aimed to design a social world in the spheres beyond the field of science and the economy (Kurczewska 1997, XX, 317). It is assumed that technocrats in industrial societies implement their aspirations in circumstances of political competition while in the post-industrial societies they may have had a full political monopoly.

Technocrat as an expert feels to be “chosen of the future society,” feels the call to the great and extraordinary things, as he is predestinated to something more than simple recognition of the reality or the management of manufacturing processes of goods or services. The first enchantment is the separation of the sacred sphere of industrial society from the sphere of the profane—science with its values and institutions, from the laypersons and their experiences. The second enchantment refers to the fact that the technocrat does not illuminate the mysteries of existence and the future but generates them itself as a “messenger of nature and the future” expressed through science and technology. The third enchantment consists of the assignment of the absolute authority of science and technology and the sphere of production of material goods, to which they relate. This confidence strengthens substantive evidence of socio-economic growth, new technologies, and management systems (Kurczewska 1997, 317–322).

Referred views of Joanna Kurczewska are complementary to the concepts of expert systems by Anthony Giddens. Giddens does not mention indeed about the possibility of a transformation of experts into the technocrats. This point of view should also be addressed to the phenomenon of cultural narcissism. It seems that—the improvement of the experts in creating mysteries, their need for

admiration and great deeds, as well as the increased scale of risk indicators of possible negative consequences of their achievements—provide the basis for the dissemination of doubts in experts' competences. The reaction to this state of affairs can tighten the criteria for selecting individuals for positions of high trust. Furthermore, it appears that the rationalized behavior in some circumstances forces experts to take care of their image while under different circumstances, this may be stigmatized. For example, the advisor to Prime Minister can be seen as the person who should have a good look and exalt to maintain contacts with individuals in the highest offices or to represent them on the outside. At the same time, however, the experts are required to know how to dress up and maintain direct and indirect contact (public relations) with the administrators of common knowledge, such as when it comes to building catastrophe, natural disaster, or strike.

The situation is complicated by the fact that in the contemporary media an expert seems to be more vulnerable than in the past due to the possibility of “being caught” in the behind the scenes' circumstances (Goffman 1981, 156–195). That is to say when being in their sphere of privacy and anonymity, they rest and prepare to continue to play their social role, and so when they perhaps, take an activities incompatible with those which are expected from them, for example, when they drink alcohol while not coping with stress and simultaneously work for an institution which aim is to limit the access to stimulants. The same situation takes place when they do their shopping during working hours or participate in the work of one of the organizations they cooperate with but at the same took ing time on sick leave at the appropriate place of employment. Contemporary mass media, despite the ethical dilemmas, often decide to conduct whistleblower journalism based on the provocations that could be recognized in certain situations as legally acceptable—however, such an assessment does not occur until after the provocation (Chyliński, Russ-Mohl 2008, 142–147). The activities of journalists as experts from the disclosure of

the facts, though risky, allow them to catch the attention of audiences and actually sell advertisements accompanying the relevant information, which is an element strictly associated with the cultural narcissism of consumer capitalism.

4 Dilemmas of the Development of Knowledge Society

The first issue, pointing to the increasingly complex relations of experts and the phenomenon of cultural narcissism is the quality of the process of creating a knowledge society. Failure of this process could lead to the social formation, which was once provocatively defined as “society of stupidity” (Zacher 2007, 247).

On the one hand, there are social forces supporting the dissemination of expert knowledge in relation to different spheres of human life: education, culture, economy, research, health and relationship to the environment, which essentially will occur as places of popularization of science, a systematic work, innovation, evaluation of effects, and synergy in providing a basis for sustainable development. In such society, it is significant to strive for equalization of opportunities, to diminish inequalities in access to digital technologies, but also an educational and intellectual gap in the use of their features and capabilities (Zacher 2007, 241).

On the other hand, there are apparent phenomena that demolition optimism of such visions of the knowledge society (Zacher 2007, 19–21, 70–71, 244–247). Multiple people cannot and do not even want to use the knowledge or treat it instrumentally. The democratization of education has led to a reduction in levels of education; universities do not always take care of the quality of libraries and staff, often accepting adolescents unprepared for the studies. There is no doubt that universities are unprepared for the “downloading” by students the texts from the Internet, buying them, as well as students' consumption of drugs that are supposed to increase their learning abilities. Contemporary education turns out to be exposed to nepotism, corruption, and personnel policy with “party members.” The mass media are dominated by ordinary language, as they accept breaking the rules of grammar as well as the publication of advertisements offending audience's feelings, combining serious information's

with entertainment (infotainment), and supplementing news with images and descriptions of violence (tabloidization). The Internet has created perfect conditions for rapid development of pornography that allows degeneration of social relationships and relations between the sexes, broadcast information noise and unwanted information (spam), and discussions and postings full of vulgarisms are widespread. There is a noticeable decrease in readership of books and newspapers, and the developmental phenomenon of the secondary illiteracy, which raises concerns about the opportunity to discuss actually based on abstract concepts. Politics and religion have to be supported through advertising that is simplifying their assumptions and objectives, extreme relativism is accepted, and a New Age movement, fortune-telling, numerology, and Scientology are offering simplified explanations of the world. Omnipresent become a marketing buzz consisting on encouraging consumers to talk with their loved ones and friends on the goods and services and therefore encouraging others to use them (*Buzz marketing* n.d.; *Word-of-mouth marketing* n.d.). These activities can give people so needed feeling of familiarity as well as the emotion of being an expert in a certain field. This takes many forms, such as, marketing of believers (evangelist marketing), viral marketing, writing blogs about brands (brand blogging), carrying out-groups, clubs and communities associated with the brand (community marketing), distribution of products samples to the opinion leaders (product seeding), supporting on social issues (cause marketing), establishment of fashion and imitation effect causing (trendsetting), and combining the promotion of some products and services with others (casual marketing).

The identified uncertainties are combined with debate on the application and the quality of created and shared knowledge through the Internet. Knowledge is one of the factors influencing an expert power the most profoundly, which is the more powerful, the smaller the numbers of people have access to information and their ordered collections that are enabling

determination of objectives, the choice of measures and decision making on the activities implemented by others (Griffin 2005, 558). For example, in an economy based on knowledge participation in the network becomes an essential condition, but simultaneously not sufficient for effective competition with others in the markets of goods, services, and labor. It is also essential to which networks the economic operator or individual belongs, and what position in them takes, whether it can acquire and create new knowledge, share it, manage it flows, and protect it (Zorska 2007, 61, 152).

Nevertheless, beyond the competition on knowledge, an important becomes collaboration in its production, which took a massive scale along with the explosion of Internet sites in the trend of the Web 2.0. The basis for these transformations is social networking (for example, MySpace, YouTube, Facebook, deviantART, Wikipedia) allowing their co-production between the users, for example, by influencing their appearance, functionality, and contents. Their characteristic feature is the user-generated content that the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) characterized through factors as it follows (Wunsch-Vincent, Vickery 2007, 8–9):

- (1) “Publication requirement,” which is a presentation of the specified wide range of audiences (they are not, therefore, for example, private letters).
- (2) “Creative effort” that is the user’s contribution to the published work.
- (3) “Creation apart from professional routines and practices,” which means that works substitute a manifestation of voluntary and non-commercial activities.

Examples of user-generated content on websites are, for example, the author’s drawings, photographs, music, videos, reviews, comments, broadcasts, books, passwords, reference works, and diaries. Previous analysis indicates many effects of the availability of user-generated content. These include, among others (Friedman 2006; Wunsch-Vincent, Vickery 2007, 28–39):

- The increase in sales of new hardware and software services for the dissemination of more involved creators.
- New concepts, initiatives, and activities.
- New advertising and marketing techniques.
- Changes in the work of traditional mass media.
- Determining changes in the way of work and leisure.
- Changes in the production of and access to information.
- The flood of information.
- More frequent communication.
- New areas of education and teaching.
- Exchange of scientific knowledge and an increase in knowledge.
- A change in the recruitment of new talents.
- The decrease in social isolation.
- Increased social engagement and political participation.
- Encouraging conscious decisions of individuals and further individualization.
- Competition between individuals that provide contents.
- The disappearance of empathy.
- An increase of creative skills.
- New addictions related to the Internet, new media, and technologies.
- New social and economic inequalities (for example, digital divide, robotic divide).
- Changes in legal standards.
- Problems with privacy and security.
- Elimination of hierarchical structures.

These characteristics describe the shaping of society and economy as extremely varied and involving complex and contradictory processes.

On the one hand, there is a chance to emerge a new and more socially responsible economy based on cooperation referred to as a Wikinomics (see Tapscott, Williams 2006, 2010). On the other hand, it is considered that the information chaos is increasing. *Quasi*-experts, “the cult of amateurs,” and instances of their use by corporations that require payments for access to the more effective forms of advertising, trade, and publishing of works and contents in the context of social networking sites appear (see Olcoń 2006; Keen 2007; Kosiński 2009; Lanier 2010). It is possible to risk the statement that mass creativity, which Internet access enables, and which is not supported by professional competencies, can serve as evidence to the scale of the phenomenon of cultural narcissism. Individuals who are not coping with the hazards are obsessively focused on publishing the works that will conceal the conflict sensations on their own size, emptiness, and needs of being admired and accepted by others. Narcissistic individuals in the networks receive a large extent of free of charge opportunities allowing them to develop their images for searching for new partners with whom they might share their problems, as well as new methods of therapy and the means of preserving health. For example, the slogan of social network expert.pl is: “What do you know? What is your problem? Everyone is familiar with something. What kind of an expert are you? Allow yourself to be found on the web and in Google.” For instance, the slogan of the website Nasze-choroby.pl reads as follows: “Share your disease! Meet with patients just like you!”

The above features enable discussion concerning the emergence of “attention economy,” which growth we can witness nowadays, especially in the Internet networks (Goldhaber 1997; Davenport, Beck 2001; Luoma-aho, Nordfors 2009; Skågebya 2009). This concept refers to an approach to information management that has the order to acquire the highest possible attention and interest of potential and current users of various goods and services. Attention is an insufficient resource because people have access to the

many competitive offerings of leisure and creative activities. At the same time, acquisition and maintenance of attention allow exercising of an invisible power over the consumers and contracting parties and consequently provides access to the profits to further investments. This type of economy is primarily associated with the development of creative industries, in particular, mass media, advertising, lobbying, marketing, and public relations services. Nevertheless, this phenomenon also includes attempts to attract the attention of amateur creators, as well as the users of social networking sites, by using comments, tags, activities in the closed groups, and other features. Moreover, Saul J. Berman and Bennett E. McClellan (2002) point ten strategies for “survival in the attention economy” for entrepreneurs. These strategies are as follows:

- (1) Connect with your customers and cultivate relationships.
- (2) Find new revenue streams.
- (3) Set your customers and your brands free.
- (4) Do not pay for impressions, pay attention.
- (5) Make your pricing dynamic.
- (6) Go global from the start.
- (7) Create standards that work.
- (8) Share the investment risk.
- (9) Be a close follower—learn from others’ mistakes.
- (10) Focus your attention as companies converge and diverge.

In a certain degree, these suggestions may also be adapted to the activities of public organizations and non-governmental organizations, as well as job seekers, consumers, and activists.

The described processes of the community production of knowledge can be related to the “universal creativity utopia” by Joseph Beuys. This artist assumed that all people have creative potential and that the associated spiritual values are far more critical than material or economic values (Beuys 2001; Kaczmarek 2001). Beuys argued that only creativity could lead people to

freedom. This freedom will be encouraged by the development of technology, which—by requiring less and less work from individuals—will place them with the problem of utilization of leisure time. These views are considered to be a utopia because they appeal to such a radical reconstruction of society that it becomes almost impossible to incorporate (Mannheim 1992).

A fundamental obstacle to the implementation of the vision of universal creativity constitutes people themselves because not everyone has sufficient human capital resources that would enable the production of works, goods, and services of high quality, in particular, groundbreaking innovations. Therefore, even if everyone is creative, some of the creative works may be of no value to other people. The human capital includes all the characteristics and capabilities that can be attributed to a single man, and that might be useful in the successful transformation of resources and discovering new ways to use them. They are, for example, knowledge (including education), health status, age, gender, knowledge of foreign languages, and computer skills (Hamm 2004, 52). The utopia of the universal creativity also contradicts research results on inequalities in the creative participation—creativity is relevant only to a few individuals that are privileged or exceeding the boundary of conformist behavior (see Florida 2005a, 48–51; Nielsen 2006; Crawford 2007).

At this point, we can agree with Jeremy Rifkin (2002, 10) that we are entering an immaterial economy associated with the development of “age of access,” which is characterized by a short and limited use of the goods, where the main rules are the permanent changes, new concepts, and ideas. However, we do not necessarily have to agree with his statement that “‘to have,’ ‘possess,’ ‘collect’ is not so important.” It is precisely the gathering and accumulation of content in social networking sites gives them their particular strength to attract additional users, who can discover previously unknown options to cope with everyday problems. Besides, the concept of “age of access” allows perceiving the very possibility of using the Internet infrastructure and the various social

networking sites does not necessarily mean equal opportunities for development. Many of the databases and services are intended, in fact, to be exclusively for experts, and they are not only deeply hidden (“deep web”) from the ordinary users, but also carefully guarded by ranks of the controllers (“gatekeepers”), institutions, and individuals defining the rules and conditions for access to network (Rifkin 2002, 187–192).

It is also important to mention another observation of Rifkin that the Internet is a cybernetic space (associated with the geographical space), where apparent confrontation takes place. It is a confrontation between (1) contemporary consumer capitalism, from which narcissistic individuals depend on and (2) the culture that is represented, particularly by undergoing professionalization of the “third sector,” or non-government organizations, which allows the reconstruction of trust and confidence (Rifkin 2002, 260–273). It is assumed that in the modernity relationships between commercialism and culture have been deteriorated along with the displacement of local products by the standardized mass goods and services that are often using the symbols and customs of the communities that have not been able to adequately protect them. Capitalism cannot, therefore, do without the richness of cultural diversity.

5 Choosing Between Substitutes of Trust and Its Reconstruction Methods

A closer discussion focuses on the decisions concerning the individual and collective measures in situations of risk and uncertainty. Dissemination of new information and communications technologies such as Internet, mobile phones, scanners, cameras, digital cameras, voice recorders, and portable USB memory device connected to computers, suggests that the characteristics of the expert knowledge and the culture of narcissism, are changing. For example, these technologies lead to the birth of citizen journalism, which is practiced by non-professionals, and which leads to the situation that the unreliable information embarrasses experts can be demonstrated publicly by everyone who has access to the Internet. This raises professional journalists' concerns about the quality of public debate while in the case of the public individuals, it may lead to a particular interest in sustaining their privacy. Embarrassing facts from the private life may, in fact, be disclosed at the least expected moment, even by inconspicuous passerby on the street, the person met at a conference or by receiving from the expert e-mail response to an inquiry (*Dziennikarstwo obywatelskie* n.d.; *Citizen journalism* n.d.; Sieńczyło-Chłabicz 2006; Chyliński, Russ-Mohl 2008, 380–386; Bradwell 2010).

Under the conditions of emerging concerns about loss of privacy, it seems that there is the demand for substitutes of trust and confidence that create alternative solutions to satisfy the needs of the predictability of behavior of other people and institutions. After the Piotr Sztompka (2007, 328–333), it is assumed that there are seven mechanisms that create substitutes for trust and confidence:

- (1) Believe in the providence, which is an escape to fate, destiny, or God that can suppress restlessness.
- (2) The corruption that gives the illusion of control over others' guarantees of their goodwill.

- (3) Excessive vigilance, personal supervision, and control over others, which is “taking matters into people hands,” employment of security agencies and guards, alarm setting, and the recovery of debts by force.
- (4) Resorting to legal institutions by drawing up contracts, calling witnesses, or by referring to the judicial decisions.
- (5) Ghettoization, which consists of surrounding by the walls, creating borders, and establishing closed or gated communities.
- (6) The paternalism that is the search for a strong leader or the affiliation in the cults and sects.
- (7) Externalization of trust and confidence, which means confidence in the leaders of other societies, their organizations, and products in international institutions and migration in search of employment.

It seems that in the context of using digital technology as substitutes of trust and confidence we can also include filtering inbound and outbound messages, the desire of individuals and institutions to consistently select information inconsistent with their objectives and measures, and preventing information from getting into the wrong hands. Responding to inquiries by electronic means requires an intellectual activity, while a lack of response to them is the source of suspicion and distrust. In the most general terms, the use of substitutes for trust and confidence can be interpreted as taking a survival strategy that is the sign of the growing phenomenon of the cultural narcissism.

In opposition to the substitutes for trust and confidence are top-down and bottom-up proposals for building a culture of trust, more broadly: strengthening the social capital, which means cooperation potential embedded in interpersonal relationships and social norms that can benefit individuals, groups, and societies. According to the theory of Robert D. Putnam (2000, 22), we can talk about the positive externality of social capital primarily when it takes the form known as the bridging social capital or inclusive social capital. This form is characterized by the cooperation and integration between people of different cultures,

religions, social classes, and groups. In the top-down development proposals for the creation of trust and confidence are relevant expert reform proposals, changes in the sphere of law, regulations, administrative regulations, and political activities, along with the fixing of strategies and development programs at national and regional levels. A theoretical justification for this trend may be a model of formation of the “culture of trust” proposed by Piotr Sztompka (2007, 293–300). The starting point of this model is the assumption that efforts should be made to such transformation of the institutions that work increase the tendency of members of society’s to bestow trust others and to meet their expectations. It is indispensable here to take action simultaneously to:

- (1) Improvement of legislation: care for the consistency of standards and the simplicity of the legal system.
- (2) Sustainability of the social order, which means guaranteeing the consistency and the irrevocability of principles such as stability in the pursuit of pro-market and democratic reforms.
- (3) Transparency of social organization, which means open nature of the activities of the authorities, the existence of independent media, think tanks, and research centers.
- (4) The kindness of the social environment, and, therefore, the kindness and helpfulness of institutional representatives.
- (5) Responsibilities of individuals and institutions, which mean free elections and equality before the law.
- (6) Wide education understood as the dissemination of access to knowledge about social life, the lessons of trust in family life, building trust and confidence in the school relationships of teachers and students, maintaining the continuity of lifestyles and habits, the transmission of trust and confidence by, for example, religious communities, taking into account the themes of trust and distrust in public debates, and showing good examples of cost-effectiveness of trust and confidence by the mass media.

The basis for top-down construction methods of a culture of trust also provides concepts for diversity steering (Sadowski 2006, 176–177; Griffin 2005, 190–193). Due to the reduction of distrust of representatives from different cultural groups, management of diversity has to result in creation of multicultural institutions, communities, cities and countries and thus enable them, for example, to reduce in operating costs, to facilitate in the obtaining of resources, to facilitate adaptation to the environment, to increase creativity and innovation, as well as increase access to information useful in solving problems.

On the side of bottom-up proposals for building a culture of trust, the lists, indexes, and catalogs of “best practices” can be set. This refers to the practices that the individuals and the collectives can implement at the local and community level. At this point, it is sufficient to indicate that example of such suggestions we can find in a publication containing 150 bottom-up methods of creation of trust and confidence developed in the Saguaro Seminar research project conducted since 1995 under the direction of Robert D. Putnam from the Harvard University, one of the primary researchers of social capital concept. This initiative involved several critical American scientists, activists, business representatives, and politicians. This summary list has been significantly expanded by the Australian social organization Bank of I.D.E.A.S. (see *Saguaro Seminar...*; *Bank of I.D.E.A.S...* 2011a, 2011b). Among the recommended practices are, for instance, organizing a social gatherings to welcome a new neighbors, attending town meetings, registering to vote and voting, volunteering special skills to an organization, donating blood, mentoring someone of a different ethnic or religious group, avoiding gossip, organizing or participating in sports, starting a monthly tea groups, creating a local outdoor activity group, participating in political campaigns, attending a local budget and committee meetings, and organizing a computer group for local senior citizens.

6 Social Stratification and Its Transformation

Another topic of the debate on relations between experts and the phenomenon of cultural narcissism constitutes a transformation of social stratification. The social stratification may be defined as the hierarchy of social classes with higher or fewer opportunities for access to some socially appreciated good, for example, wealth, power, prestige, education, and health (Sztompka 2002, 336–338, 354–355). It is assumed here that people have unequal access to various goods because of the membership in different groups and the necessity to deal with different positions. Besides, the convergence or differences between stratification hierarchies may occur and, therefore, the high or low position of the individual or group on one of the leaders of stratification or inequality may correspond or not too similar positions in other status hierarchies. For example, the convergence may be illustrated by the situation when possession of high earnings involves great prestige of the profession and access to specialized medical services. More often, for most members of society, however, comes to the discrepancy. It is also noted that the upper classes through acts of symbolic violence, cope better with converting one resource to another and maintaining a high position in different hierarchies (Bourdieu, Wacquant 2001, 104).

Transition from the production of material goods (objects) to the intangible assets (ideas, services, images, and symbols), which is taking place in the “late modernity” is the extension of the scope of institutional reflexivity and therefore the expert systems that contribute to the development of the cultural phenomenon of narcissism. It can be stated that a technological breakthrough underlying this transformation alters the scales of stratification (cf. Sztompka 2002, 348–349).

Nowadays, there are more sophisticated ideologies than the previously analyzed concepts of technocracy and meritocracy that are associated with the experts’ roles and that are justifying the distribution of socially desirable goods.

There are already at least a few models describing the social hierarchies in the “late modernity.” These are primarily models of:

- (1) “(New) new middle class–subclass” by Scott Lash (2009, 168–177), which describes the distribution of people working with the service-based structures, information and communications technologies, and resources are accumulating in them. On the other hand, there is a digitally excluded class of individuals apart from modern structures and occasionally living in poverty ghettos.
- (2) “Core–peripheries” by David Harvey (cf. Harvey 1995; Marody, Giza-Poleszczuk 2004, 254–256), which indicates a permanent narrowing the scope of elite, exclusive professions, and expert roles necessary for the long-term operation of institutions. On the periphery of the labor markets full-time people are employed, but their skills are easily accessible, and those who are working in part-time, temporary, self-employed, combining several activities, deprived of social security, performing small qualifications’ operations, poorly payable (“working poor”), and without development opportunities.
- (3) “Hipernomads–virtual nomads–infranomads” by Jacques Attali (2002, 81–82, 107–108; 2008, 169–175), which describes that the highest place is occupied by the longest living people, under the best circumstances as well by those who have authority, that protects its intellectual property rights and other objects of personal creativity. The virtual nomads are people employed in temporary positions, forced to take care of their form and knowledge, as well as to constant mobility and having access to predominantly virtual goods and opportunities for advancement. While the infranomads are the lowest located class of people, who are living below the poverty line, supporting the black economy, vulnerable to epidemics, natural disasters, and without the possibility of access to modern telecommunications and urban infrastructure.

However, later, we will describe different concepts. Namely, “netocracy–consumtariat” by Alexander Bard and Jan Söderqvist and “creative class–service class” in terms of Richard Florida. They contain essential threads and guidance on the evolution of the cultural narcissism.

Referred assumption of Joanna Kurczewska that the experts can become technocrats seems to lose its relevance. Some clarifications in this field were provided by Alexander Bard and Jan Söderqvist (2006, 71–90). These authors argue that there was a “death of statism and the crisis of democracy” and progressively their place took “netocracy” and political system known as “plurarchy.” In more general terms, it is assumed that the state socio-economic policy described as statism involves interfering in the free market, for example, through the financing of public investment, recurring collapsing companies, maintaining unprofitable production, the introduction of state monopoly in certain sectors of the economy, administration of state enterprises, and the provision of social assistance to marginalized. It is acknowledged that the increase of statism leads to a demand for technocrats who with their advice have to eliminate the subjectivism of decision-makers as well as reduce the risk of loss and risks to the community. However, experts are not infallible; sometimes they are excessively confident about the controllability of the social systems (Sztaba 2007, 119–120, 470–471; Pacholski 2001, 204; Fukuyama 1997b, 391–396).

Alexander Bard and Jan Söderqvist claim that the process of the media pluralization, in the United States and Europe has begun even before the 1990s, which consist of breaking their strong relationship with statism. The mass media were gradually released from the control of the largest corporate and government institutions and become the more and more autonomous entities in offering specialized advertising markets to other institutions as well as giving rise to the formation of “netocrats class” (Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 80). Mass media have made the transition from supporting the propaganda of corporate

and governmental media to the creation of presentations in which the “shocking news” is the new rule (Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 81). Experts have been criticized on the occasion of the youth movements at the turn of the 1960s and 1970s, their mistakes in regard to the use of chemicals and promote of industrialization were leaving aside the question of environmental protection based on the intensive exploitation of natural resources and ineffectiveness in finding ways out of the oil crises and financial crises (Jung 1997, 3; Postman 2004, 220; Fukuyama, Colby 2009). In contemporary conditions of globalization, increased activities of social movements, critical to the implementation of risky investments and research and development programs can be observed. All of this provides a wide field for mass media to work on the borders of the state sector, market, and non-governmental organizations (cf. Chyliński, Russ-Mohl 2008, 27–31). Although this model of mass media functioning is still considered to be valid, it has already recognized its tenderness towards the diffusion of new media based on the new information and telecommunication technologies, especially on the Internet (Chyliński, Russ-Mohl 2008, 380–386; Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 145–149).

People who become netocrats are those who—similarly to earlier mass media—understand the rules of the global information network and can use it for achieving the objectives. It is about individuals and groups who can discover or establish “initiation into the right network,” and to mobilize organized activities of their participants along with their resources (Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 87). For examples, as netocrats can be perceived people such as terrorist Osama bin Laden, Linus Torvalds—initiator of the Linux movement, Larry Page and Sergey Brin—founders of the Google as well as Subcomandante Marcos—one of the leaders of the Zapatistas uprising in the Mexican state of Chiapas. This could be particularly young people, who in the years of school education have access to the Internet, and in traditional organizational structures are usually placed in the lower employees positions as a beginner—although by using the

network and new technologies sometimes they have more knowledge and competence than their superiors (Cellary 2002, 15; Poulet 2009, 74–75). Meanwhile, those who do not have access to the network and are unable to use them create a new subclass called as the “consumtariat.” Members of this class can be both “digitally excluded,” as well as they can be able to use the network superficially, for example, representatives of state administration, businessmen, and social activists. Finally, the concept of the plurarchy refers to the new political system that:

“In its purest form is a system in which every individual player decides on oneself but lacks the ability and opportunity to choose over any of the other players. The fundamental notion of democracy, whereby the majority decides over minority when differences of opinion occur, is, therefore, impossible to maintain. On the net, everyone is the master of oneself, for better or worse. This means that all collective interests, not least the maintenance of law and order, will come under intense pressure. A pure plurarchy means that it is impossible to formulate the conditions for a judicial state. The difference between legality and criminality ceases to exist” (Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 89–90).

This does not mean that the netocrats are convinced of the implementation of private interests. The most significant facts, giving evidence of their power are: building their identity based on group membership, access to information, abilities to absorb and sort them, making generalizing perspective, paying attention, sharing of valuable information, openness and generosity (Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 128–129). Thus, consumtariat represents people located in the “networks of exploitative consumption,” which activities are controlled from above through the advertisements inducing desires and providing the means to maintain consumption at a level corresponding for netocrats. This form of

hyper-capitalism is not intended to achieve maximum profits, but to prevent social unrest and violence. Representatives of consumtariat are individualists who make short-term “new tribes,” unable to go outside their identity, always striving for self-realization, which they consider as a form of therapy. Both classes’ separate competitive smaller networks, access to which is indicated by commercial principles. Netocracy is distinguished primarily because of “controlling their desire to possess and the emergence”—their work and consumption. While consumtariat only executes commands of netocrats (Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 150–151).

The described theoretical concept allows assuming that both the consumtariat and netocracy belong to a set of narcissistic individuals. However, netocracy is in power to control the phenomenon of cultural narcissism in order to achieve the supposed public good. Opportunity to dictate to other people the obsession of self-development and consumption, seemingly leading to it becomes a way of sustaining the power of netocrats. At the same time, widening their circle is in the interest of netocrats as it is only justified so far as the new members have valuable contacts and knowledge. Their material wealth and social background are of no significance.

Moreover, the concept of Alexander Bard and Jan Söderqvist compared to the approaches of Christopher Lasch, and Anthony Giddens seems to distinguish from them by two significant facts. First, the individual, after defeating multiple barriers, is allowed to a certain degree of the possibility of going beyond the framework of narcissism and distrust. Second, Bard and Söderqvist do not try to describe the entire societies as experts in certain areas and laypersons in the others. They suggest that the network is common ground for all groups for both the communication and for the enslavement. Netocrats can, therefore, be characterized by the desire to interdisciplinary interests and the internationalization of their social relationships.

Richard Florida presented a slightly different approach to social stratification in the “late modernity.” The starting point in his theory leads to the assumption that the knowledge-based economy is—to a large extent—an immaterial and creative economy in which the importance of creativity is understood as the capacity for permanent creation of new products and services that have economic value (cf. Florida 2005b, 2010; Jung 2009, 109; Giddens 2009, 87–92). Broadly understood the category of the creation includes, for example, copyrights, patents, trademarks as well as architecture and design. Under this term, Florida has located similar products of music and film industry, as well as different urbanist projects, arts, and inventions. In the creative economy, there are two significant social classes: creative class and service class (Jung 2009, 110–116). Style of life and work of creative people—scientists, engineers, teachers, artists, graphic designers, writers, consultants, specialists in media and advertising, designers, and architects—is a blend of work and play, because the creativity can not be started and stopped at any time. This leads to the performance of employment activities in nonstandard hours of the day and night as well as a requirement of self-management of time. The result includes neglect of keeping the house in good condition as well as neglect of care for children or older parents, because the free time for these activities appears only, for instance, in the middle of the night when others are sleeping or during a day when others are working.

Creative people are required to carry out “an informal lifestyle” or to be dressed “cool.” They are expected to best express their personality as well as to represent the values of: individuality, self-expression, acceptance of differences, and searching for diverse experiences. Concern for physical activity is considered as the necessity for them. On the one hand, it is a fashion. On the other hand, it is the therapeutic response to longtime sedentary work, which leads to problems such as obesity and cardiovascular disease. Using the new exercises, sports, drugs, and cosmetics are associated with the promotion of their

professional image among the potential employers, business partners, and customers. Highly valued by creative people are eclectic tastes, avoiding commercialized sites and attractions, as well as “the consumption of experiences,” for example, the choice of goods and services because of the lifestyle and self-expression rather than the need to satisfy the material needs. Creative people can count on “welfare employer” who will make sure that their place of work is designed in a stimulating way and that they will feel that they do not need to go outside. The organized office spaces are replaced by open spaces that are reminiscent of cafeterias, clubs, artists’ studios, hotels, and vacation resorts. All of this has to inspire further work. Creative individuals are motivated by “soft” suggestions and gestures as well as personal contract based on their aspirations. Also, creative people are working in flexible hours, and at the expense of the employer can perform their projects, which together leads to self-exploitation.

A distinctive feature of being the creative class is a demand to perform work in the places that are “intriguing,” stimulating creativity through the tolerance, innovation, diversity, and friendliness in terms of differentiation of cultural services. For this reason, corporations are obliged to compete for a permanent encouragement of talents. Meanwhile, a service class does not have a choice of working time and is continuously exposed to their loss. Such people perform simplified operations, have lower earnings, and worse working conditions. They have a more inferior position that does not indicate, however, a lack of creative abilities but is the result of inefficient education systems and teaching methods that inhibit their development and use (Kopel 2007, 54). Creative people may need assistance from service providers coming from service class at any time of the day or night, including weekends. These can be, for example, banking, cultural, educational, catering, repair and maintenance services, travel, film screenings, as well as sports and entertainment at any time.

It should be noted that representatives of the creative class explicitly seek the ways to develop “self-governing capabilities” associated with narcissism. According to Nikolas Rose (1996, 154–159), these capabilities are enterprise and autonomy. Enterprise includes rules such as energy, initiative, ambition, calculation, and personal responsibility. People are seeking ways to maximize the human capital, to project them into the future, and to try to shape real life. Autonomy is defined as taking control of our undertakings, goals, and planning need through individual powers. Expertise is the main feature of technologies of the self that refer to practices and strategies by which individuals represent themselves and their ethical self-understanding (like responsabilization, healthism, and normalization or self-esteem). There are three aspects of expertise in the concept of self-governing capabilities (Rose 1996, 156):

- (1) Authority of scientificity and objectivity proofs.
- (2) Potential of expertise to mobilize within a political argument in distinctive ways.
- (3) Expertise operates through a relationship with the self-regulating abilities of individuals.

The creative class, therefore, is both the author and the subject of such practices.

Richard Florida’s proposal distinguishes from the concept of Alexander Bard and Jan Söderqvist by the fact that it does not refer to shape the global Internet network, but rather to the metropolitan network. It is also not only a theoretical proposition but also the result of empirical research. The limitation of this approach is the fact that it refers only to the market sector, and it does not include immediate decision-makers, representatives of non-governmental organizations as well as marginalized and excluded individuals. Moreover, in this theory, the “up” and “down” of hierarchy participates in the consumption at different levels. Nevertheless, while the activities of the creative class are similar to netocracy, the characteristics of a service class do not correspond to the description of consumtariat (cf. Bard, Söderqvist 2006, 150–151).

The experts, as members of the creative class, seem to manifest narcissistic personality characteristics to a large extent. This is partly because of their skills, and partly due to the impact of social environment and market (see Aldridge 2006, 61–66). Besides, the position of the creative class does not guarantee its security and stability. The emergence of social networking sites and mainstream services of Web 2.0 seems to expand the range selection of new creative personnel from among the active network users. Moreover, the service class seems to be more interested in “survival strategies” because of the uncertainty of their position. However, this class is not defined as a subclass devoid of opportunities for advancement. It seems that the representatives of this class are trying to imitate creative people, to a lesser or greater extent surround themselves with prestigious goods and take care of their own appearance and trying to get rapid promotion, for example, through migration to another region or country and by taking a different, other professions, which are occasionally contradictory in the interests of diversification their resume and portfolio (see Giddens 2004, 436–438). Moreover, both concepts include the topic of connections between work and entertainment. In Richard Florida’s ideas, it seems to bring benefits in the form of a greater variety of goods and services as well as improving their quality. From the point of view represented by Alexander Bard and Jan Söderqvist (2006, 99–106, 148–150) the relation of work and play refers instead carried out under the guise of entertainment control of human actions. In both cases, the authors do not seem to notice that games and plays are capable of reproduction of the trust and confidence as long as they are formed in the third sector or cultural and civic activities undertaken outside the market (see Rifkin 2002, 273–279; McGonigal 2010, 2011; Tapscott 2009).

7 Choice of the Development Path

The issue in which relationship of experts and cultural narcissism manifests itself is strategic management in developing countries and regions in order to improve the quality of life. After professionals of the United Nations Development Programme by the quality of life could be understood “category expressing the degree of human self-realization in terms of a holistic approach (at a balance of prosperity, welfare, and bliss) or more or less narrowed in terms, for example, from the perspective of consumption of material goods to meet its needs (with the dominance of the prosperity beyond the welfare and bliss)” (Borys 2008, 9). At this point, description requires a model of the two paths for development—molecular path and community path—proposed by Janusz Czapiński (2008, 24–25; 2009, 29–36). Molecular development is based on human capital, particularly in the education and health of citizens. It focuses on efficient activities, the ability to use information and knowledge, analyze and communicate when interpreting and solving problems. It also underlines improving the health and minimizing the occurrence of disease conditions and mental disorders that would make development more difficult or impossible. This path of development encourages the differentiation in the prosperity of the citizens in accordance with their competencies, motivations, and quality of life by equipping households with durable goods. The common good, in this case, is formed because of the mandatory collection of taxes, and the public investments are not very efficient.

The opposite of the molecular development is community development. This path focuses on the social capital, particularly on its indicators such as generalized trust and confidence, association with non-governmental organizations, control of corruption, and a positive attitude to democracy. Social capital is required for the success of the projects at a higher level of complexity that is based on the cooperation of central and local government, local

communities, businesses, and individual citizens. At this stage, the use of knowledge and health is no longer enough. Community development is a result of increase in the rate of infrastructure development, the efficiency of public investment, balanced increase in the prosperity of the citizens, equal opportunities of development of citizens, preventing a social exclusion, supplement the actions of state institutions by the citizens, increase their control and responsibility, as well as building and protecting the local culture from the commercialization.

Janusz Czapiński argues that, for example, in Poland, which is a member of the European Union, we can observe a particular paradox. After the year 1989—despite a weak social capital—the country has been growing dynamically in economic terms. This is the result of intensive alone citizens' investment in themselves: in their competence, psychological health, and welfare, as well as eliminating the difficulties in making a collective public investment through the use of access to external funding obtained from the programs of the European Union. It can, therefore, be assumed that narcissism is a cultural phenomenon that emerged in Polish society, along with the processes of system transformation from communism to the liberal democracy.

Assumptions about the opposition of relations between the community development and the molecular development require commentary. Such an interpretation is, of course, essential to carry out empirical measurement of current changes, also allows to see the adverse effects of individual actions and benefits from the collective action, but does not seem to correspond with a fundamental assumption of the concept of “late modernity.” The described approach instead generally treats man as a person with the possibility of admittedly changing his behavior, but only with a view to his own benefits, which casts into question the possibility of one's “transition” to the smooth functioning of the community. Moreover, that approach resembles the dilemma

of individualism and collectivism—opposing the individual characteristics to social characteristics.

For example, in the literature on the reported subject are the results of comparative studies of the social and economic organization of countries in the western and eastern cultures (see Fukuyama 1997b; Hampden-Turner, Trompenaars 2000). It is even assumed that widespread of “inner-directed” personality resulted in the successful development of the United States. Such personality is based on the conviction that people can and should control their environment by using impulses coming from their own “interiors.” Meanwhile, Japanese successes were based on the “other-directed” personality of its citizens, on the conviction that external forces govern them, often do not respond to their control, such as the elements of nature, but also financial flows and information flows. Charles Hampden-Turner and Fons Trompenaars (2000) have shown that the first—individual approach—in the context of expert systems entails significantly and influences on the cultural narcissism:

“Individualism means the risk of bringing knowledge of what the casual nomadic experts come up. (...) Almost everyone indefatigably teaching the art of building better relationships between people, arguing that companies should be better integrated, consistent, harmonious, sensitive to the needs of workers, united by ties of cooperation, not indifferent to the environmental problems. However, who we are? Casual wanderers and poorly organized academic individualists not associated with those companies that we want to merge. The whole culture of consultants is American. The very concept of sending the wise individual in order to repair the situation in a group is deeply individualistic. (...) In addition, individualism, especially in its extreme form, is better adapted for human consumption than the production. We consume as individuals and with each year of the same variety of goods and services encourage us to

gaining individual attitudes and shaping personal styles. Whereas the production of goods is the more disciplined collective effort. The decline of production in countries with an individualistic culture—with excessive consumption driving inflation rate in the pursuit of too little goods—seems to increasingly being illness of the individualistic economy, at least in developed countries” (Hampden-Turner, Fons Trompenaars 2000, 61–62).

Collectivistic cultures seem to be therefore more resistant to the phenomenon of cultural narcissism, but also the cult of expertise. Therefore, the most significant benefits might bring a skillful combination of individual and collective features. The ideas and inventions are created by the creative individuals that minds by internal impulses are shaping new conceptual relationships. Nevertheless, the more complex they are, the more their implementation and application are dependent on the activities of groups and adapt their members to external factors (Hampden-Turner, Fons Trompenaars 2000, 66–69). In addition, the extreme forms of teamwork can lead even to the individualization, or a sense of anonymity combined with the loss of discipline of one’s own behavior, which leads to increased impulsiveness and morbidity of undertaking activities as well as to the grouping syndrome involving more taking care of members of the group in maintaining its cohesion and solidarity, than the realistic consideration of the facts (Aronson, Wilson, Akert 1997, 366–382). The second phenomenon primarily affects those experts who may be concerned with negative sanctions if they decide to disclose unfavorable facts, warning signs or excessively groundbreaking, and radical ideas. The result is self-censorship, an illusion of consensus, as well as making erroneous decisions without alternative plans in case of failure.

Molecular and community vision of development could complement one another. It is essential, therefore, to seek ways of maintaining their equilibrium.

Studies of this kind are located in the mainstream of theoretical sociology of everyday life in which one of the fundamental assumptions is moving away from opposing the individual and society. It is assumed in this approach the claim by George H. Mead that human personality comprises both subjective aspects (*I*) expressing the possibility of undertaking the individual spontaneous and genuine activities, as well as an objective aspect (*me*) responsible for the conventional actions and routines subordinated to the requirements of community (cf. Sztompka 2008, 31–32). Besides, it is recognized that both human capital leading to molecular development and social capital enabling the community development, is accumulated in the human resources, that are people along with their abilities and experiences (Sadowski 2006, 21). This feedback is also visible in the indicated trust and confidence-building methods that can be the effect of a formalized education system and the ongoing informal lifelong learning processes of human. Attempt to exceed this division has also taken by Richard Florida by proposing the concept of creative capital, which would be a derivative from the human capital in conjunction with weak interpersonal ties (in other words: *thin social capital*). These links do not impede the creative activities of individuals and simultaneously would be open to immigrants and people with different characteristics and views (cf. Florida 2010, 276–292; Kopel 2007, 53–54; Theiss 2007, 33–39).

It is also assumed that in the knowledge society and economy based on knowledge two convictions seem to be of most significance: that individual self-realization leads to the development of the community, as well as the community that serves to maintain individual needs. This approach, however requires departing from thinking in terms of statism, from the belief in the possibility and necessity of management development of the group of governmental experts towards extensive participation in a defining and implementing the common goal of policy-makers, business representatives, and local communities (Hampden-Turner, Trompenaars 2000, 150–151). This

approach is closer to take continuous daily crisis management and working on a never-ending project, than incidental planning which achievements only apparently could lead to the relaxation and abandonment of responsibility (see Fukuyama 1997a, 158–169).

It comes with a substantial change in management requirements for socio-economic development. It is no longer sufficient even though the adoption of existing in the modernization theory's assumption that the mass media can serve the expert activities aimed at the dissemination of modern personality characteristics based on the great need for achievement and high levels of empathy and nonconformity. There is a noticeable fact that the mass media, which could contemporarily serve psychotherapy functions on a large scale, serve instead for the different purposes, becoming a threat to democracy, and undermines the possibility of forming a trust-based civil society (cf. Szczepański 1997, 52–55; Jałowiecki 2008, 109).

In addition, the mass media at the beginning of 21st century, present experts as incompetent individuals, who are lost in reality and cannot reach out to average citizen, expressing themselves on issues, in which they actually are not engaged in their professional life, as well as compelled by the logic of mass media functioning to present a simple and load-bearing metaphor rather than facts from their research areas (see Godzic 2007, 258–272). The journalists themselves, realizing the complexity of scientific papers either resign from writing about science, or treating its achievements as a curiosity, encouraging professionals and their institutions to create a press release department as well as shaping of contacts with the environment and protecting their professional image by public relations (Chyliński, Russ-Mohl 2008, 252–259). These facts seem to be particularly important in conditions of cultural narcissism and the cult of expertise.

The concept of combining molecular and community development leads to the demand for the reorganization of public debate systems and decision-

making procedures. Presentation of solutions related to the growing interdependence of people, their groups, and institutions with the largest scale of risk requires a separate study.

At this point, it is sufficient to indicate only the signs of further theoretical and practical studies related to developing concepts that are combining the characteristics of:

- (1) Model of “round table” by Ulrich Beck (see 2009, 47–78) describing the development of intermediation institutions that capture various problems, not as separate issues, but as interrelated (for example, addressing the environmental issues includes the implementation of economic, social, innovation, and cultural policies). An extensive collaboration of various entities and stakeholders is assumed in this model, as well as consultations, compromises, and efforts to go beyond the opinions of experts.
- (2) Bruno Latour’s nature policy (cf. Bińczyk 2006, 166–170; Latour 2009), which crucial postulate is to change the shape of public debate, striving to use in its conceptual categories expressing the heterogeneity of contemporary phenomena, their global dimension as well as the harmonious combining skills and opinions of scientists, politicians, economists, moralists, administrators, bureaucrats, and diplomats.
- (3) Formation and institutionalization of prefigurative culture by Margaret Mead (see 1978, 106–147), that is one in which the older generations are no longer teaching, the younger generations because these relationships have been reversed—children and young people better handle with the thinking and understanding of the future.
- (4) The 21st-century democracy by Alvin Toffler (see Toffler, Toffler 1996, 88–109) in which all kinds of minorities and diverse groups have to represent and to play essential roles, the citizens strive to a greater self-representation in government. Also, it comes with changes in the distribution of local, regional, national, and international levels on which decisions are taken.

(5) The participatory expertise by Damien S. Pfister (2011; cf. Stilgoe, Irwin, Jones 2006) which describes opening up knowledge production by hosting multi-perspectival conversations in environments of many-to-many communication like Wikipedia.

All of these approaches emphasize the high pace of changes in contemporary societies, their diversity, impact on people's living conditions, limitations of a simple forecasting and expert rationality, the processes of decentralization authority, and changes in intergenerational relationships.

Conclusion

The book attempted to review the sociological concepts of dependencies between the expert's roles and the phenomenon of cultural narcissism. At the same time, certain efforts were made to update their description in terms adequate to the "late modernity" societies and to the technological breakthrough that is occurring with the popularization of equipment and systems of information and communications technologies.

This publication described basic features of expert systems; cultural narcissism; an expert role as a participant in social change; model types and kinds of experts; and types of their initiations into ontological and epistemological structures of the social world; and selected contemporary issues that contain present mutual relations of the experts and phenomenon of cultural narcissism. It also introduces, in brief, such concepts as risk management, trust management, governmentality, biopower and biopolitics, epistemic communities and communities of practice, user-generated content, Wikinomics, and the attention economy.

Undertaken considerations may be used as a starting point for more sophisticated theoretical and empirical studies. Their results could be addressed to change the organization of work of all main stakeholders of the contemporary public sphere: experts, policy-makers, entrepreneurs, representatives of non-governmental organizations, mass media, business institutions, and users of new technologies themselves.

This book recognized at least some research needs:

- (1) Clarifying the roles of experts and novices, amateurs in the knowledge society and economy based on knowledge.
- (2) Methods and strategies of adapting to changes and social inclusion, both in geographical space as well as in cyberspace undertaken by the experts.

- (3) Experts' attitudes towards the abolition of restrictions on access to specialist knowledge and positive and negative effects of those transitions.
- (4) Choices in terms of trust and confidence substitutes, and the methods of its reconstruction, social advancement and encouraging, and implementation of the vision of the socio-economic community development.

The indicated directions for further research do not represent an exhaustive list. They are merely starting points that may expand the scope of activities in the sociology of expertise and intervention studies.

Application of such subjects of analysis could be noted here:

- (1) Programs and manifestos of expert groups and communities, new social movements, and representative groups of the creative class and service class.
- (2) Both successful and unsuccessful cases of implementation of above documents, consultation, diagnosis, and any stored documentation of proposed project of change in the form of broadly defined written texts, imaging, electronic and audiovisual media contents, and artistic works.
- (3) Decision-making processes that take into account the roles of experts and novices or amateurs together with their conversations and memoirs, diaries or biographies and conducting observations, in-depth interviews, and focus group interviews with their involvement.

Suggested topics for further research may allow breaking of the traditional theoretical divisions, to better understand the characteristics of the "late modernity," and to take action for reducing the scale of risks and uncertainties in human life.

Bibliography

Books

- Adamska, Agata, and Sławomir Sztaba, eds. 2007. *Ekonomia od A do Z. Encyklopedia podręczna [Economics from A to Z: Encyclopedia]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Aldridge, Alan E. 2006. *Konsumpcja [Consumption]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sic!
- Aronson, Elliot, Timothy D. Wilson, and Robin M. Akert. 1997. *Psychologia społeczna. Serce i umysł [Social Psychology]*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- Attali, Jacques. 2002. *Słownik XXI wieku [Dictionnaire du XXIe Siècle]*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie.
- Attali, Jacques. 2008. *Krótką historią przyszłości [Breve Histoire De L'avenir]*. Warsaw: Prószyński i S-ka.
- Bard, Alexander, and Jan Söderqvist. 2006. *Netokracja. Nowa elita władzy i życie po kapitalizmie [Nätokraterna: Boken Om Det Elektroniska Klassamhället]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash, eds. 2009. *Modernizacja refleksyjna. Polityka, tradycja i estetyka w porządku społecznym nowoczesności [Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bell, Daniel. 1973. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books.
- Borys, Tadeusz, and Piotr Rogala, eds. 2008c. *Jakość życia na poziomie lokalnym. Ujęcie wskaźnikowe [Quality of Life at the Local Level - Indicator Approach]*. Warszawa: UNDP.

- Boswell, Christina. 2009. *The Political Uses of Expert Knowledge: Immigration Policy and Social Research*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loic J. Wacquant. 2001. *Zaproszenie do socjologii refleksyjnej [Réponses Pour Une Anthropologie Reflexive]*. Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Bradwell, Peter. 2010. *Private Lives: A People's Inquiry into Personal Information*. London: Demos.
- Cellary, Wojciech, ed. 2002. *Raport o Rozwoju Społecznym. Polska 2001. Polska w drodze do globalnego społeczeństwa informacyjnego [Human Development Report: Poland 2001: Poland and the Global Information Society]*. Warszawa: UNDP.
- Chyliński, Marek, and Stephan Russ-Mohl. 2008. *Dziennikarstwo [Journalism]*. Warsaw: Grupa Wydawnicza Polskapresse.
- Collins, Harry, and Robert Evans. 2007. *Rethinking Expertise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cooke, Roger M. 1991. *Experts in Uncertainty: Opinion and Subjective Probability in Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davenport, Thomas H., and John C. Beck. 2001. *The Attention Economy: Understanding the New Currency of Business*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Derber, Charles. 2002. *Zaistnieć w społeczeństwie. O potrzebie zwracania na siebie uwagi [The Pursuit of Attention: Power and Ego in Everyday Life]*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydaw. Psychologiczne.
- Dusek, Val. 2006. *Philosophy of Technology: An Introduction*. Malden, MA, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ericsson, Karl A., Neil Charness, Paul J. Feltovich, and Robert R. Hoffman, eds. 2006. *The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Fischer, Frank. 2009. *Democracy and Expertise: Reorienting Policy Inquiry*. New York NY: Oxford University Press.
- Florida, Richard. 2005b. *The Flight of the Creative Class: The New Global Competition for Talent*. New York: Harper Business.
- Florida, Richard. 2010. *Narodziny klasy kreatywnej. Oraz jej wpływ na przeobrażenia w charakterze pracy, wypoczynku, społeczeństwa i życia codziennego* [*Rise of the Creative Class: and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*]. Warsaw: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.
- Frąckiewicz, Lucyna, and Andrzej Rączaszek, eds. 2004. *Kapitał społeczny* [*Social Capital*]. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej im Karola Adamieckiego.
- Friedman, Thomas L. 2006. *Świat jest płaski. Krótka historia XXI wieku* [*The World Is Flat*]. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1997a. *Ostatni człowiek* [*End of History and the Last Man*]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1997b. *Zaufanie. Kapitał społeczny a droga do dobrobytu* [*Trust: the Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*]. Warsaw, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2002. *Nowoczesność i tożsamość. "Ja" i społeczeństwo w epoce późnej nowoczesności* [*Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2004. *Socjologia* [*Sociology*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2008. *Konsekwencje nowoczesności* [*The Consequences of Modernity*]. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2009. *Europa w epoce globalnej* [*Europe in the Global Age*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Goćkowski, Janusz. 2009. *Traktat o inżynierii polityki. Studium historycznej socjologii wiedzy o technologii społecznej* [*The Treaty of Engineering Policy: Study the Historical Sociology of Knowledge about Social Technology*]. Pułtusk: Akademia Humanistyczna im. Aleksandra Gieysztora.
- Godlewski, Grzegorz, and Andrzej Mencwel, eds. 2001. *Antropologia kultury. Zagadnienia i wybór tekstów* [*Cultural Anthropology: Issues and a Selection of Texts, Part 2: I*]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Godzic, Wiesław. 2007. *Znani z tego, że są znani. Celebryci w kulturze tabloidów* [*Famous That They Are Known: Celebrities in Tabloid Culture*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Człowiek w teatrze życia codziennego* [*The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*]. Warsaw: PIW.
- Goodwin, Paul, and George Wright. 2011. *Analiza decyzji* [*Decision Analysis for Management Judgment*]. Warsaw: Oficyna Wolters Kluwer Polska.
- Griffin, Ricky W. 2005. *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami* [*Management*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Grudzewski, Wiesław M., Irena K. Hejduk, Anna Sankowska, and Monika Wańtuchowicz. 2007. *Zarządzanie zaufaniem w organizacjach wirtualnych* [*Trust Management in Virtual Organizations*]. Warszawa: Difin.
- Grudzewski, Wiesław M., Irena K. Hejduk, Anna Sankowska, and Monika Wańtuchowicz. 2009. *Zarządzanie zaufaniem w przedsiębiorstwie. Koncepcje, narzędzia, zastosowania* [*Trust Management in the Enterprise: The Concept, Tools, Applications*]. Kraków, Warszawa: Oficyna Wolters Kluwer Polska.
- Hałas, Elżbieta, ed. 2001. *Rozumienie zmian społecznych* [*Understanding Social Change*]. Lublin: Tow. Nauk. Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

- Hampden-Turner, Charles, and Alfons Trompenaars. 2000. *Siedem kultur kapitalizmu. USA, Japonia, Niemcy, Francja, Wielka Brytania, Szwecja, Holandia* [*The Seven Cultures of Capitalism: Value Systems for Creating Wealth in the United States, Japan, Germany, France, Britain, Sweden, and the Netherlands*]. Cracow: Oficyna Ekonomiczna: Dom Wydaw. ABC.
- Harvey, David. 1995. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford England, Cambridge Mass. USA: Blackwell.
- Held, David. 2006. *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge UK, Malden, MA: Polity.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 2007. *Zderzenie cywilizacji i nowy kształt ładu światowego* [*The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*]. Warsaw: Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie MUZA SA.
- Irwin, Alan. 1995. *Citizen Science: A Study of People, Expertise and Sustainable Development*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Kaczmarek, Jerzy. 2001. *Joseph Beuys. Od sztuki do społecznej utopii* [*Joseph Beuys from Art to Social Utopia*]. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Kaczmarek, Tadeusz T. 2005. *Ryzyko i zarządzanie ryzykiem. Ujęcie interdyscyplinarne* [*Risks and Risk Management: Interdisciplinary Approach*]. Warsaw: Difin.
- Keen, Andrew. 2007. *Kult amatora. Jak internet niszczy kulturę* [*The Cult of the Amateur: How Today's Internet Is Killing Our Culture*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Kloc, Kazimierz, and Ewa Chmielecka, eds. 2004. *Dobre obyczaje w kształceniu akademickim* [*Good Manners in Academic Education*]. Warszawa: Fundacja Promocji i Akredytacji Kierunków Ekonomicznych.
- Kobylarek, Aleksander, ed. 2009. *Wspólnota i różnica. Interdyscyplinarne studia, analizy i rozprawy* [*The Community and Difference: studies, analyses and essays*].

- Interdisciplinary Studies, Analyzes and Hearing*]. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Kukliński, Antoni, and Elżbieta Mączyńska-Ziemacka, eds. 2011. *Polska myśl strategiczna. Na spotkanie z enigmą XXI wieku [Polish Strategic Thought: at the Meeting with the Enigma of 21st Century]*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Ekonomiczne.
- Kukliński, Antoni, Krzysztof Pawłowski, and Jacek Woźniak, eds. 2009. *Kreatywna i innowacyjna Europa wobec wyzwań XXI wieku [Creative and Innovative Europe and the Challenges of the 21st Century]*. Cracow: Urząd Marszałkowski Województwa Małopolskiego.
- Kurczewska, Joanna. 1997. *Technokraci i ich świat społeczny [Technocrats and Their Social World]*. Warsaw: Wydawn. IFiS PAN.
- Kurz-Milcke, Elke, and Gerd Gigerenzer, eds. 2004. *Experts in Science and Society*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Lanier, Jaron. 2010. *You Are Not a Gadget: A Manifesto*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Lasch, Christopher. 1991. *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Latour, Bruno. 2009. *Polityka natury. Nauki wkraczają do demokracji [Politiques De La Nature: Comment Faire Entrer Les Sciences En Démocratie]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.
- Lemke, Thomas. 2011. *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Malikowski, Marian., and Stanisław Marczuk, eds. 1997. *Socjologia ogólna. Wybór tekstów [General Sociology: The Selection of Texts, Volume III]*. Tyczyn: Wyższa Szkoła Społeczno-Gospodarcza.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1992. *Ideologia i utopia [Ideologie Und Utopie]*. Lublin: Wydaw. "Test".

- Marody, Mirosława, and Anna Giza. 2004. *Przemiany więzi społecznych. Zarys teorii zmiany społecznej [Transformations of Social Ties: The Basic Theory of Social Change]*. Warsaw: Scholar.
- McGonigal, Jane. 2011. *Reality Is Broken: Why Games Make Us Better and How They Can Change the World*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Mead, Margaret. 1978. *Kultura i tożsamość. Studium dystansu międzypokoleniowego [Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap]*. Warsaw: Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Mikuła, Bogusz. 2006. *Organizacje oparte na wiedzy [Knowledge-based Organizations]*. Cracow: Wydawn. Akademii Ekonomicznej w Krakowie.
- Pacholski, Maksymilian, and Andrzej Słaboń, eds. 1997. *Słownik pojęć socjologicznych [Sociological Glossary]*. Kraków: Akademia Ekonomiczna w Krakowie.
- Postman, Neil. 2004. *Technopol. Triumf techniki nad kultura [Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology]*. Warsaw: Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie MUZA SA.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rich, Andrew. 2004. *Think Tanks, Public Policy, and the Politics of Expertise*. Cambridge UK, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rifkin, Jeremy. 2002. *Wiek dostępu. Nowa kultura hiperkapitalizmu, w której płaci się za każdą chwilę życia [The Age of Access: The New Culture of Hypercapitalism, Where All of Life Is a Paid-for Experience]*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie.
- Rose, Nikolas S. 1996. *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power, and Personhood*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sadowski, Andrzej. 2006. *Białystok. Kapitał społeczny mieszkańców miasta [Białystok Social Capital City of Białystok's Citizens Wse]*. Białystok: Wyższa Szkoła Ekonomiczna w Białymstoku.

- Scott, John. 2006. *Władza [Power]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sic!
- Sieńczyło-Chlabicz, Joanna D. 2006. *Naruszenie prywatności osób publicznych przez prasę. Analiza cywilnoprawna [Invasion of Privacy of Public Figures by the Press: Analysis of Civil Law]*. Cracow: Zakamycze.
- Sławiński, Andrzej, Joachim Osiński, and Sławomir Sztaba, eds. 2009. *Nauki społeczne wobec kryzysu na rynkach finansowych [Social Sciences on the Crisis in the Financial Markets]*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydaw. SGH.
- Stefanowicz, Bogdan. 2002. *Sztuczna inteligencja i systemy eksperckie. Przewodnik [Artificial Intelligence and Expert Systems: Guide]*. Warsaw: Oficyna Wydaw. SGH.
- Stilgoe, Jack, Alan Irwin, and Kevin Jones. 2006. *The Received Wisdom: Opening Up Expert Advice*. London: Demos.
- Szczepański, Marek S., Krzysztof Bierwiazzonek, and Tomasz Nawrocki, eds. 2008. *Kapitały ludzkie i społeczne a konkurencyjność regionów [Human and Social Capital and Competitiveness of the Regions]*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Szomburg, Jan, ed. 2009. *Jakie Razem Polaków w XXI wieku? Wspólnota tożsamości, zasad czy działań? [What Together of Poles in the 21st Century? Community of Identities, Policies or Actions?]*. Gdańsk: Instytut Badań nad Gospodarką Rynkową.
- Sztompka, Piotr, and Małgorzata Bogunia-Borowska, eds. 2008. *Socjologia codzienności [Sociology of Everyday Life]*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Sztompka, Piotr. 2002. *Socjologia. Analiza społeczeństwa [Sociology: Analysis of Society]*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Sztompka, Piotr. 2007. *Zaufanie. Fundament społeczeństwa [Trust: The Foundation of Society]*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Tapscott, Don, and Anthony D. Williams. 2006. *Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything*. New York: Portfolio.

- Tapscott, Don, and Anthony D. Williams. 2010. *Macrowikinomics: Rebooting Business and the World*. New York: Portfolio/Penguin.
- Tapscott, Don. 2009. *Grown Up Digital: How the Net Generation is Changing Your World*. Nueva York, EUA: McGraw-Hill.
- Theiss, Maria. 2007. *Krewni, znajomi, obywatele. Kapitał społeczny a lokalna polityka społeczna [Relatives, Friends, Citizens: Social Capital and Local Social Policy]*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Toffler, Alvin, and Heidi Toffler. 1996. *Budowa nowej cywilizacji. Polityka trzeciej fali [Creating a New Civilization: The Politics of the Third Wave]*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- White, Stuart G. 2008. *Równość [Equality]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sic!
- Zacher, Lech W. 2007. *Transformacje społeczeństw. Od informacji do wiedzy interdyscyplinarne wykłady, wpływ techniki i globalizacji [Transforming Societies: from Information to Knowledge]*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo C. H. Beck.
- Zelek, Aneta. 2003. *Zarządzanie kryzysem w przedsiębiorstwie - perspektywa strategiczna [Crisis Management in the Enterprise - Strategic Perspective]*. Warsaw: Orgmasz.
- Zorska, Anna. 2007. *Korporacje transnarodowe. Przemiany, oddziaływania, wyzwania [Transnational Corporations: Transformation, Impact, Challenges]*. Warsaw: Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.

Articles and Book Chapters

- Beck, Ulrich. 2009. "Ponowne odkrycie polityki: przyczynek do teorii modernizacji refleksyjnej [The Reinvention of Politics: Towards a Theory of Reflexive Modernization]." In *Modernizacja refleksyjna. Polityka, tradycja i estetyka w porządku społecznym nowoczesności [Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social*

- Order*], edited by Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash, 11–78. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Berman, Saul J., and Bennett E. McClellan. 2002. “Ten Strategies for Survival in the Attention Economy.” *Strategy & Leadership* 30 (3): 28–33.
- Beuys, Joseph. 2001. “Każdy artystą [Everyone’s an Artist].” In *Antropologia kultury. Zagadnienia i wybór tekstów [Cultural Anthropology: Issues and a Selection of Texts, Part 2: I]*, edited by Grzegorz Godlewski and Andrzej Mencwel, 543–47. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Bińczyk, Ewa. 2006. “Bruno Latour i jego remedium na bolączki świata współczesnego [Bruno Latour and His Remedy for the Ills of the Modern World].” *Studia Socjologiczne* 1 (180): 155–71.
- Borys, Tadeusz, and Piotr Rogala. 2008. “Jakość życia jako przedmiot pomiaru wskaźnikowego [Quality of Life as an Object of Indicative Measurement].” In *Jakość życia na poziomie lokalnym. Ujęcie wskaźnikowe [Quality of Life at the Local Level - Indicator Approach]*, edited by Tadeusz Borys and Piotr Rogala, 9–16. Warsaw: UNDP.
- Cellary, Wojciech. 2002. “Przemiany społeczne [Social Change].” In *Raport o Rozwoju Społecznym. Polska 2001. Polska w drodze do globalnego społeczeństwa informacyjnego [Human Development Report: Poland 2001: Poland and the Global Information Society]*, edited by Wojciech Cellary, 13–17. Warsaw: UNDP.
- Chmielecka, Ewa. 2004. “Informacja, wiedza, mądrość - co społeczeństwo wiedzy cenić powinno? [Information, Knowledge, Wisdom - What Knowledge Society Should Value?].” In *Dobre obyczaje w kształceniu akademickim [Good Manners in Academic Education]*, edited by Kazimierz Kloc and Ewa Chmielecka, 55–65. Warsaw: Fundacja Promocji i Akredytacji Kierunków Ekonomicznych.
- Crawford, Walt. 2007. “Long Live the Audience!.” *EContent* 30 (8): 23.

- Czapiński, Janusz. 2008. "Kapitał ludzki i kapitał społeczny a dobrobyt materialny. Polski paradoks [Human Capital and Social Capital and Material Prosperity: Polish Paradox]." *Zarządzanie Publiczne* (2 (4)): 5–28.
- Czapiński, Janusz. 2009. "Kapitał społeczny w Polsce. Kiedy stanie się niezbędną przesłanką naszego rozwoju? [Social Capital in Poland: When It Becomes Necessary Prerequisite for Our Development?]." In *Jakie Razem Polaków w XXI wieku? Wspólnota tożsamości, zasad czy działań?* [What Together of Poles in the 21st Century? Community of Identities, Policies or Actions?], edited by Jan Szomburg, 19–37. Gdańsk: Instytut Badań nad Gospodarką Rynkową.
- Evans, Robert. 2008. "The Sociology of Expertise: The Distribution of Social Fluency." *Sociology Compass* 2 (1): 281–98.
- Eyal, Gil, and Larissa Buchholz. 2010. "From the Sociology of Intellectuals to the Sociology of Interventions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 117–37.
- Florida, Richard. 2005a. "The World Is Spiky: Globalization Has Changed the Economic Playing Field, but Hasn't Levelled It." *Atlantic Monthly* 296 (10): 48–51.
- Fukuyama, Francis, and Seth Colby. 2009. "Co oni sobie myśleli? [What Were They Thinking?]." *Europa - Magazyn Idei Newsweeka* (4.09.2009): 6–7.
- Goćkowski, Janusz. 2001. "Teoretyk i ekspert: role uczestnika przemian społecznych [Theorist and Expert: Roles of Participant in Social Change]." In *Rozumienie zmian społecznych [Understanding Social Change]*, edited by Elżbieta Hałas, 185–215. Lublin: Tow. Nauk. Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Goldhaber, Michael H. 1997. "The Attention Economy and the Net." *First Monday* 2 (4).
<http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/519/440>. Accessed December 28, 2011.

- Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46 (1): 1–35.
- Hamm, Bernd. 2004. "Kapitał społeczny z punktu widzenia socjologicznego [Social Capital from a Sociological Point of View]." In *Kapitał społeczny [Social Capital]*, edited by Lucyna Frąckiewicz and Andrzej Rączaszek, 49–59. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej im Karola Adamickiego.
- Jałowiecki, Bohdan. 2008. "Media a społeczeństwo obywatelskie [Media and Civil Society]." In *Kapitały ludzkie i społeczne a konkurencyjność regionów [Human and Social Capital and Competitiveness of the Regions]*, edited by Marek S. Szczepański, Krzysztof. Bierwiazzonek, and Tomasz Nawrocki, 101–10. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Jung, Bohdan. 1997. "Kapitalizm postmodernistyczny [Postmodern Capitalism]." *Ekonomista* (5-6): 1–17.
www.sgh.waw.pl/instytuty/ism/publikacje/Kapitalizm_postmodernistyczny.pdf. Accessed December 28, 2011.
- Jung, Bohdan. 2009. "Kryzys czasu, czas kreatywności i współpracy [Crisis of Time, the Time of Creativity and Co-operation]." In *Nauki społeczne wobec kryzysu na rynkach finansowych [Social Sciences on the Crisis in the Financial Markets]*, edited by Andrzej Sławiński, Joachim Osiński, and Sławomir Sztaba, 101–24. Warsaw: Oficyna Wydaw. SGH.
- Klimczuk, Andrzej. 2009. "Wiekizm jako przeszkoda w budowie społeczeństwa mądrości [Ageism as an Obstacle in the Construction of a Wisdom Based Society]." In *Wspólnota i różnica. Interdyscyplinarne studia, analizy i rozprawy [The Community and Difference: Interdisciplinary Studies, Analyses and Hearing]*, edited by Aleksander Kobylarek, 344–60. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

- Kopel, Anna. 2007. "Klasa kreatywna jako czynnik rozwoju miast [Creative Class as a Factor in Urban Development]." *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Humanitas* 1: 51–58.
- Kukliński, Antoni. 2011. "Od gospodarki opartej na wiedzy do gospodarki opartej na mądrości. Na spotkanie z enigmą XXI wieku [From Knowledge-based Economy to an Economy Based on Wisdom: At the Meeting with the Enigma of the XXI Century]." In *Polska myśl strategiczna. Na spotkanie z enigmą XXI wieku [Polish Strategic Thought: at the Meeting with the Enigma of 21st Century]*, edited by Antoni Kukliński and Elżbieta Mączyńska-Ziemacka, 65–68. Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Ekonomiczne.
- Lash, Scott. 2009. "Refleksyjność i jej sobowtóry: struktura, estetyka, wspólnota [Reflexivity and Its Doubles: Structures, Aesthetics, Community]." In Beck, Giddens, Lash, and Konieczny, *Modernizacja refleksyjna. Polityka, tradycja i estetyka w porządku społecznym nowoczesności [Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order]*, 145–221.
- Luoma-aho, Vilma, and David Nordfors. 2009. "Attention and Reputation in the Innovation Economy." *Innovation Journalism* 6 (2): 1–18.
- Pacholski, Maksymilian. 2001. "Technokracja [Technocracy]." In *Słownik pojęć socjologicznych [Sociological Glossary]*, edited by Maksymilian Pacholski and Andrzej Słaboń, 204. Cracow: Akademia Ekonomiczna w Krakowie.
- Pfister, Damien S. 2011. "Networked Expertise in the Era of Many-to-many Communication: on Wikipedia and Invention." *Social Epistemology* 25 (3): 217–31.
- Poulet, Bernard. 2009. "Cyberwojna już trwa - wywiad z Nicolasem Arpagianem [Cyberwar Is Already Underway - an Interview with Nicolas Arpagian]." *Forum* (44-45): 74–76.

- Skågebya, Jörgen. 2009. "Exploring Qualitative Sharing Practices of Social Metadata: Expanding the Attention Economy." *The Information Society* 25 (1): 60–72.
- Szczepański, Marek S. 1997. "Pokusy nowoczesności [The Temptations of Modernity]." In *Socjologia ogólna. Wybór tekstów [General Sociology: The Selection of Texts, Volume III]*, edited by Marian Malikowski and Stanisław Marczuk, 21–70. Tyczyn: Wyższa Szkoła Społeczno-Gospodarcza.
- Sztaba, Sławomir. 2007. "Etatyzm [Etatism]." In *Ekonomia od A do Z. Encyklopedia podręczna [Economics from A to Z: Encyclopedia]*, edited by Agata Adamska and Sławomir Sztaba, 119–20. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Sztaba, Sławomir. 2007. "Technokracja [Technocracy]." In Adamska and Sztaba, *Ekonomia od A do Z. Encyklopedia podręczna [Economics from A to Z: Encyclopedia]*, 470–71.
- Sztompka, Piotr. 2008. "Życie codzienne - temat najnowszej socjologii [Everyday Life - about the Recent Sociology]." In *Socjologia codzienności [Sociology of Everyday Life]*, edited by Piotr Sztompka and Małgorzata Bogunia-Borowska, 15–52. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Znak.

Netography

- "Buzz Marketing." Accessed December 28, 2011.
http://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buzz_marketing.
- "Citizen Journalism." Accessed December 28, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizen_journalism.
- "Dziennikarstwo obywatelskie [Citizen Journalism]." Accessed December 28, 2011. http://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dziennikarstwo_obywatelskie.
- "Word-of-mouth Marketing." Accessed December 28, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Word-of-mouth_marketing.

- Bank of I.D.E.A.S. 2011a. "158 Things I Can Do to Build Social Capital in My Community." Accessed December 28, 2011.
www.bankofideas.com.au/Downloads/Social_Capital_Handout_1.pdf.
- Bank of I.D.E.A.S. 2011b. "137 Community Projects That Build Social Capital." Accessed December 28, 2011.
www.bankofideas.com.au/Downloads/Social_Capital_Handout_2.pdf.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 2011. "The Predictioneer's Game." Accessed December 28, 2011. www.predictioneersgame.com.
- Eyal, Gil, and Grace Pok. 2011. "From a Sociology of Professions to a Sociology of Expertise, a lecture from the conference Capturing Security Expertise, Copenhagen, 16-17.06.2011." Accessed December 28, 2011.
http://cast.ku.dk/papers_security_expertise/Eyal__2011_From_a_sociology_of_professions_to_a_sociology_of_expertise.pdf.
- Kosiński, Bartosz. 2009. "WikiŚwiat - Prawda, rzeczywistość i inne złudzenia w epoce WEB 2.0 [Wikiworlds - the Truth, Reality and Other Illusions in the Era of Web 2.0]: lecture from the conference i3: internet - infrastruktury - innowacje, Poznań, 6.11.2009." Accessed December 28, 2011. www.i3conference.net/online/2009/prezentacje/Wikiswiat_-_prawda,_rzeczywistosc_i_inne_zludzenia_w_epoce_WEB_2.0.pdf.
- McGonigal, Jane. 2010. "Gaming Can Make a Better World, a lecture from the conference TED2010, Palm Springs, 9-11.02.2010." Accessed December 28, 2011.
www.ted.com/talks/jane_mcgonigal_gaming_can_make_a_better_world.html.
- Nielsen, Jakob. 2006. "Participation Inequality: Encouraging More Users to Contribute." Accessed December 28, 2011.
www.useit.com/alertbox/participation_inequality.html.
- Olcoń, Marta. 2006. "Blog jako nowa forma uspołecznienia [Blog as a New Form of Socialization]: lecture from the conference II Ogólnopolskie

Symposium Fizyka w Ekonomii i Naukach Społecznych, Cracow, 21-22.04.2006.” Accessed December 28, 2011.

www.ftj.agh.edu.pl/doc/pl/fens2/2fens_olcon.pdf.

Saguaro Seminar, Civic Engagement in America at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government. 2009. “150 Things You Can Do to Build Social Capital.” Accessed December 28, 2011.

www.bettertogether.org/pdfs/150things.pdf.

Wunsch-Vincent, Sacha, and Graham Vickery. 2007. “Participative Web: User-Created Content.” Accessed December 28, 2011.

www.oecd.org/dataoecd/57/14/38393115.pdf.

Index

- Abstract systems, 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16
Administrators, 10, 29, 66
Adulthood, 16
Advertising, 15, 32, 34, 35, 36, 48, 52
Advisers, 10
Agamben, Giorgio, 11
Agents, 7, 10, 25
Amateurs, 35, 68, 69
Analysts, 10
Artificial intelligence, 7
Artists, 52, 53
Attali, Jacques, 46
Bank of I.D.E.A.S., 44
Bard, Alexander, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56
Beck, Ulrich, 36, 65
Beliefs, 22
Bell, Daniel, 8, 9
Berman, Saul J., 37
Beuys, Joseph, 37
Biopolitics, 11, 67
Biopower, 11, 67
Bliss, 58
Brin, Sergey, 49
Capitalism, 11, 14, 15, 30, 39, 51
Career, 15
Catastrophe, 29
Cities, 43
Citizens, 20, 44, 58, 59, 60, 66
Civil society, 64
Civilization, 13
Commercialization, 15, 59
Communities, 1, 18, 21, 22, 23, 32, 37, 39, 41, 43, 44, 48, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68
Communities of practice, 22
Complex systems, 1
Complexity, 1, 59, 64
Confidence, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 57, 59, 63, 68
Consciousness, 15, 17, 21, 24, 25
Consultants, 7, 10, 52, 61
Consultation, 20, 68
Consumerism, 14
Consumption, 4, 15, 31, 50, 51, 53, 55, 58, 61
Consumtariat, 47, 50, 51, 55
Core-peripheries, 46
Corruption, 8, 32, 59
Creative capital, 63
Creative class, 47, 52, 54, 55, 56, 68
Creativity, 2, 35, 37, 38, 44, 47, 52, 53, 54
Cultural narcissism, 2, 3, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 29, 30, 31, 36, 42, 45, 47, 51, 58, 61, 62, 65, 67
Culture, 2, 15, 31, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 59, 61, 66
Culture of narcissism, 2, 15, 40
Czapiński, Janusz, 58, 59
Decision-makers, 20, 48, 55
Democracy, 4, 9, 47, 50, 59, 60, 64, 66
Designers, 10, 52
Development paths, 3
Diagnosis, 20, 23, 68
Disembedding mechanisms, 6
Distrust, 41, 43, 52
Doctors, 7, 8
Dress, 15, 29, 53
Economy, 10, 28, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 47, 48, 52, 61, 63, 67, 68
Education, 15, 31, 34, 38, 43, 45, 49, 54, 58, 63
Employment, 30, 41, 53
Engineers, 7, 52
Entertainment, 16, 32, 54, 56
Entrepreneurs, 37, 67
Environment, 31, 43, 44, 56, 60, 65
Epistemic communities, 22, 67
Europe, 48
European Union, 59
Evaluators, 10
Expert knowledge, 6, 10, 31, 40
Expert systems, 3, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 29, 45, 61, 67
Expertise, 2, 3, 4, 7, 11, 14, 15, 16, 22, 55, 62, 65, 66, 68
Fate, 16, 41
Financial markets, 1
Florida, Richard, 38, 47, 52, 55, 56, 63

Foucault, Michel, 11
 Freedom, 9, 37
 Future, 11, 13, 20, 28, 54, 66
 Giddens, Anthony, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17, 29, 51, 52, 56
 Goćkowski, Janusz, 20
 Goods, 14, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 45, 46, 47, 53, 56, 58, 61
 Google, 36, 49
 Governance, 11, 20
 Government, 8, 11, 39, 48, 59, 66
 Governmentality, 11, 67
 Hampden-Turner, Charles, 61
 Hardt, Michael, 11
 Harvard University, 44
 Harvey, David, 46
 Health, 14, 31, 36, 38, 45, 58, 59
 Higher education, 10
 Hipernomads, 46
 Human beings, 27
 Human capital, 38, 54, 58, 63
 Ideology, 3, 9
 Indicators, 10
 Individualism, 3, 9, 60, 61
 Individuality, 53
 Information and communications technologies, 40, 46, 67
 Information societies, 8
 Infotainment, 32
 Infranomads, 46, 47
 Innovation, 31, 44, 54, 65
 Institutional reflexivity, 6, 17, 45
 Interdependence, 1, 65
 Internet, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 49, 55
 Intervention, 2, 9, 68
 Journalists, 30, 40, 64
 Knowledge, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 43, 47, 50, 51, 52, 58, 59, 61, 63, 66, 68
 Knowledge society, 3, 10, 31, 63, 68
 Kurczewska, Joanna, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 47
 Laden, Osama bin, 49
 Lasch, Christopher, 13, 14, 15, 51
 Lash, Scott, 46
 Late modernity, 1, 6, 8, 17, 45, 46, 52, 60, 67, 69
 Latour, Bruno, 65
 Lave, Jean, 23
 Layperson, 16, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 52
 Leisure time, 37
 Linux movement, 49
 Management, 7, 11, 28, 29, 36, 43, 53, 58, 63, 64, 67
 Marcos, Subcomandante, 49
 Market, 43, 47, 49, 55, 56, 57
 Marketing, 32, 33, 34, 36
 Mass media, 1, 30, 32, 34, 36, 43, 48, 49, 64, 67
 McClellan, Bennett E., 37
 Mead, George H., 62
 Mead, Margaret, 66
 Meritocracy, 9, 46
 Merits, 9
 Middle class, 46
 Money, 6, 16
 Multitude, 11
 Nature, 1, 6, 8, 9, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 43, 61, 65
 Negri, Antonio, 11
 Netocracy, 47, 51, 55
 Netocrats, 48, 49, 50, 51
 New Age movement, 32
 New media, 35, 49
 New paternalism, 15
 New technologies, 10, 29, 49, 68
 Non-governmental organizations, 37, 49, 55, 59, 67
 Ontological and epistemological structures, 3, 26, 67
 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 34
 Page, Larry, 49
 Personality, 13, 16, 22, 23, 53, 56, 60, 63, 64
 Pfister, Damien S., 66
 Philosophy, 2
 Plurarchy, 47, 50
 Poland, 59
 Policy-makers, 20, 64, 67
 Postindustrial societies, 8, 28
 Privilege, 24
 Professionals, 7, 16, 22, 40, 58, 65
 Prosperity, 58, 59
 Psychology, 2
 Putnam, Robert D., 42, 44
 Quality of life, 1, 58
 Regional development, 4
 Relationships, 1, 2, 6, 14, 23, 32, 37, 39, 42, 43, 52, 61, 62, 66

Religions, 32, 42
 Research and development, 9, 10, 49
 Rifkin, Jeremy, 38, 39, 57
 Risk, 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 23, 29, 35, 37, 40, 48, 61, 65, 67, 69
 Rose, Nikolas, 54, 55
 Safety, 8, 17
 Science and technology, 2, 17, 26, 28
 Scientists, 4, 7, 21, 24, 27, 44, 52, 65
 Scientology, 32
 Security, 8, 13, 35, 41, 46, 56
 Self-expression, 53
 Self-governing capabilities, 54, 55
 Self-improvement, 2, 13, 23
 Self-realization, 51, 58, 63
 Service class, 47, 52, 54, 55, 56, 68
 Services, 7, 14, 20, 23, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 45, 52, 53, 54, 56, 61
 Social capital, 2, 11, 42, 44, 59, 63
 Social change, 3, 67
 Social classes, 16, 42, 45, 51, 52
 Social development, 13, 64
 Social hierarchies, 9, 46
 Social inequalities, 3, 9, 31, 35, 38
 Social institutions, 6, 8, 11, 15, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 59, 65, 68
 Social justice, 9
 Social movements, 18, 49, 68
 Social networking, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 56
 Social problems, 1, 9
 Social stratification, 3, 45, 52
 Social world, 3, 16, 20, 26, 28, 67
 Sociology, 2, 62, 68
 Söderqvist, Jan, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56
 Software, 7, 34
 Specialists, 10, 52
 Sports, 44, 53, 54
 Subclass, 46, 50, 56
 Survival strategies, 13, 18, 56
 Sustainable development, 31
 Symbolic means, 10
 Symbolic tokens, 6
 Symbolic violence, 45
 Sztompka, Piotr, 11, 24, 40, 42, 45, 46, 63
 Tabloidization, 32
 Talents, 9, 34, 54
 Tastes, 53
 Technicians, 7, 22
 Technocracy, 9, 46
 Technocrats, 28, 29, 47, 48
 Telecommunications systems, 1
 Therapists, 7
 Therapy, 14, 15, 16, 36, 51, 53
 Third sector, 39, 57
 Toffler, Alvin, 66
 Torvalds, Linus, 49
 Transformation, 1, 2, 3, 20, 27, 29, 33, 38, 42, 45, 46, 60
 Transnational corporations, 1
 Transportation, 1
 Trompenaars, Fons, 60, 61, 62, 64
 Trust, 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 24, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 57, 59, 63, 64, 67, 68
 United Nations Development Programme, 58
 United States, 48, 60
 Virtual nomads, 46, 47
 Web 2.0, 33, 56
 Welfare, 22, 53, 58, 59
 Wenger, Etienne, 23
 Wikinomics, 35, 67
 Wikipedia, 33, 66
 Wisdom, 2, 10
 Zapatistas, 49