



Volume 12 Issue 4
12/2014
tamarajournal.com

From Fundamentalistic to Pluralistic Epistemology of Organizational Culture

Lukasz Sulkowski

University of Social Sciences, Poland
Jagiellonian University, Poland

Keywords

Fundamentalistic epistemology
Pluralistic epistemology
Organizational culture

Abstract

This paper sets out to analyse the concept of a broad multi-paradigmatic approach, combining different cognitive perspectives, drawn from the social sciences and the humanities. It presents various issues of organizational culture: critics of functionalism in organizational culture concepts, interpretativist approach to organizational culture, critical perspective of organizational culture, organizational culture management methods (comparison of fundamentalism, pluralism, eclecticism, and methodological anarchy). The theory of culture in management and the attempt at presenting ways of studying its changes presented in this paper indicate that there are multiple diverse concepts. The complexity of the theory is a derivative of the problems related to the notion of culture. The multiplicity of concepts results from the fact that researchers assume different paradigms.

Introduction

Fifteen years ago I made my first research of organizational culture in Poland and I published a book about cultural processes in organization. My research based on the functionalistic and fundamentalistic thinking stated that description, measuring and control over organizational culture is possible, attainable and desirable. The experience of work as a professor in two Polish and one American university (Jagiellonian University, Clark University and University of Social Sciences) and as an advisor of several organizations engaged me in a reflective process about paradigms of organizational culture that brings skepticism about functionalistic and fundamentalistic approach. I have learnt about alternative and humanistic paradigms of organizational culture and it seems that we are in the situation of pluralistic discourse about organizational culture based on multi-paradigm approach.

The multiplicity of concepts results from the fact that researchers assume different paradigms, and in consequence, the initial assumptions lead to diametrically different descriptions of culture, the process of its changes and its management methods (Shepherd & Challenger, 2013). This is why resolving the problems of cultural research in management depends, to a large degree, on research methods for studying culture. This paper presents the concept of a broad multi-paradigmatic approach, combining different cognitive perspectives, drawn from the social sciences and the humanities. The main contribution of the paper is the proposal of multi-paradigmatic approach to OC taking the form of methodological

eclecticism using the existing proposals and the approach derived from philosophy of science (Schultz & Hatch, 1996; Scherer, 1998; Lewis & Kelemen, 2002).

Critics of functionalism in organizational culture concepts

The functionalist view of organisational culture, being the oldest, classical and most popular cognitive perspective in management, has several characteristic features, using the neopositivistic, functionalistic and systemic approaches.

- 1) It treats research into organisational culture from the neopositivist perspective as an objectivist project, modelling the cause and effect relationships between culture and other variables (nomothetic science).
- 2) Organisational culture is treated as a sub-system of the organisational system, which is an dependent variable.
- 3) The research aim is the creation of theory, mathematical modelling and quantification, which should allow to predict and pro-effectively shape organisational culture. Individual case studies are not accepted, as they do not make it possible to generalise.
- 4) The pragmatic aim of culture research is culture management. The functionalist approach is optimistic in relation to the possibility of shaping the pro-effectiveness of cultural changes by managers. In this case, pragmatism is accompanied by instrumentalism, focused on the development of methods and techniques of implementing cultural changes.
- 5) It prefers the standardised qualitative, structured, representative methods, mostly the survey methods.
- 6) The key problems of functionalist research are related to organisation integration, culture management, strong vs. weak organisational culture, the effectiveness of culture, looking for positive cultures, typologies and models of culture, as well as cultural dysfunctions and pathologies.
- 7) The essence of organisation is its integration, which in the case of functionalism is identified with the extent of internal coherence on the area of values, norms and cultural models (homogeneity). Subcultures, counter-cultures, conflicts and internal tensions are treated as organisational problems, rather than a source of creative solutions.
- 8) Researchers assume a perspective of external observers, who are distanced from the research subject, and are axiologically neutral and uninvolved (outsiders). The perspective of a participant (insider) and valuation are undesirable in the description of reality.

Criticism of functionalism and neopositivism includes a great number of works in the social sciences, as alternative paradigms were based on the negation of the dominant paradigm (Davis, 1959). From the point of view of the cognitive and pragmatic usefulness of the theory of culture in management, it is worth considering several points of the criticism, mostly including the issues of integration, stability, homogeneity, reification and irrelevance of the methodology.

A characteristic feature of functionalism is the tendency to describe a stable state and balance, which makes it difficult to conduct research into as dynamic processes as organisational culture. Because of the integration perspective, culture is perceived as a relatively cohesive and homogenous system of values, which is contrary to the image of organisation and culture, which often includes conflicting and mutually exclusive subcultures and counter-cultures. The assumption that a functioning organisation has to be integrated – at least to a minimal extent – should not be identified with the assumption that all organisation's elements contribute to its cohesion, while the basis for its activities is harmony and unity. In the context of rapid changes in the environment, radical, integration and functionalist perspective cannot be defended. Conflicts, incoherence and contradictions can dynamise organisation's changes and development, opening new perspectives and allowing a choice of creative solutions (Coser, 1956; Dahrendorf, 1969). Nevertheless, this does not change the fact that there still remains a minimal degree of cohesion in the organisation, thanks to which it is still a whole, despite the regularly escalating internal conflicts. Two issues related to an organisation's integration have to be noted. First of all, the management of an organisation should not strive only to enhance its cohesion, as a perfectly cohesive organisation is hermetic and poorly adapted to changes, both internal and external. Secondly, the sources of integration are complex, which means that a constant increase or decrease in the degree of the organisation's cohesion, and requires taking into consideration strategic, structural and cultural factors on the level of individuals, social groups and organisation in the environment (Sulkowski, 2012). Historically, as criticism of the integration approach intensified, the

functionalists developed a concept defending the integration approach, based on balance. T. Parsons proposed a concept of punctuated equilibrium, which assumes the possibility of changes and, at the same time, the system's tendency to regain balance in a process of transformation (Parsons, 1961).

Representatives of the critical management studies accuse functionalism of creating a fake conciliation, cooperative vision of organisational culture, while it is ideological and conceals the interests and power of dominant groups. Thus, functionalism preserves the unjust status quo with the use of indoctrinating and manipulative organisational culture (Fournier & Grey, 2000).

The systemic approach entails the presentation of culture in the form of mutually related elements, which can be described with the use of variables, indicating that they are plausible objects that can be subject to research. Because of the reification of culture, functionalism has more problems with grasping the procedural essence of culture, which is transformation and flow, rather than an object that can be studied.

According to the representatives of alternative paradigms, the assumption of the neopositivist cause-and-effect pattern in order to explain culture is problematic. They believe that the cultural discourse deals with meanings within a complex network of relationships and they call for the interpretation of correlations, and not the causative analysis of variables, drawn from the scientific method of the natural sciences. Interpretivists have methodological objections to functionalism, related to the lack of understanding and individual approach. According to the representatives of interpretative-symbolic current, the application of objectivist and statistical methods, used mainly for the purpose of research into mass phenomena, does not allow one to understand the essence and sense of organisation, which can be found in deeply internalised meanings.

Another criticised assumption of functionalism is related to the use of functions, which means its usefulness to explain the existence of certain phenomena in culture. It seems that many cultural phenomena are non-functional, or even anti-functional. It is difficult to find the benefits of the creation of, for example, some destructive counter-cultures in organisations (Coser, 1977). According to the critics, the vision of culture in functionalism is over-rationalised, and sits closer to the idea of *homo oeconomicus*, and is in consequence deceptive. Moreover, interpretivists believe that functionalist explanations create an excessively determinist vision of man and culture, which assumes that human behaviour follows a pattern. There is not much space for free will, while interpretivists think that people are not cultural puppets. An overly optimistic approach is related both to the cognition and the improvement of culture. As research experiences show, many of the methods of getting to know and improving organisational culture are very unreliable (Weaver & Gioia, 1994).

Interpretivist approach to organizational culture

Interpretative theories focus on the description of correlations in complex social and organisational structures, departing from the neopositivist cause and effect pattern. The key to the creation of a scientific theory is to understand, capture the meaning from the perspective of an involved observer or an organisation member (Sulkowski, 2009). Theories are not supposed to be created in the spirit of objectivism and axiological neutrality, but should highlight the intersubjective differentiation of senses and interpretations of different organisational actors (Rhodes, 2000). Many theories related to organisational culture, human resources management, managerial processes or change management in management science are based on the assumptions of the interpretative approach. The methodology of the interpretative approach is related to the project of idiographic science, which can be identified with the emic approach. The idiographic way of practicing science means focus on unique descriptions and analysing individual cases as characteristic. Unlike nomothetic science, idiographic science does not strive for generalisations (Thomae, 1999). K. Pike proposed a diversification of human linguistic behaviour, taking into consideration the possibility of applying this dichotomy to research into all social activities (Pike & Kenneth, 1967). Both terms come from fundamental linguistic terms – phonemic and phonetic. This methodological division has gained significance in cultural anthropology and ethnology, but is also vividly reflected in the cultural research of other disciplines, from psychology, sociology and linguistics, to archaeology, medicine and psychiatry. In the case of management science, it is not completely unknown, although it appears rather occasionally (Headland, Pike & Harris, 1990). The emic vs. etic approach was used in the comparative cultural analyses by such researchers as M. Harris, W. Goodenough, J. Berry, E. Hall (Harris, 1987; Goodenough, 1970; Berry, 1969; Hall, 1964). The dichotomy between emic and etic has become the basis for the development of qualitative, involved and participatory methodology of cultural research, proposed by C. Geertz and called thick versus thin description.

Trying to describe the distinction between emic and etic in the cultural research, one can point to two different cognitive perspectives. The epistemological foundation for the emic approach is the interpretative-symbolic paradigm,

hermeneutics and phenomenology. Emic means looking for a perspective of a culture participant, who understands it, and is able to treat it analytically (insider). Participation allows for construction of research categories, set in social reality, which are particular, and not universal. Colloquial, contextual concepts, set in a given culture are primary for research, and form the discourse subject. The research method is the in-depth cultural study, often using interviews, participatory observations and other qualitative and anthropological methods. Examples of the development of methodologies located within the emic approach include C. Geertz's thick description, the grounded theory of A. Strauss and A. Tourraine's intervention sociology (Geertz, 1973; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Tourraine, 1978). The etic orientation is set in the neopositivist paradigm, together with its postulates of striving for objectivity and axiological neutrality. In consequence, researchers are external and uninvolved observers who try to distance themselves from the social reality studied (outsiders). Social reality exists objectively and should be reflected in the research process based on the scientific method. Characteristic features include striving for generalisations, objectivism and looking for a more universal reference framework, drawn from outside culture. Research methods cover a full spectrum of survey and statistical methods, as well as other qualitative and standardised methods used in empirical sociology, psychometrics, evolutionary anthropology, management science and other disciplines. It is worth noting that the creators of the emic/etic concept accepted the fact that both culture participants (insiders) and researchers from outside culture (outsiders) can assume one of the two perspectives by choosing the orientation and the research method (Headland, Pike & Harris, 1990). Many other researchers believed that being an external observer itself determines the choice of the etic perspective in cultural research.

Table 1. Interpretative-symbolic paradigm vs. functionalist paradigm of culture in management

Criterion	Interpretative-symbolic paradigm	Neopositivist-functionalist-systemic paradigm
Epistemological orientation	Emic, intersubjective perspective, idiographic science	Etic, quasi-objectivist perspective, nomothetic science
Essence of culture	Network of meanings and interpretations, integrating a social group	Values, norms and beliefs of a systemic character, commonly accepted in the organisation
Significance of culture in management	Key, the foundation of cognitive and social processes	Significant, one of the variables that shape organisational behaviour
Categories of the cognition of culture	Root metaphor	Internal or external variable
The aims of cultural research in management	Understanding, description, synthesis, stimulation of changes	Generalisation, verification, analysis, forecasting and programming changes
The researcher's attitude towards culture	Participant of the studied phenomena and processes (insider), involved	Objective, external point of view (outsider)
The researcher's attitude towards cultural values	Consciousness entangled in values and culture (axiological position)	Striving for objective cognition, which is free from valuation
The relationships between social and organisational cultures	Mutual permeation, correlations	Values from social culture spread to organisational culture
Culture description	'Thick', vivid, axiological	Quasi-objective, comparable with others
Subcultures	Inherent elements of culture; culture undergoes constant fragmentation and tension	Undesirable elements of culture; culture should be heterogeneous
Relationships between culture elements	Correlations, repetitive and individual	Cause and effect, repetitive
Organisational identity	A derivative of culture, cognitively and pragmatically useful	A useless notion, unnecessary multiplication of notions
Currents of cultural research in management	Interpretive, dramatic, critical, psychodynamic, cognitivist	Comparable cultural studies, functionalist research into organisational culture, neoevolutionism
Preferred methodology	Descriptive and explanatory or understanding (hermeneutic)	Explanatory – providing predictions based on abstract systems of notions

Preferred methods	Non-standard, qualitative, non-structured, field, anthropological methods	Standard, quantitative, structured, representative, mostly survey methods
--------------------------	---	---

Source: Own work.

Research into organisational culture draws inspirations from other scientific disciplines, which subject of interest is culture. Thus, the elementary methodological differentiation emic vs. etic is reflected mostly in the cultural research within management (Deniso, 1996).

Culture in management, as seen from the interpretative-symbolic perspective, includes mostly issues concerning:

- 1) Symbolic and interpretative aspects of management,
- 2) Social game and interactions between organisational actors,
- 3) Organisation seen as the construction of social reality,
- 4) Managerial discourse, the emergence of meanings.

The most important representatives of this orientation, conducting cultural research in management, include L. Smircich, G. Morgan, M.J. Hatch, M. Shultz, and B. Czarniawska, S. Magala (Smircich, 1983b; Morgan, 1980; Shultz & Hatch, 1996).

Many authors try to understand the essence of organisational culture using metaphors, analogies, paradoxes and symbols. The idea of culture seen as a metaphor for an organisation as a whole was first proposed by G. Morgan, and has been used by many other authors since (including L. Smircich, B. Czarniawska, M. Kostera) (Smircich, 1983a; Czarniawska, 1997). Organisational culture is described metaphorically as an organisational glue, mental programme, theatre, happening or even text. Models and typologies of organisational cultures, proposed by such researchers as T. Deal. A. Kennedy and C. Handy are full of such symbols. The symbol of a cobweb, analogies to Greek gods, comparisons to social roles (e.g. machos) are some of the rhetorical figures commonly used by researchers of organisational cultures. They allow them to aptly, synthetically describe the dominant outline of a given cultural configuration. Metaphorical understanding of organisational culture is in accordance with the spirit of humanities, and especially hermeneutics. Most of all, this is an explanation and interpretation of meaning, even if it is ambiguous. Moreover, this is a clear use of the art and essay-writing apparatus to interpret social reality. According to many researchers, but mostly interpretivists, organisational culture management is not only based on scientific rules and methods, but is also an art (Linstead, 2003). One can point to the intuitive nature, the role of covert knowledge and creativity in the management of such an ephemeral organisational sphere as culture. We are submerged in culture, we feel it, interpret it and function within it reflectively, out of habit. In both cases of activities we use intuition based on covert knowledge and experience. This allows us to make decisions, convince others of them and implement them with the necessary determination. As most interpretivists and postmodernists believe, the sphere of cultural management escapes control and its predictive power is low, as in it we deal with creativity and the shaping of social reality, rather than the social engineering associated with determinism and algorithms of action.

In relation to the research into organisational cultures, the perspective of symbolic interactionism is multi-current and methodologically diverse, although generally it can be identified with the qualitative methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). It covers organisational anthropology and ethnology, dramatic methods, as well as psychodynamic and cognitive approaches. The field involves understanding and research into culture using a wide range of interpretative and critical methods, from participatory observation, through metaphorical and narrative methods, to action research (Jemielniak, 2006). The interpretative-symbolic methodology (emic) is criticised for the radicalism of the assumptions of cultural relativism, which negate searching for cultural universals. Many researchers are sceptical about the lack of standardisation and representativeness of research, believing qualitative methods are not enough rigorous. Cultural studies are criticised by many researchers as individual descriptions, which depart from the scientific discourse because of the lack of generalisations.

To sum up, the cultural discourse of management, practiced on the basis of symbolic interactionism, despite its internal diversity, has a number of common features, including:

- 1) Emic epistemology and methodology.
- 2) Idiographic vision of science.

- 3) Criticism of the instrumental approach to culture, characteristic of functionalism.
- 4) Cultural relativism.
- 5) Social constructivism.
- 6) Culture as a root metaphor in an organisation.
- 7) Management understood as a symbolic activity.
- 8) Social and processual understanding of management.
- 9) Meanings and identity management.
- 10) Defragmentation of organisational culture and a significant role of subcultures.
- 11) Entanglement in praxis.
- 12) Everyday epistemology.
- 13) Discourse locality.
- 14) Anthropological and ethnological methodology of research.
- 15) Qualitative cognitive and pragmatic methodology.

Critical perspective of organizational culture

Organisational culture has been controversial since the very notion appeared. Thus, the critical reflection is not present only within the critical current of management (Critical Management Studies). However, representatives of the critical current propose the most radical and reflective approach, which synthesises a number of currents that appeared in previous criticism (Rowlinson, Procter, 1999).

1. The oppressiveness of organisational culture.

According to the representatives of CMS, organisational culture is not axiologically neutral and reflects the structure of power. It is oppressive, because it fulfils the interests of some groups at the expense of others. It disfavours people subject to power and sanctions the unjust order. Critical researchers generally agree with interpretivists, assuming that organisational culture can be understood as a root metaphor, which refers to what organisation is, and not to what it owns. As a consequence of such a perspective, cultural problems become fundamental for the organisation's functioning in all its dimensions (Knights & Willmott, 1987). Thus, the oppressiveness of culture translates directly into the repressiveness of organisations.

2. Ideology and 'false awareness' in cultural processes modern organisations.

By promoting the indoctrination and manipulation, culture is a mechanism of wielding power, which is of a systemic character. Owners, managers and employees do not have to realise the injustice and repressiveness of culture in modern organisations. Oppressive culture is assimilated, considered as natural, obvious, and so impossible to be changed. Culture becomes an ideology, builds 'false awareness', which rationalises – for the purpose of those in power and those subject to it – the unjust order as the only possible option, the alternative to which can only be chaos and destruction (Monin, 2004).

3. 'Symbolic violence' in organisations.

Modern organisational, managerial and consumerist culture has become the most important tool of control and wielding power. This tool is very effective and dangerous, because it is concealed and often works implicitly and in a systemic way, rather than personally. It is not 'bare violence', related to physical repression, but subtle mechanisms of control and social self-control, which – following P. Bourdieu – can be called 'symbolic violence' (Bourdieu, 1987). Language, systems of values and norms, organisational structures, communication networks are hierarchical and control

the minds in the interest of the owners of the financial, political, relational and cultural capital. 'Symbolic violence' through culture, which – according to the root metaphor – is an organisation, has spread to all aspects of organising (Smircich, 1983c). Using the Foucauldian metaphor, culture is becoming a Panopticon which controls organisations and instils the systems of self-control in their members (Lyon, 2006).

4. Instrumental methods of 'culturism' in organisations.

According to H. Willimott's description, corporations practice 'organisational culturism', which is manifested by the striving for the creation of a monoculture, oriented only towards the fulfilment of the aims and interests of owners and managers (Willimott, 1993). This means a regular implementation of practices which integrate organisations and a promotion of conformism in striving for a strong, homogenous organisational culture (Alvesson, 2002). 'Organisational culturalism' is a reflection of the functionalist understanding of culture as a variable subject to control and, at the same time, serving as a controlling tool. According to the representatives of CMS, functionalists propagated the concept of organisational culture that can be easily manipulated, which gives those wielding power another tool of oppression. Such instrumental concepts of culture are indicated by, for example, researchers from the CMS currents, who criticise the use of the methods of instrumentalisation, manipulation and social engineering in the management of culture, human resources, meanings, and point to their basis related to the maintenance of status quo. However, they also draw attention to the increase in the sophistication of controlling and power methods, related to the fulfilment of the interests of those wielding power. The autonomy of employees, giving meaning to the organisational work, non-financial motivation, building loyalty and organisational loyalty can be used as a tool for increasing profits. This means that autonomy, loyalty, identification are not autotelic, as they are only means that are supposed to lead to the increase in effectiveness and profitability. Thus, this is 'apparent empowerment', developed by such concepts as 'Y theory', the school of human relations, corporate social responsibility, self-direction etc, which in fact are of a manipulative character.

5. Organisation and organisational culture as a 'total institution'.

Creating the concept of total institutions, E. Goffman described organisations that are relatively isolated and develop their own, very effective mechanisms of supervision, which lead to the elimination of their members' individuality (Goffman, 1968). As a result of planned and spontaneous development of controlling systems in institutions such as hospitals, penal institutions, monasteries, a truly Kafkaesque, bureaucratic and de-subjectivised systems were created, the priority of which are only organisational aims, at the expense of their members. Visions of such dehumanised management, reminding of a total institution or even totalitarian systems, together with their dreams about single, coherent and real culture and ideology are sometimes presented as threats to modern organisations (Sułkowski, 2013). They concern whole organisations, which create sophisticated systems of bureaucratic supervision, and more and more often use modern technologies of surveillance and permanent control (Lyon, 2003; OECD, 2004). The systems of self-control and self-censorship, which are of a cultural character, contribute to the homogenisation of culture and building a strong organisational identity but, at the same time, lead to the suppression of non-conformism, individuality, and perhaps even creativity (Brewis & Gavin, 2009; Erdoğan, 2006). The reflection of the dehumanised organisation, reminiscent of a total institution, can be seen in the individual areas of organisation, such as the system of managing human resources (Brief, 2000). According to the representatives of CMS, the personal function, oriented towards the maximisation of the exploitation of people, and so exploitation and indoctrination, is the reason for the expansion of the sub-discipline and practice of human resources management (Boxall, Purcell & Wright, 2007). The mechanisms of total institutions, manifestations of which can be found in modern organisations, can also be found on the level of organisational subcultures. In a famous experiment, P. Zimbardo divided students into groups of 'prisoners' and 'guards', showing how the

fragmentation of culture and the creation of subcultures catalyses violence in organisations, which can take symbolic and physical forms (Zimbardo, Maslach & Haney, 2000). Other bases for total institutions are the human psyche and the authority mechanisms, set in culture. In a different, probably the most famous experiment of social psychology, S. Milgram showed how the pressure of authority can lead to a creation of social structures using violence (Milgram, 1974). In the case of most people, all kinds of authority pressure are able to force them to use violence against others.

6. 'Neo-colonialism' of intercultural management and globalisation.

CMS representatives refer to the criticism of neo-imperialism, which has been present in the discourse of management and other social sciences and humanities for several decades. N. Chomsky publishes and conducts social campaigns in order to build the awareness of the necessity to change the neo-imperial orientation of American culture and the process of 'colonisation', which uses the globalisation mechanisms (Chomsky, 2010). According to Chomsky, international corporations, worldwide financial institutions and the governments of the richest countries create an exploitative order and maintain status quo in their own interest (Chomsky, 2006). This is reflected in the freedom of the capital flow and the hegemony of the financial and banking sector in economy, which is politically protected. In order to fulfil their economic interests, governments of many countries are ready to take military action. Culture plays an important role in this neo-imperial system, as it rationalises, conceals and glorifies the activities of corporations and managers. According to many researchers, managerial culture and intercultural management are only a cover for neo-imperialism and exploitation, while on the other hand, instrumentally understood tools and techniques of obtaining high effectiveness of work in an international environment. Thus, the theory of management in the context of globalisation is developed mostly as a rationalisation of interests of people wielding power. Intellectuals, researchers, the academic environment and the consulting sector, enthusing over globalisation processes, can have their own interests in glorifying this current, but they also play the role of Lenin's "useful idiots", brainwashed with the idea of worldwide unity.

7. Colonisation of the mind of one-dimensional people, as controlled by consumerist culture.

The consumerist culture channels human nature in accordance with the interests of those wielding power. It is not a coincidence, but a systemic feature, that culture often becomes a tool of exercising power. The projection of modern power, dispersed among corporations, managers and owners on the one hand, and governments, politicians and media on the other, is the postmodernist culture of modern consumerism. The Janus-faced nature of power is reflected in a seemingly individualist culture, while in fact – as S. Deetz said – we live in a world of everyday life colonised by concerns, using the mechanisms of cultural social and media communication to shape our consumerist needs (Deetz, 1992). N. Klein describes the practice of inflating the consumer needs in an artificial way, with the use of sophisticated tools of psychomanipulation and social engineering in marketing. People become the slaves of brands which – thanks to effective advertisements, PR and branding, become their basic source of identification, satisfaction and self-esteem (Klein, 2004). Thus, paradoxically, although the people's standard of living is incomparably higher than several decades ago, and despite the fact that the technological development amazingly improves the living comfort, the social structure and human condition remain unchanged. The whole world is divided into the privileged, who wield power, and the subordinated, who are subject to power and disadvantaged. In order to maintain social order and a more effective exploitation, the systemic mechanism in the form of culture, mass media and education 'programmes' people's minds, emphasising the natural and inevitable character of the existing order. Thus, culture implicitly creates a 'model', standardised, postmodernist consumer, who is limited to the role of 'one-dimensional' and 'outer-directed' man by his freedom of market choices (Marcuse, 1991). In the context of granting identity through the identification with brands and the confusing excess of alternative information, consumers' choices are still in line with the interests of the dominant groups.

8. The output of management science as a projection of culture that legitimises power.

The threads of power have been inseparably linked with the concept of culture in management science. According to the representatives of CMS, this is a result of the instrumental character of the scientific discipline itself and its practices, created mostly in order to exploit people in a more effective way. This is reflected in most concepts created within management. Human resources management, using the dehumanised language of ‘resources’, ‘human capital’, ‘personnel’ and ‘staff’, indoctrinates in a spirit of power legitimisation. The marketing culture creates illusions of choice, channelling disadvantaged groups on narrow consumerist pathways (Brownlie, Saren, Wensley & Whittington, 1999). Accounting and financial management are thoroughly de-subjectivised and treat people as money transfers (Tinker, 1985). Strategic management rationalises profits and the development of organisations at the expense of people.

9. Critical Management Education.

Critical Management Education, a current of CMS, develops, on the one hand, the criticism of the dehumanised management education, based on the instrumental mind, and on the other, proposes a breakthrough in the form of in-depth reflection and the development of the involved methods, treating people in organisations in a subjective way. CMS criticises the ideology of managerial culture, expressed in business education, which is a kind of secondary socialisation, based on instrumental rationality. The education system maintains power relations, closely linking theory with practice. Graduates of business, economic and MBA schools are educated in a spirit of the business ethics, and not the general human ethics, and so they focus on the effectiveness of action, cost-effectiveness, loyalty towards owners and managers (Contu, 2009; Czarniawska & Gagliardi, 2006). The managerial ethos is a rationalisation of the lack of moral scruples. After such education, employees are treated as a ‘resource’, a mean leading to the achievement of economic and market goals. Management education is thus based on indoctrination and transfer of technocratic knowledge, used for the instrumentalisation of people in organisations (Perriton & Reynolds, 2004). Another purpose of the education and socialisation of employees is reproduction, which means transferring power to the chosen ones. Using P. Bourdieu’s nomenclature, management education creates a *habitus* supporting the reproduction of power structures, which is a manifestation of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1970). Thus, it can be said that ideology, as well as managerial ethos and profession (*habitus*) are ‘inherited’ or instilled in the process of education. According to the research conducted by P. Bourdieu and J.C. Passeron, the system of higher education schools awards students having a cultural capital, i.e. those from the owning classes. The earlier research of B. Bernstein gave similar results (Bernstein, 1974; Bernstein, 1975). The education system effectively eliminates nonconformists who do not want to accept the managerial ethos and culture.

10. Gurus within power structures.

Managerial culture is based on socially created authorities, which reflect power structures. Some of the most popular and influential representatives of management occupy the positions of gurus, instead of reflective and critical researchers. Thus, gurus are ‘heroes’ and the most important popularisers of the oppressive culture and managerial ideology. Gurus, who ‘produce’ the most popular guides, as well as simple and ‘practical’ concepts of management, focus on a clear, contagious idea, combined with effective marketing. Gurus are read because their concepts ‘seduce’ their readers, which means that they require no deeper reflection, are simple to understand and remember, include an element of a ‘shocking’ novelty, and are presented in a simple, non-academic language. In spite of the appearances, gurus are not rebels who destroy the existing power structures. Quite the contrary – they maintain them. They play a role of the ‘cultural industry’ in management, which is a mechanism described already by the Frankfurt School. They generate media interest in the concepts and structures of management, sanctioning the obviousness and natural state of this order. They occupy minds with kinds of ‘memes’ of contagious concepts and, at the same time, put aside reflection on issues which are

fundamental for organisations, such as power and justice. Consciously or not, gurus try to ‘program’ the minds of managers, in accordance with the interests of those wielding power (Micklethwait & Wooldridge, 2000). Gurus’ ‘cultural industry’ is supported by mass advertising campaigns, PR and scientific marketing, which leads to the creation of the position of ‘idols’ for managers. Gurus are treated in management in a special way, as their publications are of a popular character and do not fulfil the requirements of a scientific discipline, and so they are rarely subject to reliable criticism of the academic environment (Chiapello, 2002). It is also worth emphasising that – as the relationships with practice and the consulting sector are an inherent element of management understood as a scientific discipline – in the case of practitioners and managers, writing as such is a value. Some management gurus from the past, such as P. Drucker, P. Kotler and I. Ansoff, created some valuable scientific works, some of which became the basis for whole sub-disciplines of management.

Criticism is the basis for the CMS current, although its aims go deeper, as it is supposed to lead to a change. Thus, a diagnosis leads to a therapy, which entails using the humanist methods of management. This can be presented in the form of aims of the cultural current of CMS.

Democratisation of organisations.

A critical view of organisational cultures leads to a conclusion that through ‘symbolic violence’ they are the key mechanism of maintaining and reproducing inequality. According to H. Willmott, the discourse of the organisational culture in management as such is based on the instrumental approach to employees. T. Peters and R. Waterman, and their continuators (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Koch & Godden, 1996), are often ideologists of the ‘corporate culturism’, which seemingly promotes employee autonomy and democratic management, but in practice it is a method of manipulation, the aim of which is to indoctrinate employees, involve them in the work for organisation and get their obedience and efforts (Willmott, 2003). According to the CMS representatives, a change for the better should entail a significant increase in democracy within organisations, aimed at real, and not instrumental, autonomy of employees. The first to be implemented should be the methods of a radical increase in the participation of employees and subordinates in the key organisational decisions. Thus, the concepts of employee participation, internal organisational democracy, self-directed teams, present in the management literature already before the institutionalisation of CMS, are radicalised, as they are not supposed to be the means leading to higher effectiveness.

Rejection of violence by reflection of culture.

Culture of the ‘symbolic violence’ (mobbing, bullying), and sometimes even physical violence (harassment) should be ‘healed’ by the deepening of the reflection and a critical view based on the humanist orientation and moral sensitivity. After rejecting the cost-effectiveness of activities as the core of management science, it is necessary to find a new organisational order, one of the most important assumptions of which will be the increase in equality. One of the most important methods that can be applied is the management of meanings, which on the one hand, leads to a determination of the dominant discourses, while on the other, makes it possible to promote the alternatives (Alvesson, Willmott, 1996).

Methods which emancipate marginalised groups in organisations.

A common element for CMS and Marxism is the radical criticism of the existing social and organisational order. Representatives of the critical current propose changes that are supposed to lead to a change of the position of the disadvantaged groups. Striving for a radical change of the disadvantaged groups’ position is also an element which links CMS with the feminist current (Potterfield, 1999). One of the most important methods leading to the emancipation of the

disadvantaged groups is supposed to be empowerment, which empowers oppressed groups and makes them more aware (Sułkowski, 2007).

Parity means requiring the participation of disadvantaged groups in the structures of organisational management, based on legal norms or organisation's normative regulations. In the case of management, the most often solution is the minimum number of employees from the disadvantaged groups or women that have to be members of the organisation's management. This solution is increasingly often applied in Scandinavian countries and the USA, although it is very controversial, as, in fact, it discriminates individuals from non-marginalised groups (e.g. men).

Critical researchers, using the concepts of the 'linguistic breakthrough', postmodernism and textualism, are oriented towards social constructivism, and so they can see that language is the fundamental tool for the creation of reality. This is culturalism, which makes language the most important tool of shaping the world of organisation and human communities. The change of reality is impossible without the change of language, which means that the need for a radical reconstruction is a result of being anchored in culture and language. The method of changing the existing order is 'political correctness', which means striving for cleansing the language, mostly in the public discourse, of pejorative expressions that could discriminate or negatively stigmatise certain social groups, and especially minorities and the disadvantaged groups. 'Political correctness' became popular in the USA but is very controversial because, as some argue, it limits the freedom of speech (Ravitch, 2003). In the case of management, when we deal with the public discourse, the norms of political correctness become more and more popular, although the notion itself is rarely used. For most CMS representatives, political correctness is a positive tendency, although it is strongly resisted by the power structures and should be radicalised. There are also many critics who point to its negative aspects, related to the limits on expression, communication freedom, or even a destruction of the cultural programme of organising (Schwartz, 2010).

Popularisation of the emancipation culture.

Culture, and so organisational culture as well, can be seen as a method of emancipation (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992). However, this means an important change in the dominant epistemological, methodological and praxeological perspective in management science. In the cognitive sphere, this is related to the rejection of the researcher's axiological neutrality and moving to the position of social constructivism, which entails methodological consequences. Whereas in the praxeological sense, this is including the management of core values in the cultural project, towards which organisational culture shall be oriented; the values include human subjectivity, equality, tolerance for diversity. CMS researchers assume, although it may be utopian, that it is possible to reorient from the currently dominant culture of cost-effectiveness and effectiveness, and – as a subtext – power, towards humanisation. The transformation, or cultural transgression, is supposed to take place on numerous levels, including different cultural circles (social culture, mass culture, organisational cultures) and human relationships.

Anti-functionalism.

The epistemology of organisational culture is one of the key problems of CMS. In the case of CMS, the acceptance of the central role of culture in the process of organising leads to the criticism of the mainstream, which is the neopositivist paradigm and the functionalism of cultural processes, and their management (Höpfl, 1992; Kunda, 1992; Willmott, 1993; Willmott, 1995; Chan, 2001; Alvesson, 2002). The most radical current of criticism postulates the rejection of the whole management science project, while its moderate version is a kind of 'repair', related to the rejection of the instrumental mind and the primacy of cost-effectiveness in human activities (Parker, 2002).

CMS representatives are very critical about the output of research into culture within the social sciences. The research of the main current concerning organisational culture, conducted in the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s, is regarded as 'corporate culturalism', which means striving for the instrumentalisation of culture as a tool of effective management. Apart from the problem related to the effectiveness of organisational culture management, which is a reservation voiced by many authors, the key question is the ethically doubtful character of the project (Willmott, 2003).

CMS representatives are much closer to the cognitive assumptions of symbolic interactionism and postmodernism than the functionalist current. Alternative paradigms criticise resource-based, determinist and instrumentalist approach to organisational culture, rooted in the neopositivist-functionalist-systemic paradigm. Similarly to other alternative paradigms, CMS accepts the vision of culture as an area of conflict, fragmentation and the creation of subcultures. The view of the fluidity of individual and collective identities is similar. Organisational culture is perceived indeterministically, while the possibility of managing or steering culture is assessed sceptically (Alvesson, 2002).

However, there are significant differences between critical, interpretative and postmodern understandings of organisational culture. Most of all, the critical current, unlike postmodernism and interpretivism, is based on the ontological realism with a moderate version of social constructivism (Duberley & Johnson, 2003). Thus, according to CMS representatives, reality, including social reality, exists objectively or at least intersubjectively. CMS representatives believe that culture is linked with inequality and power, and that it is possible to change this situation. And so, they propose to develop the project of emancipation culture, which should be characterised by egalitarianism, inclusiveness and orientation towards humanist values, instead of the economic.

Methodology of the critical research into culture.

As a result of the ambiguity and multidimensionality of culture, CMS representatives accept the methodological pluralism approach. However, there is a quite clear preference for qualitative methods, stemming from such humanist currents as hermeneutics, phenomenology and those used by researchers identified with the Frankfurt School, radical feminism, interpretivism and postmodernism (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000).

The most important characteristic of CMS methodology, and especially of cultural research, is the postulate of a researcher involved in the change of the social reality. This means a rejection of axiological neutrality and requires the research process to become a process of changing culture. Thus, the division between critical and pragmatic aims of CMS presented here is, from the point of view of this perspective, artificial, as all aims have to be, by definition, both critical and pragmatic. Cognition should lead to the emancipation change.

The methodological pragmatism allows for a possibility to use a number of methods, as long as they are subordinated to the emancipation aim (Duberley & Johnson, 2003). The methodological pluralism allows CMS representatives to use the arsenal of methods developed within different paradigms. They most often use interpretative methods, such as cultural studies, comparative analyses, discourse analyses, organisational anthropology methods, in-depth interviews, participant observation, dramatic and narrative methods. Several methodological concepts, appearing in CMS, were drawn from postmodernism, and they include deconstruction, denaturalisation, textual and metaphorical methods. Critical researchers could also use methods stemming from the functionalist paradigm, such as statistical analyses and standard survey methods, although in this case there is a limitation in the form of the postulate of axiological neutrality, underlying the research methodology. Furthermore, it seems that the sociological methods include a number of tools that are useful from the point of view of the critical culture researchers, such as A. Touraine's intervention sociology, the grounded theory of A. Strauss and the methods of phenomenological sociology (Fernández, 2007). In the case of cultural

methods used in management, the subject of criticism is the 'corporate culturism' and the orientation towards instrumental rationality. In the case of deductive methods, CMS focus on philosophical, sociological and anthropological analyses.

Critical methodological pluralism.

As N. Harding noted, creators and promoters of management have built an extensive system of social legitimisation of power, including business schools, the market of business publishing houses, academic environment and a lobby concentrated around management. With the use of this machinery of symbolic violence, the social discourse is filled with seemingly indisputable assumptions and concepts, maintaining the reproduction and legitimising power, such as 'management protects the world against chaos and offers an objective truth about reality' and 'it is an art, allowing to wield power over other people'. (Harding, 2003).

Under the influence of CMS criticism, the attitude of organisational researchers and advisors should also undergo a radical change. At the moment, they are focused on building their own position through profession-centrism. As a result, they mostly legitimise the unjust order, lending the managerial ideology the authority of science. Moreover, referring to the authority of science and the relationships with those in power, they derive unjustified – in the opinion of CMS researchers –benefits.

Critical organisational culture.

Reflective and critical culture means that the project of the transgression of organisational culture towards emancipation is permanent. It requires criticism not only at the stage of the diagnosis of the status quo, but also during the process of implementing changes. It is a kind of promise that culture and its values will not only be celebrated and maintained, but will undergo constant reflection and critical examination from the point of view of the fulfilment of the emancipation aims (Smircich, 1989). The concern for the autonomy of people and the humanisation of organisations should be permanently present in the management science project, which would allow gradual implementation of emancipation's aims. In order for this project to be successful, it is necessary to shape the awareness of the organisation members and researchers, and to develop appropriate sensitivity and reflection. CMS have ambitions to fulfil this task.

Development of humanist management projects through the radicalisation of methods.

A chance for the development of the critical current that would humanise management, are certain threads already present in the theoretical discourse and in practice, such as corporate social responsibility, subjectivity in managerial processes (self-directed teams, substitute management), social and partner marketing, social ownership forms, heterarchies, network structures and cooperation. All these concepts go towards greater autonomy, freedom of decisions and equality of employees and consumers. However, as H. Willimott noted, in the case of organisational culture, such striving for an increase in employee autonomy is paradoxically oppressive (Willimott, 2003). It is a kind of innovativeness, the aim of which is to better control people's minds and hearts through culture and values. In this sense, this approach is oppressive and manipulative. It seems that most managerial concepts do not fulfil the emancipation criterion because, by definition, they strive for higher effectiveness, and not for a greater autonomy of people. The critical view of the theory of corporate social responsibility of business suggests that it is often a smokescreen or the creation of an image in order to derive greater benefits. A smokescreen is supposed to conceal the negative aspects of the organisation, often presenting an image that is drastically different from reality.

Organizational culture management methods

Works of the contemporary authors about OC emphasize the necessity of using many cognitive and organization shaping methods. N. Denzin, formulating postulate referring to methodological triangulation, points to the necessity of using many mutually correcting methods (Denzin, 1970). "Methodological pluralism" assumes willingness to use methods taken from various disciplines and theoretical approaches for solving a research problem. "Methodological anarchy" goes even further and suggests lack of devotion to any method and equal using of all methods and techniques taken both from

science, and from colloquial life (Feyerabend, 1996). I think that the approach, which I would call "methodological eclecticism", and which can be compared with other approaches to methodology (Table 2), is worth considering.

Table 2. Comparison of fundamentalism, pluralism, eclecticism, and methodological anarchy

Comparison criterion	Methodological fundamentalism	Methodological pluralism	Methodological eclecticism	Methodological anarchy
Cognitive methods	One "scientific method" is needed to describe, prescribe and predict OC	Many "scientific methods" needed to understand culture	Many "scientific methods", giving sometimes contradictory or paradoxical descriptions of OC	Lack of standard scientific methods (<i>anything goes</i>) in OC understanding
Combining of OC management methods	Scientific methods from different paradigms cannot be combined	Methods taken from various paradigms and approaches can be combined	Methods taken from various disciplines, paradigms and approaches should be combined	Methods taken from colloquial life and scientific discourse should be combined
Ideal of method of OC management	Universal, generalized, standardized, algorithmic	Particular, limited, open, non-standardised, heuristic	Mixed, partial, open, particular	Paradoxical, breaching, mixed
Assessment of method's effectiveness	Scientific verification or falsification	Cognitive and pragmatic effectiveness	Cognitive and pragmatic effectiveness	Practical (pragmatic) efficacy

Source: own work.

Similar to K. Weick's "hour 10 approach", the concept of "epistemological pluralism" postulates a possibility of combining attitudes taken from various paradigms, yet on the condition that we aim at coherent cognitive results. Another suggested method is the circular interpretation of the research process (Weick, 1979). Thus, one may use both functionalist terms: hypothesis, verification or falsification, and interpretive notions of meaning and interpretation, or even critical terms such as false consciousness. The research methodology aims at complementarity (methodological triangulation) and assumes a possibility of combining quantitative and qualitative methods, including the engaged methods. Management methods of OC should be used in a reflective way, because of their heuristic nature, which makes algorithmization impossible. At the present development stage of this scientific discipline we do not have full capabilities allowing verification of the cognitive and pragmatic effectiveness of various management methods, so we accept using very diversified approaches, methods, and techniques keeping in mind that they will be contradicting each other. Research is of exploratory nature and it opens problems, which indicate contradictions, paradoxes, and areas for discussion (Clarke, 1999). "Methodological eclecticism" is situated between radical cognitively liberal "methodological anarchy", and merely epistemologically tolerant "methodological pluralism". "Methodological eclecticism" accepts combinations of

incommensurable, or even contradictory, scientific methods that create a peculiar *bricolage* (Kincheloe, 2001). The main distinction of the "methodological eclecticism" from the "methodological anarchism" is the acceptance of the cognitive methods taken out from different scientific disciplines, paradigms and cognitive orientations. "Methodological eclecticism" is reflective proposal of joining several approaches and methods taken out from different paradigms. Because of that the researcher: 1) could see a broader picture of the theory, 2) apply different methods having the possibility or triangulation and incommensurability, 3) think about the possible perspective of integration of the images taken out from different perspectives, 4) apply open and reflective approach to practical issues of OC. "Methodological eclecticism" is only a proposition, and most researchers aim rather at using a single methodological approach, which does not have to be identical with "methodological fundamentalism".

Conclusions

The theory of culture in management and the attempt at presenting ways of studying its changes described in this paper indicate that there are multiple diverse concepts. The complexity of the theory is a derivative of the problems related to the notion of culture, which is vast, but also ambiguous and difficult to operationalise. The multiplicity of concepts results from the fact that researchers assume different paradigms, and in consequence, the initial assumptions lead to diametrically different descriptions of culture, the process of its changes and its management methods. This is why resolving the problems of cultural research in management to a large degree depends on research progress and the development of methods for studying culture.

One solution to the problem of multiplicity of organisational culture concepts could be the assumption of a multi-paradigmatic analysis. Some researchers of OC tried to develop multiparadigm perspectives, but not using the eclecticism concept. The methodological eclecticism is more frequently used in pedagogical and psychological discourse but not in organizational culture concepts (Hammersley, 2002; Roberts, 2002; Yanchar & Williams, 2006; Mutch, 2009; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). Methodological eclecticism means readiness to use incommensurable research methods and reflect on the incommensurable results coming out from the culture inquiry (Lewis & Kelemen, 2002; Hatch, 1993; Aldrich, 1992).

We have been educated in accordance with paradigms and the epistemic and methodological ideals of chosen scientific disciplines. Both theoreticians and managers have different intellectual backgrounds. Some have followed the path of economic education, some of managerial education, and some of technical, scientific, social, artistic or humanist education. Our professional and educational paths have shaped our cognitive networks, which include values, norms and models of 'scientificity' and 'usefulness'. Thus, we tend to build a coherent interpretation of notions, harmonising with our cognitive networks, acquired in the socialisation process. Of course, this is not determinism, as there is no agreement as to the paradigm within numerous scientific disciplines, especially the humanities and social sciences. Besides, education is overlapped by a filter of professional and life experiences, which can correct, and sometimes radically change the original orientation, stemming from education.

So what pre-judgments are there in relation to organisational culture? Most of all, coherence with the thinking drawn from the exact, technical and economic sciences, often treats organisational culture in analytical and operationalist categories. This means a tendency to accept the possibility of separating organisational culture from other organisational elements, such as strategy and structure, the possibility of managing and predicting the directions of the culture's development and acceptance of the need for a precise definition and measurement. Generally speaking, this is a tendency to interpret organisational culture within the functionalist paradigm. Apart from that, there are many cases of scepticism about the cognitive value of the concept of organisational culture. On the other hand, representatives of the social sciences and humanities are more often moving towards an understanding of organisational culture in accordance with the interpretative-symbolic paradigm, radical structuralism or even radical humanism. In such cases, organisational culture is a root metaphor of an organisation as a whole, without the possibility to separate structure and strategy. There is a greater awareness in terms of the inevitability of ambiguity and the incoherence of the organisational culture's research results. Usually there is smaller faith in the possibility of operationalising, managing and controlling organisational culture. The influence of education (or, more generally, intellectual background) can be supplemented with the harder-to-capture influence of professional and life experiences, which select our beliefs, consolidating some, and eliminating others. In relation to organisational culture, experience shapes our deep beliefs and intuition concerning the possibility of wielding influence on people, their behaviour and systems of values. In consequence, we move closer to a more universalist and scientific understanding of organisational culture, or we are oriented towards the relativism and ambiguity of these concepts. Understanding culture as such is also important, as it is a kind of model for the understanding of organisational culture. If culture is interpreted unambiguously, mostly as a civilisation, including its technological and material aspects,

as well as other measurable values, then there is a preference for functionalist-structuralist approaches to organisational culture. In most cases, awareness of the ambiguity of the understanding of culture and its contentious nature, leads to the implicit or explicit assumption of non-functionalist paradigms.

The shaping of organisational culture entails axiological, aesthetic and praxeological aspects. It is an evaluative activity, including ethical and moral content. Building organisational identity around certain values has an effect on all groups of stakeholders. It is key to answering the questions about the development of values and norms, which take into consideration social responsibility, orientation towards sustainable development and subjective treatment of employees and other stakeholders.

The axiology of organisational culture is related to the implementation of the idea of 'good', while aesthetics focuses on art and the idea of 'beauty'. Aesthetics is key to the understanding of culture, which is an activity related to the creation of beauty or its antithesis. Thus, it is difficult to assume that a derivative of culture – organisational culture – could be completely devoid of aesthetic ideals. The aesthetic threads, although still marginal in management, are more and more often applied to organisational culture. Organisational anthropology is also increasingly often the basis for documentary texts, forming a kind of organisational literature. The creation of organisational stories, role-play scenarios and performances are being used for cultural diagnosis (Brown, Denning, Groh & Prusak, 2005; Rosen, 1991; Hatch, 1997).

The praxeology of organisational culture focuses on the analysis of organisational culture from the point of view of the activity's effectiveness. It is related to the practical character of the issues, which can distinguish research into organisational culture from cultural analyses as such. Cultural studies do not have to be praxeologically oriented, unlike research into organisational culture – at least the research being subject to management science.

References

- Aldrich, H. E. (1992). Incommensurable paradigms? Vital signs from three perspectives. In: M. Reed, M. Hughes (ed.). *Rethinking Organization: New Directions in Organization Theory and Analysis*. London, Sage, 16-45.
- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding Organizational Culture*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing Critical Management Research*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1992). On the Idea of Emancipation in Management and Organization Studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 432-464.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1996). *Making sense of management: a critical introduction*. Sage.
- Bernstein, B. (1974). *Selection And Control*.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Towards A Theory Of Educational Transmissions*.
- Berry, J. W. (1969). On Cross-Cultural Comparability. *International Journal of Psychology*, 4, 119-128.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). Espace social et pouvoir symbolique. In: *Choses dites*, Paris: Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1970). *A Reproduction. Eléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit Collection Sens Commun.
- Boxall, P., Purcell, J., & Wright, P. (2007). *The Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*. Oxford.
- Brewis J., Gavin J. (2009). Culture: Broadening the Critical Repertoire. In: M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brief, A.P. (2000). Still Servants of Power. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9/4.
- Brown, J.S., Denning, S., Groh, K., & Prusak, L. (2005). *Storytelling in Organizations. Why Storytelling is Transforming 21st Century Organizations and Management*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Brownlie, D., Saren, M., Wensley, R., & Whittington, R. (eds.) (1999). *Rethinking Marketing: Towards Critical Marketing Accounting*. London: Sage.
- Chan, A. (2001). *Toward a Genealogy of Organizational Culture. The Perspectives of Foucault*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins publishing Company.
- Chiapello, E., & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse & Society* 13.2, 185-208.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Powers and Prospects: Reflections on Human Nature and the Social Order*. Boston: South End Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2010). *Making the Future: The Unipolar Imperial Moment*. City Lights Publishers.
- Clarke, A. (1999). *Evaluation Research*. London: Sage.
- Contu, A. (2009). *Critical Management Education*. In: M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, Oxford.

- Coser, L. (1969). *The functions of Social Conflict*. New York: Macmillan.
- Coser, L. (1977). *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Czarniawska, B. (1997). *Writing Management: Organization Theory as a Literary Genre*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Czarniawska, B., & Gagliardi P. (ed.) (2006). *Management Education and Humanities*. Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1969). *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. London.
- Davis, K. (1959). The Myth of Functional Analysis as a Special Method in Sociology and Anthropology. *American Sociological Review*, 24(6), 757-772.
- Deetz, S. A. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization*. State University of New York Press.
- Deniso, D. R. (1996). What is the Difference between Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate? A Native's Point of View on a Decade of Paradigm Wars. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21, 3, 619-654.
- Denzin, N. (1970). *The Research Act: Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Duberley, J., & Johnson, P. (2003). *Understanding Management Research: An Introduction to Epistemology*. London: Sage.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2006). Recommendations on Media and Ethics. In: Proceedings *International Symposium on Media and Ethics*, 3-4, <http://www.siyasaliletisim.org/pdf/medyaveetikkongrebildirileri.pdf>.
- Fernández, W., Martin, M. & Shirley, G. (2007). A multi-paradigm approach to grounded theory. *Information Systems Foundations*, 231-246.
- Feyerabend, P. (1996). *Przeciw metodzie*. Wrocław: Siedmioróg.
- Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the Critical Moment. *Human Relations*, 53, 1, 7-32.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1968). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Aldine Transaction.
- Goodenough, H. W. (1970). *Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hall, T.E. (1964). Adumbration as a Feature of Intercultural Communication. *The Ethnography of Communication*, 66, 6, 154-163.
- Hammersley, M. (2002). The relationship between qualitative and quantitative research: paradigm loyalty versus methodological eclecticism, 159-174. In: J.T.E. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*. Leicester: BPS Books, 159-74.
- Harding, N. (2003). *The Social Construction of Management*. London: Routledge 2003.
- Harris, M. (1987). *Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *Academy of management review*, 18.4, 657-693.
- Hatch, M. J. (1997). Irony and the Social Construction of Contradiction in the Humor of a Management Team. *Organization Studies*, 275-288.
- Headland, T., Pike, K., & Harris, M. (1990). *Emics and Etics, The Insider/Outsider Debate*. Sage Publications.
- Höpfl, H. (1992). The making of the corporate acolyte: Some thoughts on charismatic leadership and the reality of organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29/1, 23-33.
- Jemielniak, D. (2006). The management science as a practical field: in support of action research. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 6.3, 163-170.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). Describing the Bricolage: Conceptualizing a New Rigor in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679-92.
- Klein, N. (2004). *No Logo*. Izabelin: Świat Literacki.
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. C. (1987). Organizational Culture as Management Strategy: A Critique and Illustration from the Financial Services Industry. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, XVII, 3, 1987, 40-63.
- Koch, R., & Godden, I. (1996). *Managing without Management: A Post-Management Manifesto for Business Simplicity*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering Culture. Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Lewis, M. W., Kelemen M. L. (2002). Multiparadigm inquiry: Exploring organizational pluralism and paradox. *Human Relations*, 55.2, 251-275.
- Linstead, S. (ed.) (2003). *Text/Work. Representing Organization and Organizing Representations*. London: Routledge.
- Lyon, D. (2003). *Surveillance as social sorting: privacy, risk, and digital discrimination*. Routledge.
- Lyon, D. (2006). *Theorizing surveillance: the panopticon and beyond - Reference, Information and Interdisciplinary Subjects Series*. Willan Publishing.
- Marcuse, H. (1991). *One-dimensional Man: studies in ideology of advanced industrial society*. London: Routledge.
- Micklethwait, J., & Wooldridge, A. (2000). *The world tomorrow: The essentials of globalization*. New York: Times Books.
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Monin, N. (2004). *Management Theory. A Critical and reflective Reading*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, Metaphors and Puzzle Solving in Organization Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25.
- Mutch, C. (2009). Mixed method research: Methodological eclecticism or muddled thinking?. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 24.2, 18-30.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2004). OECD Publishing.
- Parker, M. (2002). *Against management: organization in the age of managerialism*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Parsons, T. (1961). *Theories of Society: foundations of modern sociological theory*. New York: Free Press.
- Perriton, L., & Reynolds, M. (2004). Critical Management Education: From Pedagogy of Possibility to Pedagogy of Refusal? *Management Learning*, 35, 1: 61-77.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). *In Search of Excellence: Lessons From America's Best-Run Companies*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Pike, K., & Kenneth, L. (1967). *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Potterfield, T. (1999). *The Business of Employee Empowerment: Democracy and Ideology in the Workplace*. Quorum Books.
- Ravitch, D. (2003). *The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn*. Knopf.
- Rhodes, C. (2000). Reading and writing organizational lives. *Organization* 7.1, 7-29.
- Roberts, A. (2002). A principled complementarity of method: In defence of methodological eclecticism and the qualitative-quantitative debate. *The Qualitative Report* 7.3, 1-16.
- Rosen, M. (1991). Coming to the Terms with the field: Understanding and doing organisational ethnography. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28, 1-24.
- Rowlinson, M., & Procter, S. (1999). Organizational Culture and Business History. *Organization Studies*, 20, 3, 369-396.
- Scherer, A. G. (1998). Pluralism and incommensurability in strategic management and organization theory: A problem in search of a solution. *Organization* 5.2, 147-168.
- Schultz, M., & Hatch M. J. (1996). Living With Multiple Paradigms the Case of Paradigm Interplay in Organizational Culture Studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 21.2, 529-557.
- Schultz, M., & Hatch, M. J. (1996). Living with Multiple Paradigms: The Case of Interplay in Organizational Culture Studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 4.
- Schwartz, H. S. (2010). *Society against Itself: Political Correctness and Organizational Self-Destruction*. London: Karnac Books.
- Shepherd, C., Challenger R. (2013). Revisiting paradigm (s) in management research: a rhetorical analysis of the paradigm wars. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15.2, 225-244.
- Smircich, L. (1983a). Organizations as Shared Meaning. *Organization Symbolism*, Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Smircich, L. (1983b). Studing Organisations as Cultures In: G. Morgan, *Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research*, Beverly Hills-London-New Delhi.
- Smircich, L. (1983c). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative science quarterly*, 339-358.
- Smircich, L. (1989). Koncepcje kultury a analiza organizacyjna. In: A. Marcinkowski, J. B. Sobczak (ed.), *Wybrane zagadnienia socjologii organizacji*, Kraków: UJ.

- Sulkowski, L. (2007). Application des techniques d'empowerment dans les projects d'emancipation dirige vers les groupes defavorise. In: C. Martin (ed.), *L'Europe et le developpement regional. Politiques communautaires, entrepreneuriat et mobilisation de la societe civile*, Lisboa: PGV/AESIC ISLA.
- Sulkowski, L. (2009). Interpretative Approach in Management Sciences. *Argumenta Oeconomica*, 2.
- Sulkowski, L. (2012). Elements of Organizational Culture – Theoretical and Methodological Problems. *Management*, 2, 63-71.
- Sulkowski, L. (2013). *Epistemology of Management*. Frankfurt-Oxford-New York-London, Warsaw: Peter Lang International, 129-136.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie C. (2010). Putting the human back in “human research methodology”: The researcher in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4,4, 271-277.
- Thomae, H. (1999). The nomothetic-idiographic issue: Some roots and recent trends. *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 28(1), 187–215.
- Tinker, T. (1985). *Paper Prophets: a social critique of accounting*. New York: Praegar.
- Touraine, A. (1978). *La voix et le regard*. Paris: Seuil.
- Weaver, G. R., Gioia D. A. (1994). Paradigms lost: incommensurability vs structurationist inquiry. *Organization Studies*, 15,4, 565-589.
- Weick, K. E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.
- Willmott, H. (1993). Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30/4, 515-552.
- Willmott, H. (1995) What has been happening in organization theory and does it matter?, *Personnel Review*, 24 (9), 33-53.
- Willmott, H. (2003). Renewing Strength: Corporate Culture Revisited. *Management*, 6, 3, 73-87.
- Yanchar, S. C. & Williams D. D. (2006). Reconsidering the compatibility thesis and eclecticism: Five proposed guidelines for method use. *Educational Researcher*, 3-12.
- Zimbardo, P.G., Maslach, C., & Haney, C. (2000). Reflections on the Stanford Prison Experiment: Genesis, transformations, consequences. In: T. Blass, *Obedience to authority: Current Perspectives on the Milgram paradigm*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 193-237.