Łukasz Sułkowski

Społeczna Akademia Nauk

Human Resource Management – paradigms and basic cognitive orientations

Abstract: The study area of HRM is very wide and interdisciplinary, it covers the problems of organization and management theory as well as: social psychology, sociology and education. The emergence of the subdiscipline of HRM, however, puts the cognitive challenges associated with the adoption of the basic methodological assumptions. How to classify the theories and research methods drawn from different disciplines? There are many accepted typologies of human resource management concepts that refer to the history and practice of this subdiscipline. This article presents a proposition of understanding human resources management in the organizational discourse from the different point of reference in the form of paradigms of social sciences.

Key-words: HRM, paradigms, cognitive orrientations, fuctionalism.

Introduction

Human resource management is a management science, but uses a broad perspective of the social sciences, particularly those exhibiting behavioral orientation, such as psychology, sociology and economics. The study area of HRM is very wide and interdisciplinary, it covers the problems of organization and management theory (management, personnel strategy, organizational culture), as well as: social psychology (motivation, secondary socialization), sociology (identification, power, communication) and education (education, upbringing). Human resource management is characterized by a relatively strong professional identity because researchers are a second large group that indentifies with HR, they implement and test theoretical constructs in organizations. The emergence of the subdiscipline, however, puts the cognitive challenges as-

sociated with the adoption of the basic methodological assumptions. How to classify the theories and research methods drawn from different disciplines? There are many accepted typologies of human resource management concepts that refer to the history and practice of this subdiscipline [Sułkowski 2001]. I would like to propose a different point of reference in the form of paradigms of social science [Sułkowski 2009].

1. Paradigms of Social Sciences

Management studies are multi-paradigmatic and multi-methodical. What is more, there is no clarity regarding the criteria of paradigm classification. Still, since the multiplicity of organisational metaphors can broaden the knowledge of managers and organisational studies scholars, it seems that the use of various paradigms can in a similar fashion contribute to the increase of epistemological and methodological awareness in management. It is worth attempting to overcome the contradictions and the incommensurability of various paradigms, since the perception of organisational and management studies from various perspectives helps to understand these disciplines better.

The methodology of management

Among several methods of distinguishing paradigms in management studies, the one that seems most useful in the cognitive sense is the concept of G. Burrell and G. Morgan (Table 1). This is mostly due to its general character that makes the theory applicable not only to organisational and management studies, but in fact to the majority of social sciences that address similar issues, such as: sociology, cultural anthropology, linguistics and, with certain restrictions, psychology and economics. Furthermore, the concept is deeply embedded in the philosophy of science and goes back to the roots of the basic cognitive dilemma between the objectivist (neo-positivist) vision of science based on the methodology of natural history and the subjectivist (or intersubjective) project indebted to the tradition of hermeneutics and aimed at the use of the "understanding" methods. Additionally, the juxtaposition of the idea of maintaining the status quo and the change-oriented attitude accurately conveys one of the basic cognitive dilemmas both in social sciences and in management. In fact, depending on the ideal of science they have consciously or subconsciously adopted, the majority of scholars in our discipline choose the model based either on the passive description of the existing form of organisation or on the intervention in the investigated reality stimulating its change. Apart from this, Burrell and Morgan's classification is quite commonly and creatively used in management studies.

Table 1. Paradigms of social sciences

Epistemological principles concerning the ideal of science		Preferred social orientation	
		Regulation	Radical change
	Objectivism	Functionalism	Radical structuralism
	Subjectivism	Interpretive / symbolic paradigm	Postmodernism

Source: elaborated on the basis of G. Burrell, G. Morgan, *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*, Heinemann, London 1979.

As regards the initial model proposed by the authors in 1979, I suggest to modify the names of the paradigms approaching the classification of paradigms from a historical perspective that takes into account the development of management and related social studies at the turn of the 20th century. In order to conduct analyses in the field of management studies, I propose the use of four paradigms:

1. the Neo-positivist-Functionalist-Systems paradigm which combines objectivism with regulation,

2. the Interpretive-Symbolic paradigm which combines subjectivism with regulation,

3. the paradigm of radical structuralism (Critical Management Studies), formed at the meeting point of objectivism and the radical change,

4. radical humanism (postmodernism) – a paradigm combining subjectivism with radical change [Sułkowski 2012].

2. The Neo-positivist-Functionalist-Systemic paradigm (NFS)

The paradigm that dominates in social sciences is labelled as "functionalist" or sometimes "neo-positivist", "systems" or "quantitative" [Holmwood 2005, pp. 87–109]. It sets natural history as a cognitive model. The paradigm is a combination of the influences of neo-positivist philosophy and the systems approach together with functionalism observed in social sciences and cultural anthropology [Sułkowski 2004]. It has inherited the following principles of the Vienna Circle: verificationism, the coherence and the accumulation of power, the search for a universal scientific method, the division into dependent and independent variables, the drive towards mathematical modelling, and the quantifiable methodology [Neurath, Sarkar, Shlick, Carnap 1996]. Verificationalism enables a permanent assertion of the cognitive value of the given statements through the empirical research in the subject matter [Parrini, Salmon, Salmon 2003]. This gives an opportunity to provide an unambiguous answer to the questions concerning the nature of organisation, its qualities and the ways it can

be effectively managed. The accumulation of knowledge denotes trust in the fact that the scholars in the field of organisational studies build a stable edifice of knowledge which develops systematically and contributes to the continuous progress. The scholars seek for a comparatively reliable "scientific method" that will help to discover and assess valuable knowledge. The system of dependent and independent variables enables one to create cause-and-effect relationships and feedbacks taking inspiration and basic metaphors from physical sciences perceived through the prism of Newton's (mechanistic) paradigm. Due to the necessity to create precise generalisations, the methodology of quantifiable research (the quantitative research) is valued more highly than the qualitative research. Management has also witnessed attempts of mathematical modelling and generalisation aiming at a coherent image of organisational studies expressed in the universal language of nature – the language of mathematics (e.g. operational research, forecasting and simulation). The neo-positivist image of management remains as the dominant paradigm and offers a "commonsensical" vision of the practiced discipline.

The second source of such orientation is the functionalist approach in sociology and cultural anthropology [Layton 1997, Elster 1990, pp. 129–135]. It is characterised by a conviction that the social entity should maintain balance in the process of exchange between the elements of the social system. The majority of actions performed by the members of the organisation aim to maintain the higher order of the social system. The "function" is the contribution of the partial activity to the total activity [Davis 1959, pp. 757–772]. Functionalism in management leads to distinguishing a system of complementary organisational functions that maintain the operation of the whole (e.g. planning, organising, motivating, monitoring). A functionally unified and well-balanced social system guarantees harmonious and peaceful collaboration of its subsystems [Radcliff-Brown 1952, pp. 192–193]. Functionalism leads to the deterministic methodology which complies with the neo-positivist spirit and enables comprehending the patterns and repetitions in the social processes within the organisation [Merton 1982].

The third area of inspiration for the trend is the systems concept which positions organisations at the level of complex social systems with flow from functionalistic orientation [Boulding 1956].

The Neo-positivist-Functionalist-Systems (NFS) epistemology is thus characterised by the orientation towards creating integrated systems and the verification of truth using objective quantitative methods. What plays the key role here is the analytical approach which offers a possibility of generalising and modelling mathematically the research results. Social processes have an objective, cause-and-result character and are based on the following assumptions:

the axiological neutrality of science and the non-interference of the researcher, the creation of possibly most general social theories and the mathematical modelling of the reality of social sciences. In social sciences, functionalists often apply the cognitive perspective of self-regulating social systems.

In management studies, NFS is the dominant cognitive concept. The majority of theories aim at realising the neo-positivist ideal of science. Knowledge should be objective and universal. The created scientific theories can be represented as casual sequences of variables which can, at least potentially, be mathematically formalised. It is also postulated that the theory of management should be highly universal and verifiable, and should have predictive power. The tendencies that are most deeply rooted in this perspective include these directly connected with classical economics and technical sciences that gave birth to management studies. The systemic and functional vision of the organisation is accompanied with the image of the human being who is close to the categories of *homo oeconomicus*. The quantitative methodology occupies an important position in such subdisciplines of management as: management accounting, logistics management or information management. However, quantitative survey methods are also useful for research of social, organizational phenomena like corporate culture and climate [Sułkowski 2002].

3. Interpretive / symbolic paradigm (IS)

The interpretive / symbolic paradigm emerged in opposition to functionalism. Its most important sources of inspiration are social sciences and humanities such as: sociology, psychology, political sciences and cultural anthropology. The attempt to reconstruct the principles of the interpretive/symbolic paradigm in management leads to several points including: social constructivism, the cognitive role of language in shaping the social reality and the practical aspect of cognitive activity. These epistemological assumptions realise themselves in research programmes based on the qualitative methodology taken mostly from humanities [Blumer 1969].

Interpretive theories concentrate on describing interrelations in complex social and organisational structures departing from the cause-and-effect neo--positivist model. The key to creating a scientific theory is comprehension, grasping the gist from the point of view of an involved observer or a member of the organisation [Sułkowski 2009]. Theories are not to be created in the spirit of objectivism and axiological neutrality, but they should expose the intersubjective diversity of meanings and interpretations proposed by various organisational actors.

In management studies, many theories related to organisational culture [Sułkowski 2008, pp. 9–25], HR management, supervision processes or ma-

nagement processes are based on the principles of the interpretive approach, the examples of which are: K. Weick's theory of enactment, G. Morgan and L. Smircich's management of meanings, the organisational identity as seen by S. Albert and D.A. Whetten or J. Pfeffer and G.R. Salancik's "networks of power" [Weick 1979, Smircich 1983, pp. 55–65, Peiffer, Salancik 1978]. What serves as the basis of the interpretive theory is the assumption that the social and organisational reality has a constructivist and conventional character [Hatch 2002, p. 24, 56]. The organisational order does not exist objectively, but is still maintained, reconstructed and modified by individuals and groups functioning within and around the organisation. The organisation and the management processes are created by groups in the processes of institutionalisation, legitimisation and internalisation, and they are a matter of convention – a collective consensus [Berger 1966]. Economical interests exert the same impact as political, social and psychological factors. The human being in the organisation is a person who is oriented towards values, who searches for the meaning and who involves themselves in a study situation.

4. The paradigm of radical structuralism, Critical Management Studies (CMS)

The paradigm of radical structuralism, also known as Critical Management Studies (CMS), is based on the principle of the existence of objective social reality which yet needs a fundamental restructuring. Social truths are hidden in the omnipresent micro- and macrostructures of power. The role of social sciences is to uncover the concealed mechanisms of power, domination and social inequality as well as to change the social awareness and reality. The paradigm of radical structuralism adopts a critical attitude towards the social *status quo* and the achievements of social sciences. The role of the scholar is to discover the social mechanisms and, more importantly, to change the social reality. The character of change is more oriented toward revolutionary or punctuated equilibrium approach [Gersick 1991, pp. 10–36]. The methodology of research has a qualitative character and is based on the involved methods.

The critical tendency in management studies takes its source from the philosophical doctrines which adopt a radical vision of the development of organisation and management seen as the foundations of domination and power. This idea goes back to Bentham's idea of panopticon and Karl Marx's class struggle. In the 20th century, the critique of the oppressive dimensions of organisation was expressed by: the Frankfurt School, neomarxists, poststructuralists and postmodernists [Benhabib 1986]. What also serves as an important point of reference is Jürgen Habermas's critical theory of communication [Habermas 1985]. Considered the precursor of postmodernism, Michael Foucault raised the problem of power and domination as the basic driving force of social ac-

tivities (e.g. the concept of knowledge-power) and the constant surveillance and control seen as the methods of enforcing obedience and submission in organisations and society [Michel 1976]. P. Bourdieu, who introduced the term "symbolic violence" [Bourdieu 1990], was an important theoretician describing the objectively interpreted mechanisms of inequality, domination and power. Today, the continuation of his thought can be found in the critical approach to media and social communication represented by S. Hall and S. Deetz [1995]. Another trend following this direction is neo-Marxist feminism depicting the situation of women as a group that has been culturally dominated by: false consciousness, the manipulation of identity and symbolic violence [Oakley 2000].

The theories formed on the basis of the paradigm of radical structuralism (CMS) share a few common principles. Their researches focus on the same subject matter which includes the mechanisms of power, oppression, instrumentalism and domination in organisations and in management. CMS is socially involved and supports groups subjected to oppression. In organisations, we have to do with inequality and privileging some groups at the cost of others. Unequal social relations are concealed, rationalised and ideologised within the discourse of management studies and the managerial discourse. The aim of CMS is to uncover the oppressiveness, domination and injustice, which would lead to the emancipation of groups discriminated against in organisations and in social life. There is a clear axiological orientation of the scholar and the manager, which means that both the understanding of the organisation and the understanding of the management are inevitably embedded in values. The language and the culture are not neutral media, but they serve as tools of domination and symbolic violence. Accepted by all CSM scholars, the statement that the theory and practice that dominate in management studies are the rationalisations of the existent, unjust status quo and thus, reinforce the reproduction of the unjust order and the ideology of managerialism. This means a tendency towards the radical criticism of the former managerial discourse. The possibilities of changing the oppressive, unjust and frequently concealed social order are connected with the use of the involved methods of organisational cognition and change which lead to the abandonment of "false consciousness".

The critical trend in management is fairly controversial because the principles underlying its foundations have an ideological character. Described as a persuasive discourse maintaining the oppressive social structures, management is perceived in a one-sided and ideological way. At the same time, Critical Management Studies have scientific ambitions that go back to neo-Marxist objectivism. Marxism postulated the "scientificism" of its own discourse, yet it has not managed to reach beyond the ideology.

5. The approach of radical humanism, postmodernism (POST)

Proposed by Burrell and Morgan, the paradigm of radical humanism appears to be closest to postmodernism which is one of the most influential trends in modern humanities. Postmodern epistemological relativism leads to the problem with the use of the scientific approach. Without the correspondence or the coherence theories of truth, the notion of the "scientific theory" does not make any sense. As a matter of fact, in the context of moderate postmodernism, one may speak only about "theorising" in a broad meaning of the term.

In management, postmodernism occupies a peripheral position and, similarly as in other social sciences, it serves as a form of an extreme reaction against the earlier neo-positivist ambitions. Postmodernism introduces to management an element of criticism that does not cause the deconstruction of the object of management, but contributes to foregrounding the issue of cognition and social processes. Postmodernism is presented as a relativistic, subjectivist and anti-intuitive concept that goes against the common impressions of the majority of management specialists. I believe that the postmodern trend in management can be treated as a peculiar intellectual provocation that draws attention, in an exaggerated way, to the key epistemological and ethical problems. This is where the real value of postmodernism resides. We are facing the dilemmas of cognitive and cultural relativism, the problems of the researcher's involvement, subjectivism and the ethical context, which should be the subjects of reflection [Scheurich 1997].

6. Paradigms of social sciences in HRM

Adapting solution G. Morgan and G. Burrell to the needs of human resource management we can look at often contradictory: theories, methods and research tools relating to human resources functions.

I. Functionalism in Human Resources Management

Functionalism is the dominant trend of human resource management. Most used theories and methods of recruitment, motivation, training, promotion, career path planning and HR strategy are based on a functionalist thinking. Implicite its chosen approach to recruitment is seeking people who have the relevant expertise, including: the knowledge, skills and psychophysical abilities.

Competence must be clearly defined, measurable by available methods of personnel selection and diagnosis. This approach usually ignores the role of: intuition, tacit knowledge, adaptation to a specific culture and identity of a social group. Psychophysical predispositions include personality traits, usually described as a combination of a relatively stable orientation of the individual

describing human behavior towards the environment (extraversion – introversion, dominance – submission, etc.). What is usually overlooked here, is the role of individual and collective identity, and therefore the construction of personality and social belonging only in the process of interacting with a group (eg. communication, action).

The most commonly used concepts of motivation in human resources management are: A. Maslow's pyramid of needs and the scheme of needs of F. Herzberg. Using them in the discourse of management science generally refers to the instrumental vision of human nature. Motivators are the reasons, behaviors of people in organizations are the results. People with knowledge of the system of rewards and punishments shape and modify their behavior ergo incentive system is the cause of their work. From the point of view of other psychological and sociological concepts, image of human behavior is far more complex. Psychodynamic concept will be referred to the incentives inherent in human consciousness and cognitive concepts will point to the complexity of psychosocial processing of environmental stimuli and to take actions in the range of reflexive reactions to informed decisions. A similar analysis can be carried out in relation to the other mentioned elements of human resource management that is: education, promotion, career path planning and HR strategy. Of course, most of the authors of these concepts and practitioners using them are not aware of applied cognitive canon. It is taken for granted, to justify a claim to "scientific method" of human resource management. However, despite its undoubted popularity and applicability functionalist way of thinking cannot cope with many organizational phenomena. Functionalist description such as staff development, organizational culture, leadership, organizational learning and communication processes is highly dynamic, and overly simplified so that there are problems with its use.

Many practitioners attempting to implement mechanistic and seemingly universal "model" of the selection process, evaluation and incentive systems or tools change organizational culture experienced this.

II. Interpretive-symbolic paradigm in human resource management

Interpretive-symbolic paradigm have been penetrating human resource management from other social sciences since the 70s of the last century. It led to a redefinition of some terms and concepts of that subdiscipline. They have gained symbolic, social and metaphorical, dimension which may be subject to different interpretations and collective presentations. For example, I refer here to the interpretive understandings of organizational culture, HR strategy and leadership.

Culture is interpreted as an indigenous metaphor and so identified with the process of organizing. Organizations are understood primarily as a symbolic actions, a form of human expression and creativity, cognitive enterprises or symptoms of the deep structures of the human mind and society [Smircich 1983].

Personal strategy constituting part of the strategy throughout the organization gained an incremental and emergent dimension. Interpretative model is based on the perception of the strategy through the prism of its creation and understanding of the social group. The strategy, therefore, is gaining significant socio-emotional dimension. It ceases to be a purely rational decision-making process based on reliable knowledge. Methods used are of heuristic and interpretative character.

This model often describes strategy as a political process involving abrasion of various interest groups and the construction of pragmatic coalitions for consolidating power in organizations. Planning blends with the implementation, controlling and corrections of plans occur during the process. The strategic process takes synchronous form. Planning is primarily a source of integration, and motivating employees, and it is difficult to measure efficiency foreseeable future. The strategy is born in the operations performed by the manager.

Concepts of emergent strategies developed by K. Weick and logical incrementalism of J.B. Quinn can be considered interpretative [Weick 2001, Quinn 1978, pp. 7–21].

Concepts of leadership based on interpretative thinking suggests the social and symbolic factors of the role of a leader. Leadership is not based on personal charisma, but it is kind of relationships and social image, which identify members of the group. The leader is seen and sees himself as a hero of organization which carries out the mission. The key elements of leadership are: faith, emotion, interaction and group communication processes supporting the sustainability of the image and building the identity of the leader and his followers [Hogg, Terry 2000, pp. 121–140].

Interpretative trend brought to the management a number of new methods and techniques of qualitative research. From the perspective of human resource management is worth mentioning about the possibility of applying the methods of involvement and participation drawn from cultural anthropology [Smircich 1983, pp. 160–172, Rosen 1991, pp. 1–24, Haich 1997, pp. 275–288]. These include such techniques as: participant observation, in-depth interviews (biographical, anthropological), text analysis, and other qualitative fieldwork. There will also appear applications of the methodology related to organizational anthropology, but drawn from sociology: ethnometodology, sociology of intervention, grounded theory, the method of extended case studies and research including involvement [Morgan (ed.) 1983]. The usage of these

methods gives the knowledge and tools affecting the complex social processes in organizations.

III. Radical structuralism in personnel management

Radical structuralism in human resource management takes the form of a critical analysis of the practice of the discipline and pointing out methods of emancipation of disadvantaged social groups. The theory is influenced by economic and political power. Knowledge in the modern world is no longer a disinterested pursuit of truth, becoming a tool for policy-makers and businesses. This also applies to the management, which at its very inception, was intended to create conditions for increasing the effectiveness of the organization. Management analyzed in terms of radical structuralism aims primarily at manipulating members of the organization and the created theory takes as objective truth, and the foundations of this doctrine ideological functions imposed from outside [Chomsky 1993, p. 40].

The theory of scientific management rationalized instrumental and alienating treatment of industrial workers [Clegg 1981, pp. 545–562, Goldman, van Houten 1977, pp. 108–125]. For example, the so-called "modern" methods of management as reengeneering, lean management and job sharing within the meaning of the critical trend have become euphemisms, behind which the exploitation and laying off employees lies. Modern theorists of organization and management sanction the usability and the inevitability of globalization avoiding answering troubling questions in whose interest it is and how those using it support the creation of the theory [Thomas 1979]. Critical analysis seeking for the possible ideological connections, can perhaps be a valuable source of reflection. Research on the perspectives of disadvantaged groups in specific contexts of management (eg. women or ethnic minorities) can provide valuable knowledge about the mechanisms of social legitimacy based on the pretense of rationality [Alston 2003, Glennon 1983, pp. 260–271]. By studying the development of popularity of a specific method or management concepts it can be observed that often they flow from the social aspects [Micklethwait, Wooldrige 2000, pp. 29–31]. In the human resource management a critical analysis methods are used to debunk a situation of inequality and power in organizations and social structures by means of: a discursive analysis, dramaturgical metaphors, the methodology of radical feminism [Morgan (ed.) 1983]. Among scholars of human behavior in organizations who identify themselves with the current radical structuralism one can point S. Deetz, M. Alvessona, P. Adler, E. Wray-Bliss, and others [Wray-Bliss 2005]. Despite the growing number of applications radical structuralist paradigm in human resource management still suffers from underdevelopment methodology.

Critical trend may be a kind of reflection assuming searching for the links between the creation and transmission of knowledge and the political and cultural forms of governance [www.trinity.edu/~mkearl/knowledg.html, 2004]. It is worth to take seriously the problem of the universality of this knowledge (situation, contingency). The development of this discipline is stimulated socially, through the influence of political power, conflicts of interest, the importance of the scientific community, and certainly it is needed to examine how these social factors influence the content and method of obtaining knowledge in management.

IV . Postmodernism and HR functions

Postmodernism as an anti-system and anti-method formation does not propose any direct methods and tools for human resource management, however, it is a source of reflection and a critical look at theories of human behavior in organizations. This takes the form of the perception of the organization and management from the perspective of: paradoxes, antinomies, multiple metaphors and poetic logic of the organization [Sköldberg 2002]. One of the important postmodern threads is the problem of man in the organization. Z. Bauman, G. Burrell, H. Willmott and others describe the processes of fragmentation and virtualization of human labor as the cause of the loss of a sense of stability and confidence to the community by the employees [Bauman 2006, pp. 202–252, Burrell 1990]. B. Czarniawska, M.J. Hatch, D.A. Gioia, M. Schultz and K. Corley perceive organizational culture from the perspective of the processes of fragmentation, lack of its analytical capabilities to extract from the organizational processes and gaining a liquid dimension of individual and collective identity [Czarniawska-Joerges 2004, pp. 407–435, Gidia, Schultz, Corley 2004, pp. 349–376]. Postmodernism brings reflections on issues of sexuality at work [Brewis, Linstead 2000]. It often uses here approach similar to that of radical feminism, but enriched by reflections on the fragmentation of identity and irreducible social diversity [The Sexuality of Organization 1989].

An interesting theme is also deconstructing the Weberian tradition of charismatic leadership as a kind of meta-narratives [Calas 1993, pp. 305–328, Hopfl 2005]. Other widely exploited topics include: the problem of disintegration of human identity in conditions of the consumer society [Bauman 1998, pp. 95–101], creating a hyper-reality as a work environment [Virtual Culture. Identity & Communication in Cybersociety 2002], intellectual capital involvement in the problems of domination (the dialectic of knowledge-power), and the deconstruction of the traditional concepts of human resource management (eg. category profession, career, employee development).

Mentioned theories and research tools are just the outline the four paradigms. They are, moreover, at different stages of development of their own theories and methodologies. Functionalism is a mature paradigm, which generated a coherent conceptualization and management tools. The criticism emanating from the weakness of the dominant paradigm to cope with the analysis of a number of social phenomena in organizations has led to the rapid development of theory and methods interpretive-symbolic approach.

Paradigms of radical structuralism and postmodernism are mostly critical themes of reflection on the topic of dominant human resource management trend. At the present stage of development of the discourse of human resource management the development of this discourse can therefore be regarded dualistic: classical theories of human resource management versus critical theories of human resource management. Bearing in mind, however, that the latter stemming from the criticism of the dominant functionalist paradigm, however, are based on various epistemic ideals.

Summary

Each of the paradigms is based on different cognitive grounds and therefore critique of the concept should be carried out from two perspectives: the same paradigm or another paradigm. Awareness of this diversity allows for a better understanding of the seemingly "non-scientific" approaches and concepts, which operate on the basis of a different paradigm. Consideration of the same problem can be carried out in the different paradigms, which raises creative, but sometimes paradoxical implications for human resources management. For example, the concept of organizational culture discussed in terms of functionalism is a subject to description and operationalization in the form of variables, recognition of which allows the control of cultural change.

The symbolic and interpretative paradigm such control over cultural change in an organization is impossible because they are spontaneous, indeterministic processes that make up in the complex and interdependent plays of actors and social groups. Radical structuralism indicates the possibility of the diagnosis of organizational culture as a tool of domination, control and power, and will focus on the implementation of the methods of weakening its oppressiveness and empowerment of disadvantaged groups in organizations. Postmodernists will deconstruct the very same concept of organizational culture by describing them as: the linguistic game and narration, which is a pure emanation of the internal discourse of social sciences with no roots in social reality.

Bibliografia

Alston M. (2003), *Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling*, Routledge, London.

Bauman Z. (1998), *Globalizacja*, PIW, Warszawa.

Bauman Z. (2006), *Płynna nowoczesność*, Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Benhabib S. (1986), *Critique, Norm, and Utopia: A Study of the Foundations of Critical Theory*, Columbia University Press.

Berger P.L., Luckmann T. (1966), T*he Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Doubleday, Garden City.

Beyond Method. Strategies for Social Research (1983), ed. G. Morgan, Sage, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi.

Blumer H. (1969), *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boulding K.E. (1956), *General Systems Theory, The Sceleton of the Science*, "Management Science", no. 8.

Bourdieu P. (1990), *Animaadversiones in Mertonem* [in:] R.K. Merton, *Consensus and Controversy*, ed. J. Clark, C. Modgil, S. Modgil, The Falmer Press, London-New York.

Brewis J., Linstead S. (2000), *Sex, Work and Sex Work: Eroticizing Organization*, Routledge, London.

Burrell G. (1990), *Fragmented Labours* [in:] *Latour Process Theory*, ed. D. Knights, H. Willmott, Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Calás M.B. (1993), *Deconstructing Charismatic Leadership: Re-reading Weber from Darker Side*, "Leadership Quarterly", 4 (3-4).

Chomsky N. (1993), *Language and Thought*, Mayer Bell, Wakefield, Rhod Island, London.

Clegg S. (1981), *Organisation and Control*, "Administrative Science Quarterly", nr 26.

Czarniawska-Joerges B. (2004), *Narratives of Individual and Organisational Identities* [in:] *Organisational Identity. A Reader*, ed. M.J. Hatch, M. Schultz, Oxford University Press, Oxford–New York.

Davis K. (1959), *The Myth of Functional Analysis as a Special Method in Sociology and Anthropology*, "American Sociological Review", 24(6),

Deetz S. (1995), *Transforming Communication, Transforming Business: Building Responsive and Responsible Workplaces*, Cresskill, Hapton.

Elster J. (1990), *Merton's Functionalism and the Unintended Consequences of Action* [in:] J. Clark, C. Modgil, S. Modgil, R. Merton (eds.), *Consensus and Controversy*, Falmer Press, London.

Gersick C.J.G. (1991), *Revolutionary Change Theories: A Multilevel Exploration of the Punctuated Equilibrium Paradigm*, "The Academy of Management Review", Vol. 16, No. 1.

Gioia D.A., Schultz M., Corley K. (2004), *Organisational Identity, Image and Adaptive Instability* [in:] *Organisational Identity*. A Reader, ed. M.J. Hatch, M. Schultz, Oxford University Press, Oxford–New York.

Glennon L.M. (1983), S*ynthesism. A Case of Feminist Methodology* [in:] *Beyond Method. Strategies for Social Research*, ed. G. Morgan, Sage, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi.

Goldman P., van Houten D. (1977), *Managerial Strategies and the Worker*, "The Sociological Quarterly", nr 18.

Habermas J. (1985), *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Translated by Thomas McCarthy, Beacon Press.

Hatch M.J. (1997), *Irony and the Social Construction of Contradiction in the Humor of a Management Team*, "Organization Studies".

Hatch M.J. (2002), *Teoria organizacji*, PWN.

Hogg M.A., Terry D.J. (2000), *Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts*, "The Academy of Management Review", Vol. 25, No. 1.

Holmwood J. (2005), *Functionalism and its Critics [in:] A. Harrington, (ed.) Modern Social Theory: an introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hopfl H. (2005), T*he Making of the Corporate Acolyte: Some Thoughts on Charismatic Leadership and the Reality of Organizational Commitment* [in:] *Critical Management Studies. A Reader*, ed. Ch. Grey, H. Willmott, Oxford University Press, New York.

Layton R. (1997), *An Introduction to Theory in Anthropology*, Cambridge: CUP.

Merton R. (1982), *On Social Structure and Science*, ed. P. Sztompka, Chicago-London.

Michel F. (1976), *Histoire de la sexualité, volume 1: La volonté de savoir*, Paris, Gallimard.

Micklethwait J., Wooldrige A. (2000), *Szamani zarządzania*, Zysk i s-ka, Poznań.

Neurath M., Sarkar S., Shlick M., Carnap R. (1996), *Logical Empiricism at its Peak: Schlick, Carnap, and Neurath*. New York: Garland.

Oakley A. (2000), *Experiments in Knowing. Gender and Method in the Social Sciences*, The New Press, New York.

Parrini P., Salmon W.C., Salmon M.H. (ed.) (2003), *Logical Empiricism – Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Pfeffer J., Salancik G.R. (1978), *The External Control of Organisations: a Resources Dependence Perspective*, Harper and Row, New York.

Quinn J.B. (1978), *Strategic Change: Logical Incrementalism*, "Sloan Managemant Review", no 20.

Radcliffe-Brown A.R. (1952), *On the Concept of Function in Social Science [in:] Structure and Function in Primitive Society*, The Free Press of Glencoe, Glencoe.

Rosen M. (1991), *Coming to the Terms with the field: Understanding and doing organisational ethnography*, "Journal of Management Studies", nr 28.

Scheurich J.J. (1997), *Research method in the postmodern*, Falmer Press, London, Washington, DC.

Sköldberg K. (2002), *The Poetica Logic of Administration*, Routledge, London and New York.

Smircich L. (1983), *Organisations as Shared Meaning* [in:] *Organisational Symbolism*, JAI Press, Greenwich.

Smircich L. (1983), *Studing Organizations as Cultures* [in:] *Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research*, G. Morgan (ed.), Beverly Hills-London-New Delhi.

Sułkowski Ł. (2002), *Czy kultury organizacyjne zmierzają do unifikacji?*, „Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi", Instytut Pracy i Spraw Socjalnych, 3–4.

Sułkowski Ł (2008), *Czy warto zajmować się kulturą organizacyjną?*, "Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi", nr 6.

Sułkowski Ł. (2012), *Epistemologia i metodologia zarządzenia*, PWE, Warszawa.

Sułkowski Ł. (2009), *Interpretative Approach in Management Sciences*, "Argumenta Oeconomica", no. 2.

Sułkowski Ł. (2004), *Neopozytywistyczna mitologia w nauce o zarządzaniu*, „Organizacja i kierowanie", nr 1 (115).

Sułkowski Ł. (2009), *Paradygmaty nauk społecznych w zarządzaniu zasobami ludzkimi*, „Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi", nr 6 (71)..

Sułkowski Ł. (2001), *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi*, Absolwent, Łódź.

The Sexuality of Organization (1989), ed. J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, G. Burrell, Sage, London.

Thomas S. (1979), *The Multi-National Companies*, Wayland Publishers, Hove.

Virtual Culture. Identity & Communication in Cybersociety (2002), ed. S.G. Jones, Sage, London.

Weick K. (2001), *Making Sense of the Organization*, Blackwell, Malden.

Weick K. (1979), *The Social Psychology of Organising*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.

Wray-Bliss E. (2005), *Abstract Ethics, Embodied Ethics: The Strange Marriage of Foucault and Positivism in Labour Process Theory* [in:] *Critical Management Studies. A Reader*, ed. Ch. Grey, H. Willmott, Oxford University Press, New York.

www.trinity.edu/~mkearl/knowledg.html, 2004.