

Łukasz Sułkowski, Michał Zawadzki

Critical Discourse in Contemporary Management Science

Abstract: The article presents characteristic features of the critical approach in management—Critical Management Studies—which keeps gaining popularity in the global management studies discourse. The authors point out the major paradigmatic assumptions of this line of inquiry, its intellectual sources and its critical tools, emphasizing in particular the role of education as the key to effective emancipation. The article closes with a criticism of CMS, which falls into line with the demand of the critical approach that the practice of scientific research should be accompanied by autocriticism.

Keywords: critical approach in management, critical paradigm in CMS, education, emancipation, autocriticism in scientific research

Introduction

Critical reflection concerning organizational and managerial processes has accompanied managerial science since its beginnings. The works of Mary Parker Follet, Elton Mayo, Abraham Maslow contain elements of critique of instrumental and technocratic ways of managing humans.¹ In the classical period of the development of management science postulates about humanizing organizational methods appeared. The foundations for the development of the radical cur-

¹ M. P. Follett, *Freedom and Co-ordination: Lectures in business organization* (New York: Management Publications Trust Limited, 1949 [1987]). A. H. Maslow, *Maslow on Management With added interviews by Deborah Stephens and Gary Heil* (New York: Wiley, 1998). Note: previously published as: *Eupsychian Management: A Journal* (Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey, 1965).

rent of critical thought were laid down by alternative approaches connected with the postmodern, radical structural, interpretative-symbolic, and narrative currents.² This has resulted in the fact that in management science, radical critical thought has been developing for some time, questioning its epistemological foundations which were hitherto unshaken.³ The most important modern sources of inspiration for auto-critical thinking in management go back to postmodernism (M. J. Hatch, S. Fuller) and textualism (N. Harding, B. Czarniawska, N. Monin), neo-Marxism (M. Hardt, A. Negri) and the Frankfurt School (S. Deetz, N. Chomsky), feminism (M. Alston, A. Oakley) and the strong program in the sociology of knowledge (B. Barnes, D. Bloor).⁴

However, it was birth and development of Critical Management Studies (CMS) that led to the institutionalization of the radical view questioning the cognitive and pragmatic value of management in the modern world. The turning point here is the birth of CMS, which was institutionalized after the appearance of Mats Alvesson and Hugh Willmott's publication entitled *Critical Management Studies*.⁵ During the last twenty years, the radical critical current in management has developed very quickly, undertaking reflection not only in the field of organizational theory, but also in such subdisciplines of management as: marketing, strategic management and human resource management, and even accounting and finance. An expression of the crystallization of this approach is its institutionalization—visible, among others, in the crea-

² J. Hassard, M. Parker, eds., *Postmodernism and Organisations* (London: Sage, 1993). D.M. Boje, R. P. Gephart Jr, T. J. Thatchenkery, *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1996). B. Czarniawska, *Narratives in Social Science Research* (Thousand Oaks–London–New Delhi: Sage, 2004). M. Koster, *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu* (Warszawa: PWE, 1996). S. Magala, *The Management of Meaning* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

³ More on this subject: Ł. Sułkowski, *Epistemologia w naukach o zarządzaniu* (Warszawa: PWE, 2012).

⁴ M. Hardt, A. Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 2001). B. Barnes, D. Bloor, "Relatywizm, racjonalizm a socjologia wiedzy," in: *Mocny program socjologii wiedzy*, S. Butrym, ed. (Warszawa: IFiS PAN, 1993). N. Monin, *Management Theory. A Critical and Reflective Reading* (London–New York: Routledge, 2004). S. Fuller, *Social Epistemology* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002). N. Chomsky, *Profit over People. Neoliberalism and Global Order* (New York: Odonian Press, 1999). A. Oakley, *Experiments in Knowing. Gender and Method in the Social Sciences* (New York: The New Press, 2000).

⁵ M. Alvesson, H. Willmott, eds., *Critical Management Studies* (London: Sage, 1992).

tion of many conferences, publications, and journals that is reflected in the live discussions conducted within the boundaries of the critical chapter of the *American Academy of Management*. In Poland, *Critical Management Studies* is not yet a well-known discipline, and few authors conducting research and publishing texts in the field of management studies make use of this cognitive perspective.⁶ The goal of this article is to acquaint readers with the characteristic features of this critical current: an indication of its philosophical sources, paradigmatic position, a description of its main areas of interest, as well as an analysis of its weak points.

The Intellectual Sources of CMS

Critical Management Studies is a relatively new perspective, which did not crystallize until the early 1990s. The year 1992 is considered to have marked the beginning of CMS's institutional development, when M. Alvesson and H. Willmott's work *Critical Management Studies* was published.⁷ Pioneering works undertaking the demystification of the ideological functions of management based on the structure of dominance already appeared in the 1970s,⁸ however, in the last two decades, Critical Management Studies took the form of institutionalized discourse due to the appearance of numerous publications, studies, conferences, specialty periodicals, and associations (such as the CMS chapter of the American Academy of Management).⁹

The philosophical sources that Critical Management Studies refer to adopt a radical vision of organizational development interpreted as a tool of domination and oppression.¹⁰ The intellectual base of this cog-

⁶ Ł. Sułkowski, "Nurt krytyczny w naukach o zarządzaniu," *Współczesne Zarządzanie*, 2006, nr 1, pp. 5–13; M. Zawadzki, *Nurt krytyczny w zarządzaniu: kultura, edukacja, teoria* (Warszawa: Sedno, 2014); Ł. Sułkowski, M. Zawadzki, eds., *Krytyczny nurt zarządzania* (Warszawa: Diffin, 2014).

⁷ M. Alvesson, H. Willmott, eds., *Critical Management Studies*.

⁸ H. Braverman, *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974).

⁹ M. Alvesson, H. Willmott, eds., *Critical Management Studies*.

¹⁰ Ł. Sułkowski, "Nurt krytyczny w naukach o zarządzaniu..."

nitive perspective is equally rich, as it is controversial. Above all, this base is rooted in the various schools of neo-Marxism, beginning with Karl Marx's concept of class struggle and ending with the Frankfurt School's critique of consumer society and mass media, especially that of J. Habermas.¹¹ The second, later (though no less significant) sources of CMS were post-structuralism and postmodernism.¹² Michel Foucault, considered a precursor of postmodernism, undertook the problems of power and domination as the main motor of social action (e.g. the concept of knowledge-power) and universal invigilation and surveillance as methods of coercing organizations and societies into obedience.¹³ Among other authors accepting the standpoint of cognitive and cultural relativism who influenced the development of CMS, we can indicate Frederic Jameson, Richard Rorty, Jean Baudrillard, Jacques Derrida, and Zygmunt Bauman. The third source, which is not only a cognitive perspective, but also a social movement, is radical feminism, whose goal is to destroy the order built upon patriarchal rule.¹⁴ Other inspirations reflected in the critical current are: E. Goffman's conception of total institutions,¹⁵ the anti-psychiatry movement,¹⁶ and radical pedagogy,¹⁷ the strong program

¹¹ S. Benhabib, *Critique, Norm, and Utopia: A Study of the Foundations of Critical Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), A. G. Scherer, "Critical Theory and Its Contribution to Critical Management Studies," in: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 29–51.

J. Habermas, *Teoria i praktyka: wybór pism*, trans. M. Łukasiewicz, Z. Krasnodębski (Warszawa: PIW, 1983).

¹² J. Habermas, "Modernizm – niedokończony projekt," in: *Postmodernizm – antologia przekładów*, R. Nycz, ed. (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Baran i Suszczyński, 1998), pp. 25–46.

¹³ M. Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité, volume I: La volonté de savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976).

¹⁴ E. Willis, "Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism," in: *No More Nice Girls: Countercultural Essays* (Minneapolis: Wesleyan University Press, 1992 [1984]).

¹⁵ K. L. Ashcraft, "Gender and Diversity: Other Ways to 'Make a Difference,'" in: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 304–327; R. Pringle, "Sexuality at Work," in: *Critical Management Studies. A Reader*, C. Grey, H. Willmott, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 284–303. E. Goffman, "Charakterystyka instytucji totalnych," in: *Elementy teorii socjologicznych* (Warszawa: PWN, 1975), pp. 151–152.

¹⁶ D. Cooper, *Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry* (London: Paladin, 1967).

¹⁷ A. Contu, "Critical Management Education," in: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 536–550.

in the sociology of knowledge,¹⁸ cultural studies,¹⁹ and the qualitative methodology of engaged studies.²⁰ Thus, CMS's intellectual base in philosophy, social science, and the humanities is extensive and heterogeneous, which led to its rapid development.

It is worth adding that in Poland, most likely due to historical circumstances, neo-Marxism has held a marginal place in social scientific discourse. Postmodernism, though it has gained much attention in the humanities, has met with a weak reception in economics and management science.²¹ The same is the case with radical feminism, which is a rather marginal social movement in Poland, and lacks a wider academic base. In the United States, Great Britain, Scandinavia, and France, CMS has many representatives who undertake problems from various perspectives.

CMS's Paradigmatic Position

It is worth indicating CMS's paradigmatic position in management science. To do this, it is worth looking at Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan's classification of sociological paradigms.²² The authors concluded that the conceptions, theories, and works within the bounds of the theories of organization and management (as well as in the social sciences in general) can be classified into the categories of four main paradigms, depending on their assumptions regarding cognition (objectivity—subjectivity) and social orientation (dimension of regulation—radical change).

¹⁸ B. Barnes, D. Bloor, J. Henry, *Scientific Knowledge: A Sociological Analysis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

¹⁹ J. Martin, "Meta-theoretical Controversies in Studying Organizational Culture," in: *The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory: Meta-theoretical Perspectives*, C. Knudsen, T. Haridimos, eds. (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 392–422.

²⁰ N. Denzin, *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Aldine Transaction, 2006).

²¹ M. Kostera, *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu* (Warszawa: PWE, 1996); Ł. Sułkowski, "Postmodernistyczne inspiracje zarządzania," *Współczesne Zarządzanie*, nr 3, 2004.

²² G. Burrell, G. Morgan, *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life* (London: Heinemann, 1979).

Table 1. Paradigms in Management Science according to G. Burrell and G. Morgan

Social Orientation		
<i>Regulation</i>	<i>Radical Change</i>	Assumptions Concerning Science
Functionalism	Radical Structuralism	<i>Objectivity</i>
Interpretive Paradigm	Radical Humanism	<i>Subjectivity</i>

Source: Ł. Sułkowski, *Epistemologia w naukach o zarządzaniu* (Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, 2005), p. 73; on the basis of: G. Burrell, G. Morgan, *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life* (London: Heinemann, 1979).

In attempting to place CMS in this paradigmatic classification, we must first notice that the common feature of studies conducted within the framework of CMS is the assumption concerning science's radical change of reality by virtue of critique. This allows us to place CMS in the paradigm of radical humanism and radical structuralism due to their common assumption regarding the social orientation of studies, which is radical change. The common feature of both paradigms is the emancipatory vision of the role of science, which also characterizes CMS: the role of science is to consist in the emancipation of people from conditions that are unfavorable to them.

The characteristic feature of CMS is a critical position *vis-à-vis* the strong version of ontological and epistemological realism, which characterizes the functionalist paradigm. According to advocates of CMS, it is impossible, on the basis of investigation, to cognize Truth independent of the cognizing subject, Objective reality. The cognizing subject is always entangled in a socio-cultural context and in investigating reality, he simultaneously changes it due to the normative premises he accepts. Facts cannot be separated from values, and science and cognition are endeavors of a normative character. In connection with this, cognitive and research processes are to consist in conducting intersubjectively-communicable negotiations of meanings with the intent of achieving a temporary and "critique-able" consensus, not in discovering universal Truth.

Therefore, it is worth noting that a critical position *vis-à-vis* the strong version of ontological and epistemological realism brings CMS closer to the assumptions that characterize the interpretive paradigm. The most basic of these assumptions states that social reality is the intersubjectively-communicable creation of its participants who interpret and negotiate meanings; thus, it is not of a specific character, it does not exist Objectively. In other words, as Monika Kostera observes in characterizing the interpretive paradigm,

the world of social life does not exist “outside of” our minds, waiting for its laws to be uncovered, but are constantly created by us, and thus also by researchers. The participants of this world see it as evident, but the researcher’s task is to demonstrate how it was created (the interpretation).²³

Interpretivists emphasize the key role of language in the construction of reality: in their opinion, it is with the help of language that we endow reality with sense and interpret it, thus creating it.

The constructivist position regarding the construction of reality by way of language also characterizes CMS, though, while interpretivists see in language above all a tool for explaining reality, representatives of CMS consider language both the basic tool for changing reality (not only for its explanation), and the basic object of critique (a critique of discourse). Therefore, we must note that CMS is closest in its assumptions to the paradigm of radical humanism, according to which the researcher’s role is not only to explain reality (which does not exist Objectively, but is construed when endowed with sense in the process of meaning-negotiation), but above all to unmask the false traps of collective and individual consciousness, which may be formed pursuant to the institutionalization and legitimization of oppressive discourse. Social phenomena, including language and discourse, are examined in terms of symbolic power, ideological dominance, and the legitimization of processes of indoctrination—not, as the functionalist paradigm

²³ M. Kostera, *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu* (Warszawa: PWE, 1996), p. 34.

states, in terms of its potential function in striving towards the system's equilibrium. It is recognized that both researchers in the field of management and people engaged in organizational activity are often unaware of pathological phenomena, as they consider the existing state of affairs natural (management discourse, organizational conditions), which is why their awareness must be awakened by virtue of an emancipatory project.

An analysis of the last paradigm—radical structuralism—in terms of the assumptions accepted in CMS presents many difficulties. This paradigm, though in agreement with the intention of CMS concerning the radical change of reality, is based on the assumptions characteristic of Objectivism, and thus incompatible with the relativist and constructivist epistemology of CMS. Despite this, this paradigm fits into CMS's project and is connected with studies in the field of critical realism.²⁴ Within the framework of the latter, studies are conducted that are directed towards the analysis of the structural conditions which determine the existence of subjects intending to change those conditions. This orientation accepts that independent reality only makes the achievement, formulation, and communication of the research possible—it does not indicate absolutely right, universal answers to posed questions (as is the case in functionalism). Thus, we can acknowledge that CMS is also based on the assumptions of radical structuralism—though in regards to the Objective assumption characteristic of this paradigm, it proposes a relatively moderate variant in the form of critical realism.

Thus, it seems justified to say that the most adequate paradigms that would merge the main assumptions of CMS are radical humanism and radical structuralism, since they are characterized by an orientation towards the emancipation of individuals from unfavorable organizational conditions, and this is CMS's main goal. In rejecting the aspiration

²⁴ Michael I. Reed, "Critical Realism in Critical Management Studies," in: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, H. Willmott; M. Alvesson; T. Bridgman, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 52–75.

to regulate reality, characteristic of functionalism and interpretivism, CMS does take from interpretivism the assumption about the linguistic nature of reality; in contrary to interpretivism, though, it indicates that language should be looked at as a potential tool for creating repressive discourse. On the other hand, within the range of studies drawing upon the critical current's realism, CMS adopts a moderate version of the ontological realism whose strong version characterizes the paradigms of radical structuralism and functionalism.

CMS's paradigms, similarly to postmodernism and interpretivism, belong to the group of alternative managerial paradigms that build their identities on antinomy in regards to the dominant functionalist paradigm (or rather, the neopositivist-functionalist-systemic paradigm—NFS²⁵). That is why the common assumptions of alternative paradigms, which distinguish them from NFS, are connected with, e.g., cultural relativism, the interpretive and processual view of organization, the key role of communicative processes and the distribution of power in management, and a preference for using qualitative methods. On the other hand, however, the differences are clear, and can be seen reflected in the matrix of paradigms proposed by Burrell and Morgan. The IS paradigm is subjectivist and is orientated towards the status quo, which means that it is concentrated on the descriptive and local aspect of conducting cognitive discourse. CMS, on the other hand, aspires to a quasi-objectivist description of unfair relationships of dominance in organizations and strives to change them. The relationship between CMS and postmodernism is even more complex, because the similarities are deeper. The problem of power, oppressive social structures, critique of modernity, and use of textualist themes is common to both paradigms. On the other hand, however, postmodernism is subjectivistic, and so rejects the correspondence theory of truth and aspirations to objectivism, while CMS aspires to discover and change the true, objective, and at least intersubjective (quasi-objective) relations of dominance

²⁵ Ł. Sułkowski, *Epistemologia i metodologia zarządzania* (Warszawa: PWE, 2012).

that exist. Postmodernism is anti-methodological by definition, and concentrates solely on glossa and individual studies, while CMS creates and incorporates qualitative and engaged methodologies. As J. Duberley and Ph. Johnson note, postmodernism is too individualistic, irrational in its extreme epistemological relativism, and ineffective in proposing tools to change and correct reality.²⁶ In this sense, the critical paradigm, in contrast to postmodernism, assumes the development of science, including management science, though it perceives their entanglement in social processes.

The Aims of CMS's Critique

A reconstruction of the most important assumptions of the critical current allows for the distinction of several common assumptions that constitute the internally-differentiated paradigm of *Critical Management Studies*. These include, above all, the treatment of management science as persuasive discourse stemming from the premises of capitalism and striving to uphold the existent status quo based on domination and exploitation. The critical current in management has “unmasking” ambitions that lead to the questioning of the apparently “objective” and “natural” status: organizational order, managerial power, institutions, managerial identity and practices.²⁷ This “denaturalizational” discourse of managerism leads to the descriptions of actions and institutions based on dominance: oppressive, often harmful to individuals and the society, such actions and institutions often hide under the appearance of the rationality of management science. This postulate to discover the interests of the various social groups in power, also through the control of scientific discourse, is to lead, in consequence, to the critique and, eventually, to the change of the existing, unjust social order. As a result of the development of the critical current,

²⁶ J. Duberley, Ph. Johnson, *Understanding Management Research: An Introduction to Epistemology* (London: Sage, 2003), p. 115.

²⁷ M. Alvesson, H. Willmott, eds., *Studying Management Critically* (London: Sage, 2003).

unfavored social groups, i.e. those, that are ruled over, such as ethnic and social minorities, and women, would be able to build their awareness and gain the possibility of expressing and realizing their interests.²⁸ Their emancipation would be accompanied by the discovery of the mechanisms of the functioning of symbolic power, a demystification of the ideology of managerism, and a break from irresponsible and instrumental managerial practices. The tools worked out by the critical current encompass: the deconstruction and ‘denaturalization’ of managerial discourse, the critical and reflective analysis of the language of power, and methods of strengthening the autonomy and self-control of unfavored groups (e.g. *empowerment*, *parities*).²⁹

Representatives of the critical current are characterized by a high level of critical reflectiveness towards all of science, especially towards the field of management science. They point to the fact that management, as a science, functions within certain institutional boundaries, which also means certain hierarchies of power and authority. For the past few decades, academic institutions engaged in research in this field have been advocating models of a flexible organization that would be open to change and non-hierarchical. However, these research centers often remain in rigid and centralized structures themselves. On the level of academic institutions, symbolic power is exercised, i.e. norms of “scientificity,” research and teaching programs are created. In accordance with the assumptions of the critical current, this power should be very closely scrutinized. We should strive to create the conditions for a valuable, uncensored, and non-monopolized science.³⁰

Theory is influenced by the economic and political authorities. In the modern world, it has lost its “innocence.” It has ceased to be a “disinterested aspiration to the truth,” becoming a tool in the hands of polit-

²⁸ C. Grey, H. Willmott, *Critical Management Studies: A Reader* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

²⁹ M. Parker, *Against Management: Organisation in the Age of Managerialism* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002).

³⁰ Cf. P. Bourdieu, “Animaadversiones in Mertonem,” in: *Robert K. Merton: Consensus and Controversy*, J. Clark, C. Modgil, S. Modgil, eds. (London–New York: The Falmer Press, 1990), p. 300.

ical and economic dissidents. This also refers to management, which from the beginning was to create the conditions for a rise in the effectiveness of organizations. These organizations were most frequently companies, but non-commercial organizations could also be found, including such oppressive organizations as the army and police.

In the critical current of management studies, management is perceived as a social science which serves to manipulate the members of organizations, and which accepts ideological functions of research and teaching that have been externally-imposed as objective truth and therefore also as the foundation of the theoretical discourse underlying the discipline.³¹ The theory of scientific management rationalized the instrumental and alienating treatment of workers in industrial organizations.³² For example, the so-called “modern” methods of management, such as: *reengineering*, *lean management*, or *job sharing* have become euphemisms behind which job cuts hide. Methods of management, such as TQM or *reengineering*, can serve to rationalize organizational power and managerial discourse by reproducing ideology and propagating false awareness among the workers.³³ Modern theorists of organization and management sanction usefulness and the inevitability of the processes of globalization, avoiding answers to uncomfortable questions, such as whose interest it is in, and how those who make use of it support the creation of its theory.³⁴

Management is a normative science that should create the rules of effective organization, take on an auxiliary function in regard to economic practices, and have a practical application. Indeed, this occurs sometimes; however, rejecting hypocrisy, we must admit that the application of these theories of effective management is not a standard. Busi-

³¹ N. Chomsky, *Language and Thought* (Wakefield, Rhode Island and London: Moyer Bell, 1993), p. 40.

³² Cf. S. Clegg, “Organisation and Control,” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, No. 26, 1981, pp. 545–562. P. Goldman, D. van Houten, “Managerial Strategies and the Worker,” *The Sociological Quarterly*, No. 18, 1977, pp. 108–125.

³³ T.B. Lawrence, N. Philips, “Commentary: Separating Play and Critique: Postmodern and Critical Perspectives on TQM/BPR,” *Journal of Management Inquiry*, No. 7 (2), pp. 154–160.

³⁴ S. Thomas, *The Multi-National Companies* (Hove: Wayland Publishers, 1979).

nessmen, entrepreneurs, and supervisors are rarely educated in management. However, the practical engagement of this discipline is its fundamental premise, which is why the academic community of management scientists is attempting to prove the value of the applications of its theories, which—for the time being—can always effectively deal with practical reality. Consulting operations have formed between academic centers and the economic sector, which specialize in advising entrepreneurs and those engaged in management. This lobby exists by virtue of the application of theoretical concepts of management, which is why, putting on a guise of scientificity and making use of the marketing of ideas, it strengthens the influence and popularity of management science (which does not always transfer into cognitive authority). On the other hand, consulting is one of the most important methods of transferring the results of studies to managerial practice. It creates the linkage between theory and practice so vital to the practical sciences. The description of organizational reality, as well as the postulates directed at managerial practice created by researchers and specialists, can also draw from ideological motivation or aspirations to force the interests of a group of reference.³⁵

In the twentieth century, management science became an influential discipline, closely linked with business circles and authority. In the institutional sphere of management science, various interest groups formed which push through their own influence, in effect shaping management science itself. Among the most important interest groups are: scholars specializing in management, consultants and business advisors, businessmen, entrepreneurs, and business owners. The “stakes in the social game,” whose arena is also constituted by management science, encompasses: money, social prestige, and power. Other social divisions could also be indicated, e.g. managers in the private sector and managers in the public sector, or employee divisions based on nationality, as well as other types of motivational factors, such as the feeling of security.

³⁵ A. Fox, *Beyond Contract: Work, Power and Trust Relations* (London: Faber and Faber, 1974).

The interests of the mentioned social groups criss-cross, creating a complex constellation or more or less enduring coalitions that cooperate in a more or less conscious way. Often, the interests of social groups entangled in the social game hid behind the veil of objectivism; a game, which also occurs in the field of management science.

Many authors considered postmodernists, textualists, or social constructivists indicate the complete dependence of the contents of management on the social context, which suggests that this science is not able to tell us anything about reality. It is not of a descriptive character, but is meant to create social reality. The perception of the social world from the perspective of organization, supervision, or projects is only a type of narration and metaphor, which allows for action (neopragmatism³⁶).

Management does not form a homogeneous paradigm, set of ideas, and methodology, but is a mixture of various conceptions. The “life cycle” of the conceptions is ever shorter. Many of them become a fading trend promoted by “management gurus,” consulting firms, or academic centers. These conceptions are generally not based on studies, but on one impressive idea that leads to the reduction of organizational reality. Research on trends in management indicates both the rapid spread of conceptions, and their quick rejection by organizations and theoreticians of management.³⁷ Trendy “theories” cause management science to become more popular, but simultaneously less trustworthy.³⁸ They are a clear example of social constructivism, within the boundaries of which conceptions mutually influence organizational reality.³⁹

Nowadays, managers are one of the most influential social groups. They control the flow of financial resources, material goods, and ser-

³⁶ R. Rorty, *Filozofia a zwierciadło natury* (Warszawa: Aletheia, 1997).

³⁷ E. Abrahamson, “Managerial Fads and Fashions: the Diffusion and Rejection of Innovations,” *Academy of Management Review*, No. 16/3, 1991, pp. 586–612.

³⁸ Cf. K. Klincewicz, “Zarządzanie wiedzą jako przykład mody w zarządzaniu,” *Organizacja i kierowanie*, No. 1 (115), 2004, pp. 15–32.

³⁹ P. J. DiMaggio, W. W. Powell, “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organisational Fields,” *American Sociological Review*, No. 48, 1983, pp. 147–160.

vices on a global scale. They exercise power in larger social structures over small and large groups of people, often ousting political dissidents.

According to many representatives of CMS, managerism connected with the modern capitalist formation has even gained control over the public sector.⁴⁰ As a dominant group, managers form their own ideology which allows them to preserve their power and rationalize their own position. The ideology of managerism contributes to the creation of group identity and solidarity. It is reflected in the concepts of object and managerial methods worked out within the framework of the dominant current.⁴¹

Management science is founded on the position of instrumental rationalism. Managerial processes are characterized by the aspiration to effective work organization based on “scientific”—objective and universal—principles. Management science has cognitive goals, which translate into the pragmatics of managerial activity. The roles of supervisor, manager, and administrator are, thus, the primary object of interest of management science. An idealized image of their activity is created. Descriptions of the decisional processes in organization are based on the individualistic premises of *homo oeconomicus*, ignoring the key influence of the social group.

The motif of management as an ideology rationalizing the exercise of power is present throughout the critical current. According to these conceptions, the social self of the manager is created, which emphasizes rational action, pragmatism and utilitarianism, the aspiration to power and success, loyalty in regards to the organization, and faith in the managerial ethos. The critical current strives to demystify these elements of a manager’s identity, indicating that they constitute a justification for the aspiration to dominate over others.⁴²

⁴⁰ V. Fourier, Ch. Grey, “At the Critical Moment: Conditions and Prospects for Critical Management Studies,” *Human Relations*, No. 53 (1), p. 10.

⁴¹ M. Alvesson, H. Willmott H., *Making Sense of Management. A Critical Introduction* (London: Sage, 1996).

⁴² M. Parker, *Against Management...*

The power exercised by managers and the owners creates a self-reproductive social order. Upholding it for a longer time requires the application of symbolic power.⁴³ The people subject to domination must in some way collectively accept the institutions of property, the market, and managerism. According to CMS representatives, this purpose is served by a system of rationalizing social dominance called management, which has taken the institutional form of science and social practice. N. Harding notes that the creators, continuators, and advocates of management built a huge system of social legitimization of power, which encompasses: business schools, the business publishing market, academic community, and a political lobby centered on management. With the help of this machine of symbolic power, seemingly irrefutable premises and content upholding the reproduction and legitimization of power are written into the social discourse:

- Without management the world would fall into chaos.
- Management is a science that gives the objective truth about external reality.
- Management is an art permitting the exercise of power over other human beings.⁴⁴

Critical Management Education

The educational plane is the most important emancipatory field for representatives of CMS, because it makes the transmission of critical postulates to the world of management and organization possible. In developing the problem of management's ideologicallity, we can develop the Marxist theme of false consciousness created by an educational system that reproduces the ideological knowledge of management.⁴⁵ According to representatives of the current of *Critical Management Education*, which is a component of broader CMS, business schools "enslave the minds" of managers and employees by granting

⁴³ J. F. Lane, *Pierre Bourdieu. A Critical Introduction* (London: Pluto Press, 2000).

⁴⁴ N. Harding, *The Social Construction of Management* (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 14.

⁴⁵ M. J. Hatch, *Teoria organizacji* (Warszawa: PWN, 2002), p. 337.

them sources of identity.⁴⁶ Identifying with the seemingly scientific, objective, effective, just, and, according to advocates of managers, only possible system of exercising power in the modern world, leads to false consciousness. False consciousness, in accordance with the conceptions of the critical current, is created by the system for the dominant social group. It is a tool of control and “symbolic power.” Huge masses of people dedicate their time to an absurd chase after new things and services, propelling the development of transnational corporations and top level owners and managers, i.e. those at the top of the pyramid.⁴⁷ False consciousness, therefore, does not concern only managers, giving them the unjustified feeling of being on a mission and of justice in exercising power in the interests of the organization; it also concerns employees and consumers, who are subject to this power through a process of symbolic power that S. Deetz has called “the colonization of daily life by concerns.”⁴⁸ An important aspect of the reproduction of power is managerial education, which is of an ideological and indoctrinating character.⁴⁹ It is based on the socialization of a social group, which rationalizes the process of exercising power.⁵⁰

CMS’s critique of the educational sphere is holistic and encompasses not only the plane of managerial education, but also critical reflection on the university. As Mats Alvesson notes, the market model of university reform currently dominant in the West is entangled in the trap of educational fundamentalism,⁵¹ in accordance with which it is acknowledged that higher education allows for the education of society and thus contributes to the development of the economy and economic growth.

⁴⁶ H. Willmott, “Critical Management Learning,” in: *Management Learning: Integrating Perspectives in Theory and Practice*, J. Burgoyne, M. Reynolds, eds. (London: Sage, 1997), pp. 161–176).

⁴⁷ Ł. Sułkowski, “Społeczeństwo informacyjne a kultura konsumpcyjna,” in: *Koncepcje, modele i metody zarządzania informacją i wiedzą* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej, 2006).

⁴⁸ S. Deetz, *Transforming Communication, Transforming Business: Building Responsive and Responsible Workplaces* (Cresskill: Hapton Press, 1995).

⁴⁹ H. A. Giroux, *Pedagogy and Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997).

⁵⁰ C. Grey, “Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education,” *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2004, 3(2), 178–186.

⁵¹ M. Alvesson, *The Triumph of Emptiness. Consumption, Higher Education and Work Organization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 75–76.

According to this ideology, receiving a higher education increases the probability both of finding work, and of an increase in social satisfaction. In addition, within the market model of the university lurks the trap of market fundamentalism, which is connected with the neo-liberal belief that the market provides the proper model for reforming the university, constituting the proper regulator of changes taking place in the sector of higher education.⁵²

Educational fundamentalism generates the erroneous belief that education naturally allows for the attainment of an education. In this formulation, receiving a higher education and diploma is to guarantee that its owner is an educated person. The falsity of such reasoning is especially visible when diagnosing the educational processes in the modern university, which often consist in the absorption of knowledge through memorization, instead of through the conveyance and acquisition of knowledge.⁵³

The disappearance of the culture of ‘learning’ and receiving an education in market-guided colleges, along with the simultaneous increase in the number of people holding degrees confirm the results of the studies conducted by Richard Arum and Josip Roksa, in which the authors studied 2,200 American college students in terms of critical thinking abilities, analytical reasoning skills, problem-solving skills, and narrative skills connected with their writing abilities.⁵⁴ Approximately 45 percent of the students demonstrated a lack of development of mentioned skills after two years of study—37 percent after four years of college.

⁵² D. Jemielniak, D. J. Greenwood, “Wake-Up or Perish: Neo-Liberalism, the Social Sciences, and Salvaging the Public University,” *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies*, 2013, pp. 1–11. The article has been published online prior to print at <https://www.academia.edu/5549141/Wake-Up_or_Perish_Neo-Liberalism_the_Social_Sciences_and_Salvaging_the_Public_University> (06.01.2014).

⁵³ L. Witkowski, “Koniec kultury uczenia się? Edukacja w dobie presji ‘simulacrum’ konsumpcji (dyskusja nie tylko z Zygmuntem Baumanem),” in: *Jaka kultura? Jaki dyskurs? Sfera publiczna a spory o edukację, pedagogikę i zarządzanie*, M. Jaworska-Witkowska, ed. (Szczecin: „Pedagogium”, 2008), pp. 213–242.

⁵⁴ R. Arum, J. Roksa, *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

Another erroneous assumption resulting from educational fundamentalism is the belief that a college diploma increases the probability of efficient functioning in the job market. Meanwhile, a significant number of jobs in the United States and in Europe require basic, practical occupational skills that do not require college degrees. For example, in Great Britain approximately 6.5 million jobs do not require qualifications connected with a university degree (26 percent of all jobs in the country), while only 2.6 million people in the British job market do not possess such qualifications.⁵⁵ This situation leads to frustration both on the part of graduates and employers due to the inadequacy of the expectations *vis-à-vis* the true abilities and skills.

The next dangerous assumption connected with the educational fundamentalism characteristic of the ‘market university’ is that the main role of the university is preparing students to function in the job market. Thus, universities are confused with technical schools without noticing that the market always works short-term, whereas the role of a university is to function long-term and develop cultural competence in the students that will allow for civil action regardless of market or social changes and needs.⁵⁶ The mission of the university is to democratize societal life by preparing students for participation in symbolic culture, which makes possible the development of critical thinking, societal imagination, and humanistic sensitivity that will enable them to care for other human beings—not solely to prepare people to take on occupational roles. Seducing students with the vision of the university as a technical school is another source of disillusionment for them, as they point to the lack of practical application of their studies. On the part of the administration this generates the desire to lead the university further in the direction of technical school in order to satisfy its clients. The problem is that this “occupationalizaton” in the mar-

⁵⁵ A. Chevalier and J. Lindley, “Overeducation and the Skills of UK Graduates,” *Journal of the Royal Statistic Society* 172 (Part 2), pp. 307–337, after: M. Alvesson, *The Triumph of Emptiness. Consumption, Higher Education and Work Organization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁵⁶ S. Kozyr-Kowalski, *Uniwersytet a rynek* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2005).

ket model does not go hand in hand with the possibility of receiving an education, only a diploma.

Market fundamentalism, on the other hand, is connected with the false assumption that the market, economy, and organizational reality do not require reform and should designate the direction of change of the university. The deceitfulness of this belief can be seen in the Polish organizational reality, dominated by the imperative of economism, which in striving for financial profit at the cost of human life commands us to see in this a phenomenon natural to capitalism.⁵⁷ This leads to a crisis of cultural illiteracy among employees, as well as to the illegitimate claims of employers, who look at the university as a factory for the production qualified workers, which—in their opinion—is having more and more trouble fulfilling this role. This stands in opposition to the university's cultural mission, which ties in with critical intervention in the social surroundings—including the market—in order to democratize and humanize these spheres.⁵⁸

Another dangerous illusion resulting from market fundamentalism is the indication (in the market model of the university) that it is necessary to adapt the principles of management, which has its roots in the private sphere, to universities. This belief assumes a primitive form of management that derives from the functionalist paradigm and is connected with the dominance of the imperative of economism (Taylorism, Fordism), acknowledging *ad hoc* that functionalism and economism are alternative-less imperatives, natural to modern private organizations. Meanwhile, management is a complex social process, which does not have to assume the aspiration to an economic end at any cost (including in the management of private organizations).⁵⁹ Advocates of the market model of the university do not take into account the fact

⁵⁷ M. Zawadzki, *Nurt krytyczny w zarządzaniu: kultura, edukacja, teoria* (Warszawa: Sedno, 2014).

⁵⁸ K. Leja, *Zarządzanie uczelnią. Koncepcje i współczesne wyzwania* (Kraków: Wolters Kluwer, 2013).

⁵⁹ M. Kostera, "Manifest humanistyczny współczesnego zarządzania," in: *Organizacje i archetypy* (Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer, 2010), pp. 13–20.

that the university will lose its identity through primitive management that draws on over-economized business solutions.⁶⁰

Towards a Critique of CMS

One of the basic assumptions of the critical current in management is auto-reflexiveness, which is connected with the necessity of a constant critical analysis of the premises accepted in CMS. Let us indicate a few elements of the critical current that seem doubtful, though they do not take away from the efforts put forth in this cognitively fascinating paradigm. The critical current in management science is very controversial and should be evaluated by someone other than an advocate. We would like to propose a critical analysis of the CMS current on two levels. The first is a general critique of the entire CMS current, encompassing epistemology, methodology, and praxeology. The second level of analysis is more specific and refers to the application of the critical current in various subdisciplines and in regards to various management problems.

Starting from a general critique of CMS, we can indicate several key problems of a general nature:

- Its controversial philosophical basis in the form of neo-Marxism and postmodernism,
- Its lack of extensive epistemological and institutional reflection,
- Its pragmatic weakness.

1. The critical current derives from neo-Marxism and demonstrates connections to postmodernism. That is why it constitutes a reflection of the key cognitive problems of both of these philosophies. CMS employs a modified perspective of the Marxist conflict of classes. The key con-

⁶⁰ See C. Mazza, P. Quattrone, A. Riccaboni, eds. *European Universities in Transition. Issues, Models and Cases* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2008).

cepts of this current are: power, domination, rule, the ruling and subject class, false consciousness.⁶¹ Categories appear that are drawn from other neo-Marxists, such as: symbolic power,⁶² neo-imperialism.⁶³ Though Marxism's vision was compromised in economics, politics, and society during the course of the last century, it lingers in the critical current's ideas in management, sociology, and cultural anthropology. The critique of Marxism in economic science has a long tradition, especially when it comes to the neoclassical⁶⁴ or Keynesian⁶⁵ schools. Marxism, which was a significant economic school for over one hundred years, became a completely marginal economic orientation in many countries after the fall of "real socialism" and bankruptcy of communism. Postmodernism is equally problematic, especially when understood as the epistemological basis for the development of social science. Though Mats Alvesson clearly emphasizes the differences between postmodernism and CMS, these two currents have many scholars and ideas in common. These include: Michel Foucault, Jean François Lyotard, Zygmunt Bauman, and in our sciences: George Burrell, M. Schultz, M. J. Hatch, B. Czarniawska, and M. Kostera. The problems common to both currents are: a skeptical vision of the development of science and progress, the key role of power in organizations, the postulate of an increase in moral sensitivity, and the preference for discursive methods. Skepticism in regards to social progress connects neo-Marxism with postmodernism, and is also present in CMS. Scholars functioning on the basis of this paradigm concentrate on inequalities, injustice, discrimination, and violence, often not caring to perceive the clear fact of social and organizational progress, which betters the conditions in which man functions. Organization enabled technical, political, and social progress, which encompasses all of humanity. CMS researchers do not want to perceive that,

⁶¹ J. Larrain, *Marxism and Ideology* (London: Macmillan, 1983).

⁶² P. Bourdieu, *Language & Symbolic Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).

⁶³ N. Chomsky, "The Corporate Takeover of U.S. Democracy" <chomsky.info> (24.01.2010); M. Hardt, A. Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 2001).

⁶⁴ F. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

⁶⁵ J. K. Galbraith, *The Affluent Society* (Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958).

though the economic differences between countries and societal groups are indeed deepening, this results from the rapid increase in wealth of citizens and countries already located within the sphere of the highest income, not from the regress of the groups with the lowest incomes. An analysis similar to this one can be conducted in reference to scientific skepticism. A lack of faith in scientific progress, one of the more important themes in postmodernism and significant in CMS, is to a large degree irrational because scientific progress, including that of the social sciences, is a fact. Of course, the social sciences develop significantly more slowly than the natural sciences, but they do exhibit progress. Science is entangled in society and is not axiologically neutral, but certainly contributes to man's and societies' development. Other core concepts of CMS, such as: the struggle for dominance, false consciousness, symbolic power, can also be criticized as overdrawn and excessively ideological. Thus, postmodernism, with its radical cultural and epistemological relativism, does not constitute a good basis for the development of science, unless it is as a source of inspiration and of metaphors.

2. CMS is in the initial stage of development and, in a certain sense, above all connects enthusiasts of this approach. It lacks the maturity of a paradigm that has gone through a series of phases of development and crises. Undoubtedly, a critical examination of CMS is needed, both from its own perspective, and that of other paradigms. Moreover, the promulgation of its concepts would be indicated, so that CMS could be present in the management discourse in many other countries. At present, CMS is barely visible in management science analyses in Poland, both in terms of the number of publications, and research projects or conferences.

3. CMS also demonstrates a limited pragmatic effectiveness, since there are few significant research projects realized on the basis of the critical paradigm in management. The concept of organizational "perfecting" change that takes into account greater ethical sensitivity is realized on the grounds of various paradigms in management sci-

ence, not only within the framework of CMS. For example, business ethics is an essential and developing current that connects philosophical and business themes. Another example is *Corporate Social Responsibility*, whose goal is making organizations more sensitive to the needs of society. The significance of the humanistic current, emphasizing the meaning of subjectivity, self-realization, and human creativity in organization, is similarly increasing on the level of organizational behavior in management science. Therefore, undertaking projects to make organizations more ethical and friendly does not have to mean moving to the position of the CMS paradigm—though critique from the perspective of the critical current, in contrast to mainstream conceptions of management that lay claim to being humanistic, is characterized by deeper insight into those elements of organizational life that are hidden and often left unsaid.⁶⁶ When it comes to the critique of the conception of management, it is, of course, practiced within many different paradigms, and one need not be a representative of CMS to critique managerial theory and practice.⁶⁷ Though, as representatives of CMS note, not every attempt at taking a critical look at the results of management science fits within the critical current.⁶⁸ The necessary conditions of undertaking critique from the perspective of the CMS paradigm is the use of the intellectual tools proper to this thought formation, namely: an aspiration to emancipate unfavored groups and the acceptance of the premises of denaturalizing managerial discourse.

A critical look at CMS will vary depending on the problem undertaken and its subdiscipline. It seems that the critical and postmodern currents are useful from the point of view of marketing analyses, because they point to the manipulative aspects of this subdiscipline. On the other hand, though, CMS investigators do not perceive the development

⁶⁶ Fijałkowska, J. "Społeczna nieodpowiedzialność biznesu," in: *Krytyczny nurt zarządzania*, Ł. Sułkowski, M. Zawadzki, eds. (Warszawa: Diffin, 2014).

⁶⁷ Cf. W. Kieżun, ed., *Twórczo i krytycznie o zarządzaniu* (Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer and Akademia Leona Koźmińskiego, 2010).

⁶⁸ J. Duberley, P. Johnson, *Understanding Management Research: An Introduction to Epistemology* (London: Sage, 2003).

in marketing of humanizing conceptions and those accenting subjectivity and ethicality, such as: affinity marketing,⁶⁹ relationship marketing,⁷⁰ and social marketing.⁷¹ It is also difficult to separate postmodern themes from CMS in marketing. The application of the critical current to human resource management is also creative, though the image of the subdiscipline itself is distorted by CMS. The critique of strategic management from the perspective of CMS is less successful. The indication of the top management's rationalizations meant to disguise unethical practices is interesting, but already known from the earlier managerial conceptions proposed by Karl Weick,⁷² for example. The applications of CMS to organizational culture are interesting, because they indicate the possible oppressive and ideological effect of values and norms. Other aspects creatively developed by CMS are connected with ideology, oppressiveness of the management, problems with organizational authority, communication, and business ethics.⁷³ At least for now, the digression of certain representatives of the critical current, concerning: managerial accounting, quality management, and logistics, remain exotic and weakly rooted in theory.⁷⁴ In general, the application of CMS varies depending on the research problem and subdiscipline. In secondary literature, we can find examples of innovative and accurate applications of the critical discourses discussed in this article that proved viable, and examples of short-lived, failed, or less successful applications.

In summary, the conceptions of CMS as critical analysis serving to raise awareness, ethical sensitivity, and to deepen cognitive reflection, and consisting in engaging the premises of the critical paradigm in pragmatic projects of changing the organizational reality are very

⁶⁹ K. Fonfara, *Marketing partnerski* (Warszawa: PWE, 2004).

⁷⁰ See J. Otto, *Marketing relacji, Koncepcja i stosowanie* (Warszawa: C. H. Beck, 2001),

⁷¹ See N. Lee, Ph. Kotler, *Social Marketing: Influencing Behaviors for Good* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2011).

⁷² K. Weick, "Substitutes for Corporate Strategy," in: *The Competitive Challenge* (Cambridge: Ballinger, 1987); K. Weick, *Managing the Unexpected: Resilient Performance in an Age of Uncertainty* (San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, 2007).

⁷³ K. Blanchard, N. V. Peale, *Etyka Biznesu* (Warszawa: EMKA, 2008).

⁷⁴ J. Lunariski, *Zarządzanie jakością w logistyce* (Rzeszów: Politechnika Rzeszowska, 2010).

valuable cognitively and practically. However, the condition of their value is a continual confrontation of the conception with the approaches of other methods and their critical evaluation.

Conclusion

The reflections presented here do not repudiate the cognitive value of the managerial sciences. They also do not lead to the claim that all contents of management are socially conditioned, while theory and methodology are constructed solely to satisfy the interests of particular groups. Nevertheless, they constitute an attempt at analyzing the possible ideological influences on managerial science. A critical analysis “objectively” seeking possible ideological connections may be a valuable source of reflection in management. Investigating the perspectives of groups discriminated against in given managerial contexts (e.g. women or ethnic minorities) may provide valuable knowledge about the mechanisms of legitimizing social authority based on the appearances of rationality or justice.⁷⁵ In investigating the development of a particular method or conception of management, it is noticeable that they often stem from social aspects.⁷⁶ Of course, we should not exaggerate with relativism and indicate cultural context or social interest as the sole source of knowledge.⁷⁷ Assuming that we do not have direct access to the investigated reality because our interpretations are tied with the social context (interests, culture), we can still, at least indirectly, cognize the world and make changes within it.⁷⁸

The critical current in management science can be a sort of reflection presuming the search for links between the creation and transmission

⁷⁵ M. Alston, *Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling* (London: Routledge, 2003); L.M. Glennon, “Synthesism. A Case of Feminist Methodology,” in: *Beyond Method. Strategies for Social Research*, G. Morgan, ed. (Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage, 1983), pp. 260–271.

⁷⁶ For example, reengineering. After: J. Micklethwait, A. Wooldrige, *Szamani zarządzania* (Poznań: Zysk i s-ka, 2000), pp. 29–31.

⁷⁷ Cf. J. Życiński, *Granice racjonalności. Eseje z filozofii nauki* (Warszawa: PWN, 1993), pp. 41–45.

⁷⁸ T. Benton, I. Craib, *Filozofia nauk społecznych. Od pozytywizmu do postmodernizmu* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP, 2003), p. 89.

of knowledge and the political and cultural forms of ruling.⁷⁹ It is worth treating the problem of the context of creating management science seriously and remembering this knowledge's lack of universality (situationality, adventitiousness). The development of our discipline is socially stimulated, through an influence on political rule, conflicts of interest, the significance of the academic environment, and how these social factors affect the content and manner of gaining knowledge in management should undoubtedly be researched. This will make it possible for the standards of rational and reliable creation of the social sciences to be upheld.

The critique conducted within the bounds of CMS is radical, but at the same time originally and provocatively understands the basic problems of management, which encourages the undertaking of reflection and debate. The reconstruction of many claims and their formulation within the bounds of one critical current is a risky operation, because the conceptions differ from one another. Nevertheless, it seems that the common point is an in-depth critique of the ethical and cognitive sides of management, which, consequently, could lead to the delegitimization of this science, or at least to its radical alteration. Such an alteration is especially necessary in Polish managerial science and management practice, where the imperatives of economism and functionalism, destructive for man, society, and the economy, remain dominant.

⁷⁹ See <www.trinity.edu/~mkearl/knowledg.html, 2004> (02.04.2015).

Bibliography

- Abrahamson E. 1991. "Managerial Fads and Fashions: the Diffusion and Rejection of Innovations." *Academy of Management Review*, 16/3: 586–612.
- Alston M. 2003. *Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling*. London: Routledge
- Alvesson M., Willmott H., eds. 1992. *Critical Management Studies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Alvesson M., Willmott H., eds. 2003. *Studying Management Critically*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson M., Willmott H. 1996. *Making Sense of Management. A Critical Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson M. 2013. *The Triumph of Emptiness. Consumption, Higher Education and Work Organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Arum R., Roksa J. 2011. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ashcraft K. L. 2009. "Gender and Diversity: Other Ways to 'Make a Difference.'" In: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Ed. M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Barnes B., Bloor D., Henry J. 1996. *Scientific Knowledge: A Sociological Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barnes B., Bloor D. 1993. "Relatywizm, racjonalizm a socjologia wiedzy." In: *Mocny program socjologii wiedzy*. Ed. B. Barnes. Warszawa: IFiS PAN.
- Benhabib S. 1986. *Critique, Norm, and Utopia: A Study of the Foundations of Critical Theory*. Columbia University Press.
- Benton T., Craib I. 2003. *Filozofia nauk społecznych. Od pozytywizmu do postmodernizmu*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP.
- Blanchard K., Peale N. V. 2008. *Etyka Biznesu*. Warszawa: Studio EMKA.
- Boje D. M., Gephart R. P., Jr., Thatchenkery T. J. 1996. *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu P. 1990. "Animaadversiones in Mertonem." In: *Robert K. Merton: Consensus and Controversy*. Ed. J. Clark, C. Modgil, S. Modgil. London–New York: The Falmer Press.
- Bourdieu P. 1991. *Language & Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braverman H. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burrell G., Gareth M. 1979. *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. London: Heinemann.
- Chevalier A, Lindley J. 2009. "Overeducation and the Skills of UK Graduates." *Journal of the Royal Statistic Society* 172 (Part 2): 307–337.
- Chomsky N. 1993. *Language and Thought*. Wakefield, Rhode Island & London: Moyer Bell.
- Chomsky N. 1999. *Profit over People. Neoliberalism and Global Order*. New York: Odonian Press.

- Chomsky N. 2010. *The Corporate Takeover of U.S. Democracy* <chomsky.info> (24.01.2010).
- Clegg S. 1981. "Organisation and Control." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26: 545–562, Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Contu A. 2009. "Critical Management Education." In: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Ed. M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper D. 1967. *Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry*. London: Paladin.
- Czarniawska B. 2004. *Narratives in Social Science Research*. Thousand Oaks–London–New Delhi: Sage.
- Deetz S. 1995. *Transforming Communication, Transforming Business: Building Responsive and Responsible Workplaces*. Cresskill: Hapton Press.
- Denzin N. 2006. *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Aldine Transaction.
- DiMaggio P. J., Powell W. W. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organisational Fields," *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147–160.
- Duberley J., Johnson P. 2003. *Understanding Management Research: An Introduction to Epistemology*. London: Sage.
- Fijałkowska J. 2014. "Społeczna nieodpowiedzialność biznesu." In: Ł. Sułkowski, M. Zawadzki, eds., *Krytyczny nurt zarządzania*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Follett M. P. 1949. *Freedom and Co-ordination: Lectures in business organization*. (Reprint 1987). New York: Management Publications Trust Limited.
- Fonfara K. 2004. *Marketing partnerski na rynku przedsiębiorstw*. Warszawa: PWE.
- Foucault M. 1976. *Histoire de la sexualité, volume 1: La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Fourier V., Grey C. 2000. "At the Critical Moment: Conditions and Prospects for Critical Management Studies." *Human Relations*, 53/1: 10.
- Fox A. 1974. *Beyond Contract: Work, Power and Trust Relations*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Fuller S. 2002. *Social Epistemology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Galbraith J. K. 1958. *The Affluent Society*. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Giroux H. 1997. *Pedagogy and Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Glennon L. 1983. "Synthesism. A Case of Feminist Methodology." In: *Beyond Method. Strategies for Social Research*. Ed. M. Gareth. Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Goffman E. 1975. "Charakterystyka instytucji totalnych." In: *Elementy Teorii Socjologicznych*. Ed. W. Dereczynski, A. Jasińska-Kania, J. Szacki. Warszawa: PWN.
- Goldman P., van Houten D. 1977. "Managerial Strategies and the Worker." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 18: 108–125.
- Grey C., Willmott H. 2005. *Critical Management Studies: A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grey C. 2004. "Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education." *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3/2: 178–186.

- Habermas J. 1983. *Teoria i praktyka: wybór pism*. Warszawa: PIW.
- Habermas J. 1998. "Modernizm – niedokończony projekt." In: *Postmodernism – antologia przekładów*. Ed. R. Nycz. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Baran i Suszczyński.
- Harding N. 2003. *The Social Construction of Management*. London: Routledge.
- Hardt M., Negri A. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Hassard J., Parker M., eds. 1993. *Postmodernism and Organisations*. London: Sage.
- Hatch M. J. 2002. *Teoria organizacji*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Hayek F. 1994. *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jemielniak D., Greenwood D. J. 2013. "Wake-Up or Perish: Neo-Liberalism, the Social Sciences, and Salvaging the Public University." *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies*, 15/1: 72–82.
- Kieżun W. 2010. *Twórczo i krytycznie o zarządzaniu*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer, Akademia Leona Koźmińskiego.
- Kliniewicz K. 2004. "Zarządzanie wiedzą jako przykład mody w zarządzaniu." *Organizacja i kierowanie*, 1/115: 15–32.
- Kostera M. 1996. *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu*. Warszawa: PWE.
- Kostera M. 2010. "Manifest humanistyczny współczesnego zarządzania." In: *Organizacje i archetypy*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer Polska.
- Kozyr-Kowalski S. 2005. *Uniwersytet a rynek*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Lane J. 2000. *Pierre Bourdieu. A Critical Introduction*. London: Pluto Press.
- Larrain J. 1983. *Marxism and Ideology*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lawrence T. B., Phillips N. 1998. "Commentary: Separating Play and Critique: Postmodern and Critical Perspectives on TQM/BPR." *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7/2: 154–160.
- Lee N., Kotler Ph. 2011. *Social Marketing: Influencing Behaviors for Good*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Leja K. 2013. *Zarządzanie uczelnią. Koncepcje i współczesne wyzwania*. Kraków: Wolters Kluwer.
- Łunarski J. 2010. *Zarządzanie jakością w logistyce*. Rzeszów: Politechnika Rzeszowska.
- Magala S. 2009. *The Management of Meaning*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin J. 2005. "Meta-theoretical Controversies in Studying Organizational Culture." In: *The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory: Meta-theoretical Perspectives*. Ed. Ch. Knudsen, T. Haridimos. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maslow A. H. 1998. *Maslow on Management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mazza C., Quattrone P., Riccaboni A., eds. 2008. *European Universities in Transition. Issues, Models and Cases*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Micklethwait J., Wooldrige A. 2000. *Szamani zarządzania*. Poznań: Zysk i s-ka.
- Monin N. 2004. *Management Theory. A Critical and Reflective Reading*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Oakley A. 2000. *Experiments in Knowing. Gender and Method in the Social Sciences*. New York: The New Press.

- Otto J. 2001. *Marketing relacji. Koncepcja i stosowanie*. Warszawa: C. H. Beck.
- Parker M. 2002. *Against Management: Organisation in the Age of Managerialism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Pringle R. 2005. *Sexuality at Work*. In: *Critical Management Studies. A Reader*. Ed. C. Grey, H. Willmott. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reed M. I. 2009. "Critical Realism in Critical Management Studies." In: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Ed. M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rorty R. 1997. *Filozofia a zwierciadło natury*. Warszawa: Altheia.
- Scherer A. G. 2009. "Critical Theory and Its Contribution to Critical Management Studies." In: *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Ed. M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, H. Willmott. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sułkowski Ł., Zawadzki, M., eds. 2014. *Krytyczny nurt zarządzania*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Sułkowski Ł. 2004. "Postmodernistyczne inspiracje zarządzania." *Współczesne Zarządzanie*, 3: 5–13.
- Sułkowski Ł. 2006. "Nurt krytyczny w naukach o zarządzaniu." *Współczesne Zarządzanie*, 1: 5–13.
- Sułkowski Ł. 2006. "Społeczeństwo informacyjne a kultura konsumpcyjna." In: *Koncepcje, modele i metody zarządzania informacją i wiedzą*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej.
- Sułkowski Ł. 2012. *Epistemologia i metodologia zarządzania*. Warszawa: PWE.
- Thomas S. 1979. *The Multi-National Companies*. Hove: Wayland Publishers.
- Weick K. 2007. *Managing the Unexpected: Resilient Performance in an Age of Uncertainty*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Willis E. 1984. "Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism." In: *No More Nice Girls: Countercultural Essays*. Minneapolis: Wesleyan University Press.
- Willmott H. 1997. "Critical Management Learning." In: *Management Learning: Integrating Perspectives in Theory and Practice*. Ed. J. Burgoyne, M. Reynolds. London: Sage.
- Witkowski L. 2008. "Koniec kultury uczenia się? Edukacja w dobie presji 'simulacrum' konsumpcji (dyskusja nie tylko z Zygmuntem Baumanem)." In: *Jaka kultura? Jaki dyskurs? Sfera publiczna a spory o edukację, pedagogikę i zarządzanie*. Ed. M. Jaworska-Witkowska. Szczecin: „Pedagogium”.
- Zawadzki M. 2013. "Denaturalizacja paradygmatu funkcjonalizmu w epistemologii nauk o zarządzaniu. Perspektywa nurtu krytycznego." *Organizacja i Kierowanie*, 2 (155): 11–28.
- Zawadzki M. 2014. "Konsekwencje założeń funkcjonalistycznych w epistemologii kultury organizacyjnej. Perspektywa nurtu krytycznego w naukach o zarządzaniu." *Problemy Zarządzania*, 11/4 (44), p. 58–74.
- Zawadzki M. 2014. *Nurt krytyczny w zarządzaniu: kultura, edukacja, teoria*. Warszawa: Sedno
- Zawadzki M. 2014. "Deuniwersytetyzacja współczesnego uniwersytetu." In: *Krytyczny nurt zarządzania*. Ed. Ł. Sułkowski, M. Zawadzki. Warszawa: Difin.

Zawadzki M. 2015. "Modne acz niebezpieczne bzdury. Guru zarządzania z perspektywy krytycznej." *Zarządzanie w kulturze* 16/23: 275–291.

Zawadzki M. 2015. "Smuggling Panaceas by Management Gurus: A Critical Approach." In: *Handbook of Research on Managerial Panaceas: Adaptation and Context*. Ed. A. Örtenblad. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Życiński J. 1993. *Granice racjonalności. Eseje z filozofii nauki*. Warszawa: PWN.

Łukasz Sułkowski, Michał Zawadzki

Dyskurs krytyczny we współczesnych naukach o zarządzaniu

Streszczenie: Artykuł przedstawia cechy charakterystyczne nurtu krytycznego w zarządzaniu – „Critical Management Studies” – który zdobywa coraz większą popularność w światowym dyskursie nauk o zarządzaniu. Autorzy wskazują główne założenia paradygmatyczne omawianego nurtu, jego źródła intelektualne, a także stosowane narzędzia krytyki, zwracając szczególną uwagę na płaszczyznę edukacji jako najistotniejszą z perspektywy skuteczności procesów emancypacji. W końcowej części przeprowadzona została krytyka nurtu CMS, wpisująca się w postulat nurtu krytycznego dotyczący potrzeby przyjmowania postawy autokrytycznej w badaniach naukowych.

Słowa kluczowe: nurt krytyczny w zarządzaniu, paradygmat krytyczny CMS, edukacja, emancypacja, postawa autokrytyczna w badaniach naukowych