Łukasz Sułkowski

Społeczna Wyższa Szkoła Przedsiębiorczości i Zarządzania

The problems of epistemology of corporate culture

1. Introduction

Culture is a heavily theoretically and empirically "burdened" concept. In the second half of the XXth century culture was a prevailing paradigm of explanation of the complexity of social processes covering all disciplines of social sciences and the humanities. It has also become a universal term and has been deep-rooted in the colloquial discourse of most contemporary languages. During the last decade, however, we have dealt with the growth of significance of nativist and evolutionist positions as opposed to "culturalism". The old concepts of the universals of human nature and biological determinants of man's actions as well as sociobiology come back. New influential disciplines as: evolutionist psychology, cognitivistics or neuroscience issue a challenge to cultural sciences [Pinker 2002]. Does then deconstruction of the concept of "culture" and consequently of cognate concepts such as "corporate culture" take place?

It seems that a concept of corporate culture experiences a cognitive crisis in management as well. The appearances of popularity cover some essential problems of understanding corporate culture and corporate culture management. This is where serious doubts expressed in the title of the publication raise. Thus the subject matter of the article is an analysis of cognitive and practical problems of the corporate culture trend in management concluded with an attempt to outline a prospect of their solution.

Among the most important cognitive problems in the corporate culture trend in management are the issues as follows:
– Calling into question the values of "culturalist" paradigms.
– Discrepancies (or incommensurabilities) between understanding corporate culture paradigms (schools).
– Blurred and divergent corporate culture definitions.

– Unclear and variously described correlations between corporate culture and structure, strategy and organizational environment.
– Lack of consensus of researchers on a model and typology of corporate culture i.e. its dimensions, components or levels.

2. The cognitive evolutionism-based criticism of culturalist approach

The culturalist approaches interpret the societal world and human behaviour through the prism of cultural diversification i.e. human communities which have different values, norms and culture patterns. Classical nature-*versus-c*ulture opposition confronts man's innate and genetic conditions and learned assimilated patterns transmitted by the society. The second half of the XXth century is the period of indisputable dominance of culturalism which rejects or at least marginalises the significance of the universalism of biological human nature. Culturalism was a sui generis reaction to cognitive and political excesses of a vulgarised form of social Darwinism which had become one of the ideological foundations of the XXth century totalitarian systems. Frenology and eugenics gave a pseudo scientific justification to discrimination, racism and, in extreme version, genocide inflicted upon "lower" and "genetically inferior" races. It appears, however, that the contemporary development of biological sciences, evolutionary psychology, cognitivistics and neuroscience allows to break this tradition of culturalist-nativist antagonism indicating a possibility of existence of a moderate position combining the vision of universal human nature with its biological roots and the cultural diversity concept.

According to this approach culture is being created in a close relation with biology [Barkow (ed.) 2006]. The ability of symbolic thinking and creation of social institutions is an innate evolutionarily formed characteristic of human nature which, anyway, is a continuation of clearly visible trend among primates [Tomasello 2002, pp. 286–287]. Neo-evolutionist research of culture makes it possible to construct mathematical models which accurately diagnose and forecast human behaviour. Commencing with sociobiological and evolutionist concepts we can arrive at the foundations of functioning of the society and culture[1]. The key, albeit concealed, motive of people's decisions remains "the egoism of genes", thus genetic reproduction equal to duration and development of the complex information structure which genes actually are. Organisms and species are to some extent "a side effect" of that development of information structures. Such an assumption was the basis of research explaining human behaviours related to drive for reproduction, relations with family and kinsmen, the problems of an organism's survival, kin and non-relative altruism, cooperation and conflict within social groups and the sexual diversity of human species [Buss 2007,

---

[1] In the article two designations: cognitive evolutionism and neoevolutionism are used interchangeably and in a bit simplified way.

pp. 36–70]. The development of human brain in the course of evolution became an adaptive effect conducive to reproduction. Due to it man, along with the development of cognitive skills and complexity of human communities, started to create and form basic organizational skills: division of labour, cooperation, leadership and societal communication. The use of evolutionist perspective in social sciences allows for explanation of numerous hard to interpret behaviours. Evolutionary sources of cultural universals such as: language, individual identity, marriage, incest taboo and many others are being studied [Pinker 2005, pp. 617–621]. The structures have been found which enable individuals and communities to detect and eliminate social impostors, in a parasitic manner taking advantage of people's openness and will to cooperate in a group [Cosmides, Tooby 1996, pp. 1–73]. The essential differences in perception and interpretation of reality occurring between genders have been examined [Eals, Silverman 2004, pp. 88–108]. Learning is also conditioned by the perceptive apparatus and evolutionary structures which serve interpretation and effective operation [Seligmann, Hager 2004, pp. 75–82]. Emotional reactions such as: fear or stress but also liking, friendship or love have their biological-functional roots. Also the whole family sphere commencing from reproduction and relationship building, through bringing up children up to societal consequences of nepotism and familism is embedded in the evolutionary heritage. Thus the contemporary evolutionary research, which avails itself of the methods of social sciences and the newest brain study techniques as well, forms a very expressive depiction of human behaviour based on coupling of genes and environmental influences. This approach encounters a very strong emotional reaction of the representatives of the traditionally oriented humanities.

There exist no uniform neoevolutionist position towards culture. No doubt a common point is the criticism of "culturalism" which loses its explanatory power in the context of discoveries referring to universal biological foundations of societal behaviours. The development of brain and societal processes has activated a connection resulting in the birth of culture which can be interpreted as a societal transmission of knowledge mechanism. Neoevolutionism, however, has no single unquestionable theory of culture at its disposal. One of the proposals is e.g. memetics [Blackmore 1999]. According to its assumptions the desire to reproduce is one of the most general mechanisms which covers not only living organisms but also ideas. The memes aim at spreading on a largest scale possible through social and symbolic systems. Any doubts as to the validity of memetic concepts should not obscure the value of cognitivistics [Gardnem 1985]. The development of human communities, so also organizational skills, is strictly related to the improvement of man's cognitive skills rooted in his mind. Biological sciences basing on the evolutionist paradigm also treat the mind as an evolutionary construct which shapes psychological and social aspects of reality

through culture [Edelman 1998, p. 325]. Thus the neoevolutionist criticism of "culturalism" is not tantamount to an attempt of eradication of culture from the scientific discourse, but only points to its continuity with nature, i.e. a biological heritage of human species.

From the point of view of the management and corporate culture issues departure from the assumptions of "culturalism" bears serious far-reaching consequences. Apparently the evolutionist trend researches are very far from corporate problems, however a deeper analysis shows that the adopted evolutionary explanations have an impact on all behavioural sciences. A few examples can be quoted here. Management processes are related both to the fight for dominance within a group and the skills of coalition building and communication. Diversity of the "masculine" and "feminine" management styles can be a consequence of the differences in the structure of cognitive and emotional apparatuses. Human resources management avails itself of the recruitment, motivation and development theories which are based on an overrationalised vision of human nature close to the *homo oeconomicus* assumptions. Meanwhile many decisional processes, as brain studies show, happen beyond conscious control which requires the human resources management theory to be reviewed [Colarelli 2003]. Marketing corporate behaviours should take into consideration, both theoretically and practically, evolutionary motives of human action related to, be it partner selection or evaluating system which rewards behaviours conducive to survival in the primitive group[2]. Numerous evolutionary explanations also allow to better understand psychological and social foundations of functioning of money, e.g. risk factors, playing the stock exchange, frugality and wastefulness etc. Darwinism, supported by some reliable brain studies, allows to obtain knowledge useful in terms of strategic management. Planning, sense of time and inclination to take risk stem from the biological foundation of human cognitive-emotional apparatus and served to enhance the chance of survival in primitive communities. Therefore it seems that management, as well as other social sciences, face a chance of comprehending "human nature" which can be found in many spheres of interest of our discipline. Thus it seems that the processes of management, leadership, exercising authority, communication, conflict and cooperation and also relations and gender differences are inexplicable without reference being made to evolutionism. A new paradigm that is coming into being, and which can be defined as neoevolutionism, has cumulated numerous researches and theories creating a coherent, in terms of social sciences, image of man in his environment.

---

[2] And unfortunately, not always functional nowadays, excessive consumption of calorific food in spite of food's general availability.

3. Paradigms of corporate culture

The culture trend in management wrestles with the elementary epistemological problems related to the ways of defining of corporate culture. There is no consensus among researchers either to understanding or corporate culture paradigms, besides it is an issue related to ambiguity of cultural studies in general [Kroeber, Kluckhon 1952]. We can distinguish many paradigms of understanding culture and consequently of corporate culture. Searching for paradigms of understanding culture as such, at least three orientations should be indicated: the functionalist-structuralist trend, interpretative-symbolic approach, postmodernism and post-structuralism [compare: Sułkowski 2005]. In cultural studies functionalism, the foundations of which came into being in the first half of the XXth century and which resulted in the occurrence of structuralism, was a classical approach. The development of hermeneutics, humanistic sociology and cultural anthropology became a foundation for the emergence of the interpretative-symbolic paradigm. In the eighties and nineties of the XXth century the significance of postmodernist orientation considerably increased due to critical philosophy and cultural anthropology.

A similar distinction of paradigms can be applied with reference to corporate culture. M.J. Hatch proposes a distinction of four paradigms in management sciences: classical, modernist, interpretative-symbolic and postmodernist [Hatch 2002, pp. 62–65]. In classical approaches to management the corporate culture trend has not existed. Modernism expresses corporate culture in functionalist and structuralist categories as one of the corporate subsystems and refers to the methodology of representative comparative research. The necessity of corporate culture supervision resulting in its instrumentalisation is suggested. The interpretative-symbolic approach characterises it as a process of construction and interpretation of the societal reality of an organization in man's symbolic and linguistic actions within a group. Qualitative methodology, e.g. organizational ethnography is preferred whereas the possibility of instrumental formation of corporate culture is rather sceptically evaluated. Postmodernism emphasizes defragmentation, cultural and epistemological relativism, textual and narrative approach. The point of creation of methodology is denied, and deconstruction becomes a major "anti-method" [Hatch 2002, pp. 204–238].

L. Smircich, reviews the paradigms that underpin the concepts connecting culture and organization [Smircich 1983, pp. 160–172]. Five common areas have been found: (1) comparative intercultural research, (2) internal culture of an enterprise, (3) cognitive theory of organization, (4) organizational symbolism, (5) unconscious and subconscious processes in an organization.

Table 1. Typology of cultural research in the theory of organization with respect to cultural assumptions and the role of culture in corporate reality.

Culture as an independent variable	Culture as an internal variable	Culture as an indigenous metaphor
Intercultural management National management styles. Similarities and differences in management methods of diverse countries. The relation of effectiveness and national culture. Corporate culture globalisation.	**Culture of the enterprise** Managing corporate culture. The relation of effectiveness and corporate culture. Alterations and classifications of corporate cultures.	**Cognitive approach** Organization as a cognitive undertaking. **Symbolist approach** Organisation – a symbolic discourse. **Dramaturgical approach** People as corporate actors. Organization as the theatre. **Interpretative approach** Organisational reality as an intentional construct of consciousness. **Psychodynamic approach** Research into an organisation as a form of human expression.
FUNCTIONALISM		NON-FUNCTIONALIST PARADIGMS

Source: based on Kostera 1996, p. 63.

Corporate culture can be interpreted as an independent (external) variable – a result of the influence of environment on the organization, internal organizational variable or indigenous metaphor [Thompson, Luthans 1990]. Culture perceived in the perspective of comparative intercultural studies in management is an independent variable exerting influence on the organization [Kostera 1996, pp. 63–65]. So approached it is understood in terms of functionalism and is a sui generis context which exerts influence on the whole management process. Within the confines of that approach the studies of national management and leadership styles and comparative studies of the influence of cultural context on organizations can be mentioned. Culture – an internal variable comes into being as an effect of functioning of the organization and is characteristic for it. So understood organizations can create corporate culture. Studies deal first of all with its creation and development, typology and relations to effectiveness of the whole organization. Culture can also be interpreted as an indigenous metaphor, in terms of paradigms different from functionalism. Within them corporate culture is identified with the organization itself. Organisations are understood first of all as symbolic actions, the forms of human expression and creation,

cognitive undertakings or manifestations of deep structures of human brain or communities. A change of perspective occurs on the basis of those paradigms. Economic organizations cease to be primarily economic undertakings and other psychological, social and symbolic aspects of their existence are emphasised.

J. Martin carries out a classification of corporate culture concepts, analysing approaches of over 70 researchers, including them to one from three theoretical perspectives. An integrative perspective is oriented to striving for homogeneity and stability of corporate culture what resembles the functionalist-structuralist paradigm. A differentiation perspective admits possibility of divisions, tensions, conflicts, creation of subcultures and separations in which it is closer to the interpretative-symbolic paradigm. A fragmentation perspective oriented to flow, distribution, constant change of indefinable culture is the closest to the postmodernist and post-structuralist paradigm [Martin 2002, pp. 93–114].

Apart from those three similar concepts of paradigms of corporate cultures numerous researchers present their own proposals of paradigms, schools or approaches to corporate culture which usually ignore the genesis of corporate culture which stems from cultural studies in general [for example O'Donovan 2006, pp. 45–78].

4. Definitions of corporate culture

An obvious consequence of non-existence of one paradigm and even consensus of researchers for a common way of putting in order the approaches to corporate culture is multiplicity of definitions of the very corporate culture as well the descriptions of its components, typologies and correlations with other organizational spheres and environment. In reference books a few dozen various definitions can be encountered which could be classified as falling under one of three paradigms. An example of such an analysis can be found in table 2.

Table 2. Definitions of corporate culture.

Author	Definition of corporate culture	Paradigm
E. Jacques	Conventional or traditional way of thinking and behaving which is shared to some extent by organization members and which has to be, at least partially, accepted by new employees.	Functionalist--structuralist
E. Schein	A pattern of fundamental shared assumptions which a given group created while solving the problems of adaptation to environment and those of internal integration. It is inculcated in new organization members as a correct method of problems solving.	Functionalist--structuralist

H. Schenplein	Values, norms and beliefs generally accepted in the organization and creating a system.	Functionalist--structuralist
G. Hofstede	„Mind programming" in organization members, thus a set of values, norms and organizational rules successfully inculcated by the group [Hofstede 2000, pp. 38–41].	Interpretative--symbolic
P.M. Blau	Specific unwritten "rules of the social game" in the organization , which enable the social life participants to understand their organization and identify with it [Blau 1994, p. 298].	Interpretative--symbolic
J. van Maanen		Interpretative--symbolic
L. Smircich	Semantic networks created by people in the course of organization[Smircich 1983, p. 39].	Interpretative--symbolic
R. Deshapande R. Parasurman	Unwritten, often subconsciously perceived, rules which fill a gap between the unwritten and actually happening in the organization [Deshapande, Parasurman 1986].	Interpretative--symbolic
J.M. Kobi H. Wüthrich	Organizations not only have culture but they are culture themselves [Kobi, Wüthrich 1991, p. 29].	Interpretative--symbolic

Source: author's own study.

Among the chosen examples of definitions of corporate culture those that belong to postmodernist paradigm are lacking. For the authors which exploit that approach take an anti-systemic position and they usually call into question the point of introduction of corporate culture concept. The most important postmodernist motives related to culture and organizational process include: criticism of cultural repression and symbolic violence in an organization [Czarniawska 2002; Burrell 1984, pp. 97–118; and Pringle 2005, pp. 284–303; Spivak, Brewis 2000, and Butler 2004], the problem of defragmentation of identity of individuals and communities [Rosen 1991, pp. 1–24; Hatch 1997, pp. 275–288) and the criticism of the culture of managerism and consumerism [Monin 2004, p. 191; Harding 2003, p. 14].

The consequence of dispersion of paradigms and semantics of corporate culture are difficulties with the construction of coherent research projects as well as the practical ones. Corporate culture becomes an overcapacious and unoperationable term. In the cultural research trend there is no effect of the accumulation of scientific output and the researchers mutually use the results of their studies to a small extent.

5. Relations: culture vs structure, strategy and organizational environment

Also the relations of corporate culture with other organizational spheres as: structure, strategy and organizational environment are vague. A few approaches and differentiation criteria can be pointed out here.

The first problem is separation of corporate culture from other components of organization. The functionalists usually opt for the possibility of theoretical and practical separation of cultural, structural and strategic spheres, whereas the interpretativists and postmodernists usually tacitly assume or even explicitly point out that those semantic spheres are interwoven [Smircich 1983, pp. 55–65].

Another question is determining a priority, i.e. an answer to the question whether a corporate culture is superior to other spheres of management, equivalent or even less essential. Of course the majority of researchers of cultural phenomena support the superiority or at least equivalence of culture in management of the whole organization [e.g. Kobi, Wüthrich 1991]. However, outside the corporate culture it is easy to point out the supporters of the dominance of strategy over corporate culture [de Wit, Meyer 2007, s. 33].

The third key problem, in my opinion, is to determine the relations between corporate culture and organizational environment. In reference books an enormous quantity of studies and analyses can be found on the correlation between culture as such and other components of societal-economic environment [Bogalska-Martin 2007, pp. 237–256]. Commencing from the classical studies by M. Webera [2002] through analyses of relations between culture and the wealth of nations by F. Fukuyama [2001] and D.S. Landes [2000], up to comparative intercultural studies of: G. Hofstede [1984], A. Trompenaars and Ch. Hampden-Turner [1998], R. Hous [1997, pp. 215–254] and R. Ingleharta [1997]. This abundance of research, however, does not deal with the relations of corporate culture with the societal, economic or even cultural environment. If we admit, that corporate cultures are "immersed" in the cultures of communities and they make a circle of values, than what a transmission between those area is? Majority of researchers assume that the values and norms diffuse from societal to corporate culture. Feedback is possible, of course, however usually its scale is smaller because of the community size and the depth of enrooted values and norms. All the same, a homogeneous model describing correlation of societal and corporate cultures is lacking. There is no final say which would enable determination what is a degree of coherence between the societal culture and corporate culture. Some authors describe corporate cultures and societal cultures availing themselves of completely different models and dimensions of values [Hofstede 2007, p. 307]. Others assume larger coherence and avail themselves of identical or similar models and dimensions of values [Sułkowski 2002, p. 111].

The absence of determinations in the sphere of relations: corporate culture versus other components of organizational system and also corporate culture

versus environment results in adoption of very diverse research and practical assumptions within that area. Among theoreticians and managers we can find both enthusiasts and sceptics of organizational management with the use of corporate culture.

6. Models and typologies of corporate culture

A fundamental cognitive problem related with the creation of models and typologies of corporate culture is a question of discerning them from the models of organization as such or its selected spheres. As we have both theoretical and operational problems with the isolation of corporate culture from the whole organizational system, so we face an obstacle in its description and classification. H. Mintzberg suggesting five basic configurations of organization: simple structure, machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, divisionalised form and adhocracy, although concentrates on structure, actually refers to corporate culture [Mintzberg 1983]. Ch. Perrow creating matrix of technologies base on the following parameters: task variability and analyzability (routine, engineering, craft i non-routine) simultaneously describes the corporate structures types [Perrow 1967]. The sieve and human capital model is simultaneously a corporate culture model in its two contradictory ideal types. The similar situation is with leadership models, those of power, organizational learning or human resources management. They are descriptions of the whole organization or its chosen aspect and simultaneously either a model or typology of corporate culture. Excessive capacity and ambiguity of corporate culture concepts results here in the impossibility of analytical isolation of corporate culture from other organizational spheres.

In reference books numerous models and typologies of corporate culture can be found. The most often quoted concepts are those of: E. Schein, W. Ouchi [1980, pp. 129–141], T. Deal and A. Kennedy, T. Peters and R. Waterman [2000], G. Hofstede and Ch. Handy. All of them are built implicitly on functional structuralism. While analysing those concepts from the point of view of convergence, it should be mentioned that there is a concord between them as far as corporate culture components are concerned. Most of authors include, after E. Scheine, to corporate culture a few mentioned components: values, norms, basic assumptions, cultural patterns, language, symbols, artefacts, rituals and taboos [Schein 1992]. Corporate culture models, instead, are very differentiated as far as proposed values dimensions and typologies are concerned. After all a part of them came into existence basing on profiteering and consulting experiences rather than on research projects. T. Deal and A. Kennedy differentiate corporate cultures from the point of view of risk degree and speed of verification of managerial decisions. Intersection of those parameters results in the origin of typology of cultures: strong guys (macho), hard working and playing hard, supporting their company and oriented to process [Deal, Kennedy

1988]. Similarly simplified and not rooted in larger research products are the concepts of Ch. Handy, W. Ouchi and also T. Peters and R. Waterman. The last three concepts bear the traits of good "marketing products", that is based on clever idea and extensively promoted popular manuals. Unfortunately in order to sell well, they were forced to oversimplify reality. Thus even if they are brilliant and inspire managers, they cannot be recognized as based on solid empirical foundation. The situation with G. Hofstede's concept, which emerged from the studies of enterprises carried out, even if on a small scale but based on a rather complex qualitative-quantitative research project, was different. In that case, six dimensions based on the analysis which had been mentioned before, have been distinguished: orientation to observation of procedures – orientation to results achievements, care for employees – care for production, affiliation (parochial) – professionalism, open system – close system, loose control – tight control and normativeness – pragmatism [Hofstede 2007, p. 307]. However, the dimensions of corporate culture proposed by G. Hofstede are essentially different from the dimensions proposed by other authors who create empirical research-based models [Goffee, Jones 1998]. Therefore we deal here with a "jungle" of models, dimensions and corporate cultures typologies.

Corporate cultures are considered by various researchers in terms of diverse dimensions, through which the following dychotomies often run: 1) weak culture – strong culture, 2) positive culture – negative culture [Bate 1984], 3) pragmatic culture – bureaucratic culture, 4) introvert culture – extrovert culture [Sikorski 1990], 5) conservative culture – innovative culture, 6) hierarchical culture – egalitarian culture, 7) individualist culture – collectivist culture. A cognitive problem consists in a diverse way of selection of those dimensions and the differences in their defining. A good example can be a confrontation: strong culture – weak culture understood by some authors as homogeneous culture, and as a culture which fosters effectiveness by others [compare: Deal, Kennedy 1988, pp. 4–20; Kobi, Wüthrich 1991].

7. Conclusion

Corporate culture, similarly to culture as such, escapes cognition and control. However the problems related to defining corporate culture cannot obscure the significance of the trend. It is worthwhile asking what valuable and lasting the culture trend brought into management.

First, those are reliable studies of cultural differentiation of diverse communities and organizations which have a considerable impact on enterprises, economic development and action of people seen as employees. Numerous research projects describe the diversity of cultural patterns, norms and configurations of organizational values pointing at the significant influence of societal culture context [Fukuyama 1997; Lewis 1996; Mol 2000; Sweeney, Hardaker 1995]. It leads to theoretical and practical concepts of management

taking into consideration cultural relativism and opposed to thinking in terms of *one best way,* i.e. assuming that in management there exist universal optimal patterns which wait to be discovered. Thinking in terms of cultural relativism tears down all remnants of neopositivist thinking which, after all, underpin historical trend of a "scientific management".

Second, this is an indication to diversity of management tools developed in various cultures and to the possibilities of their adaptation to dissimilar social conditions. Effective management techniques created in one society can be used, with certain limitations, in others. By way of example the experiences with transferring Japanese organizational techniques to American and European conditions, i.e. quality circles, kaizen or kanban, provide the material concerning the problems of differences in management existing between diverse cultures.

Third, the cultural trend has stimulated development of intercultural management. Globalisation processes enhance the significance of transnational corporations operating in many countries. Establishment of affiliates, subsidiary companies, strategic alliances and mergers fostered development of the practical tools of intercultural communication and formation of corporate culture e.g. training systems, culture audits and the techniques of transformation of values, norms and cultural patterns. Studies of the impact of societal culture on organizations became especially important in the face of internationalisation of business activity which resulted in development of intercultural management.

Fourth, the cultural approach draws attention to the need of looking for new understanding of organizations and business life. The development of cultural trend in management contributed to intensification of epistemological discussions. The limitations of prevailing *homo oeconomicus* presumption have been pointed out, while a reflection based on functionalist and non-functionalist perspectives was proposed. As far as epistemology and methodology is concerned management was located within the scope of social sciences and the humanities.

And finally fifth, the culture trend fostered the expansion of the scope of methodology of organizational studies by interpretative methods. Management instruments dedicated more place to such "soft" research methods as: projection techniques, biographical and focused interviews, discursive and narrative methods or ethnomethodological techniques. Qualitative methods gain in significance – they stopped to be used as a mere introduction to representative research.

Therefore, if the output of corporate culture trend, and more broadly culture trend in management, is positively evaluated, then how, in the face of previous critical comments, should the research be conducted? First of all, one has to accept multiplicity of paradigms and definitions of corporate culture and also to adopt a position of methodological pluralism or eclecticism. Openness to concepts and methods following from other academic disciplines is also

important. It is not only the disciplines related to humanities and social sciences such as sociology, cultural anthropology, cultural studies and linguistics that are involved in the sphere of research of corporate culture but also new sciences as: cognitivistics and information technologies. It is possible that explanations of culture processes will become a part of scientific revolutions connecting the issues of social sciences and natural science. I hope that interdisciplinarity and openness will facilitate solution of the problems of corporate culture, which cannot be eliminated from the analysis of functioning of societal groups. Also intensification of the research within the corporate culture field and working out severe criteria for rejection of low cognitive value projects or those unsupported by reliable empirical research seems to be purposeful.

Abstract

Culture is a concept heavily theoretically and empirically burdened. In the second half of the XXth century culture was a prevailing paradigm of explanation of the complexity of social processes covering all disciplines of social sciences and humanities. It has also become a universal term and deep-rooted in the colloquial discourse of most contemporary languages. During the last decade, however, we have dealt with the growth of significance of nativist and evolutionist positions as opposed to "culturalism". The old concepts of the universals of human nature and biological determinants of man's actions as well as sociobiology come back. New influential disciplines as: evolutionist psychology, cognitivistics or neuroscience issue a challenge to culture sciences [Pinker 2002]. Does then deconstruction of the concept of "culture" and consequently of cognate concepts such as "corporate culture" take place?

References

Barkow, J.H. (ed.) 2006, *Missing the Revolution. Darwinism for Social Scientists*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bate, P. 1984, *The Impact of Organisational Culture on Approaches to Organisational Problem Solving*, "Organisational Studies", No. 5.

Blackmore, S. 1999, *The Meme Machine*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Blau, P.M. 1994, *The Organisation of Academic Work*, Transaction, New Brunswick.

Bogalska-Martin, E. 2007, *Wprowadzenie do teorii kulturowych uwarunkowań rozwoju gospodarczego* [in:] *Ekonomia rozwoju*, Piasecki, R. (ed.), PWE, Warszawa, pp. 237–256.

Brewis, J., Linsted, S. 2000, *Sex, Work and Sex Work: Eroticizing Organization,* Routledge, London.

Burrell, G. 1984, *Sex and Organisational Analysis*, „Organization Studies", 5 (2), pp. 97–118.

Buss, D.M. 2007, *Evolutionary Psychology. The New Science of the Mind*, Pearson, Boston, pp. 36–70.

Butler, J. 2004, *Undoing Gender*, Routledge, London.

Colarelli, S.M. 2003, *No Best Way. An Evolutionary Perspective on Human Resource Management*, Praeger, London.

Cosmides, L., Tooby, J. 1996, *Are humans good intuitive statisticians after all?,* "Cognition", No. 58, pp. 1–73.

Czarniawska, B., Höpfl, H. (eds.) 2002, *Casting the Other: the Production and Maintenance of Inequalities in Work Organizations*, Routledge, London.

de Wit, B., Meyer, R. 2007, *Synteza strategii*, PWE, Warszawa, s. 33.

Deal, T., Kennedy, A. 1988, *Corporate Cultures. The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*, Penguin Books, London, pp. 4–20.

Deshpande, R., Parasuraman, A. 1986, *Linking corporate culture to strategic planning,* "Business Horizons", Vol. 29, No. 3.

Eals, M., Silverman, I. 2004, *The Hunter-Gatherer Theory of Spatial and Sex Differences* [in:] "The Functional Mind. Readings in Evolutionary Psychology", Kenrick, D.T., Luce C.L. (eds.), Pearson, Boston, pp. 88–108.

Edelman, G.M. 1998, *Przenikliwe powietrze, jasny ogień. O materii umysłu*, PIW, Warszawa.

Fukuyama, F. 2001, *Culture and Economic Development* [in:] *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Smesler, N.J., Baltes, P.B. (eds.), Pergamon, Oxford.

Fukuyama, F. 1997, *Kapitał społeczny a droga do dobrobytu*, PWN, Warszawa – Wrocław.

Gardnem, H. 1985, *The Mind's New Science: A History of Cognitive Revolution*, Basic Books, New York.

Geertz, C. 1973, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic, New York.

Goffee, R., Jones, G. 1998, *The Character of a Corporation,* Harper Collins Publishers, New York.

Hampden-Turner, Ch., Trompenaars, A. 1998, *Siedem kultur kapitalizmu. USA, Japonia, Niemcy, Wielka Brytania, Szwecja, Holandia*, Dom Wydawniczy ABC, Warszawa.

Harding, N. 2003, *The Social Construction of Management*, Routledge, London.

Hatch, M.J. 1997, *Irony and the Social Construction of Contradiction in the Humor of a Management Team*, "Organization Studies", pp. 275–288.

Hatch, M.J. 2002, *Teoria organizacji*, PWN, Warszawa.

Hofstede, G. 1984, *Culture's Consequences*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.

Hofstede ,G., Hofstede, G.J. 2007, *Kultury i organizacje*, PWE, Warszawa, p. 307.

House, R.J., Hanges, P. and Ruiz-Quintanilla, A. 1997, *GLOBE. The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior. Effectiveness: Research Program*, "Polish Psychological Bulletin", 28(3), pp. 215–254.

Inglehart, R. 1997, *Modernization and Postmodernization. Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Kobi, J.-M., Wüthrich, H. 1991, *Culture d'entreprise. Modes d'action. Diagnostic et intervention*, Nathan, Paris, p. 29.

Kostera M., 1996, *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu,* PWE, Warszawa.

Kroeber, A.L., Kluckhon, C. 1952, *Culture. A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, "Peabode Museum of American Anthropology and Ethnology Papers", Cambridge, Vol. 47, No. 1.

Landem, D.S. 2000, *Bogactwo i nędza narodów. Dlaczego jedni są tak bogaci, a inni tak ubodzy*, Muza, Warszawa.

Lewis, R.D. 1996, *When Cultures Collide. Managing Successfully Across Cultures*, Nicholas Brealey Publishing, London.

Martin, J. 2002, *Organizational Culture. Mapping the Terrain*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, London, pp. 93–114.

Mintzberg, H. 1983, *Structures In Five: Designing effective Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Mole, J. 2000, *W tyglu Europy. Wzorce i bariery kulturowe w przedsiębiorstwach*, Prószyński i S-ka, Warszawa.

Monin, N. 2004, *Management Theory. A Critical and Reflective Reading*, Routledge, London – New York.

O'Donovan, G. 2006, *The Corporate Culture Handbook. How to Plan, Implement and Measure a Successful Culture Change Programme*, The Liffey Press, Dublin.

Ouchi, W. 1980, *Markets, Bureaucracies and Clans,* „Administrative Science Quarterly", No. 25, pp. 129–141.

Perrow, Ch. 1967, *A Framework for Comparative Organizational Analysis*, "American Sociological Review", No. 32/2.

Peters, T.J., Waterman, R.H. 2000, *Poszukiwanie doskonałości w biznesie*, Medium, Warszawa.

Pinker, S. 2002, *The Blank Slate. The Modern Denial of Human Nature*, Penguin Books, London.

Pinker, S. 2005, *Tabula rasa. Spory o naturę ludzką,* GWO, Gdańsk.

Pringle, R. 2005, *Sexuality at Work* [in:] *Critical Management Studies. A Reader*, Grey, Ch., Willmot, H. (eds.), Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 284–303.

Rosen, M. 1991, *Coming to the Terms with the field: Understanding and doing organisational ethnography*, "Journal of Management Studies", No. 28, pp. 1–24.

Schein, E.H. 1992, *Organizational Culture and Leadership,* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Seligmann, M.P., Hager, J.L. 2004, *Biological Boundaries of Learning* [in:] *The Functional Mind. Readings in Evolutionary Psychology*, Kenrick, D.T., Luce, C.L. (eds.), Pearson, Boston, pp. 75–82.

Sikorski, Cz. 1990, *Kultura organizacyjna w instytucji*, Wyd. UŁ, Łódź.

Smircich, L. 1983, *Organizations as Shared Meaning*, "Organization Symbolism", JAI Press, Greenwich, pp. 55–65.

Smircich, L. 1983, *Studying Organisations as Cultures* [in:] *Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research,* Morgan G. (ed.), Beverly Hills-London-New Delhi, pp. 160–172.

Sułkowski, Ł. 2002, *Kulturowa zmienność organizacji*, PWE, Warszawa, p. 111.

Sułkowski, Ł. 2005, *Epistemologia w naukach o zarządzaniu*, PWE, Warszawa.

Sweeney, E.P., Hardaker, G. 1995, *The Importance of Organisational and National Culture*, European Business Review, Internet – sweeney.htm.

Thompson, K.R., Luthans, F. 1990, *Organisational Culture. A Behavioural Perspective* [in:] „Organisational Climate and Culture", Schneider, B., Jossey-Bass (eds.), Oxford, chapter 9.

Tomasello, M. 2002, *Kulturowe źródła ludzkiego poznania*, PIW, Warszawa, pp. 286–287.

Weber, M. 2002, *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo: zarys socjologii rozumiejącej*, PWN, Warszawa.