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Part I: Theoretical aspects of metaphors in management

Introduction

"All theories of organization and management are based on implicit images or metaphors that persuade us to see, understand, and imagine situations in partial ways. Metaphors create insight. But they also distort. They have strengths. But they also have limitations. In creating ways of seeing, they create ways of not seeing. Hence there can be no single theory or metaphor that gives an all-purpose point of view. There can be no 'correct theory' for structuring everything we do."

It has always been the goal of managing bodies to understand their employees’ intentions, and try to predict their behavior in an organizational context. However, today’s management faces a great challenge. Our mental patterns are no longer sufficient for navigating the scenarios of modern organizational complexity. The modern-day manager is challenged with dealing with these constantly increasing complexities in the pursuit of efficiency and effectiveness. They must understand how constant changes influence their tasks so they can contribute to establishing a fast-reacting organization. “Ideal organizations”, as described by Weick and Quinn as well as Buchanan et al., are capable of ongoing adaptation, being both proactive and reactive at the same time according to circumstances and situation. Organizational metaphors can serve as methods or tools that provide insight into how organizations function, and how best to deal with

making them successful in a state of permanent change. Bolman and Deal, stress that companies are ambiguous, contradictory and uncertain, and that metaphors can help administrators to decrease or remove the misunderstandings caused by managing such a complex phenomenon. Morgan states that metaphors assist companies in analyzing organizations from a “mosaic of different lenses or images”.

Bennis and Nanus investigated transformational leaders, i.e. those who had the ability to transform people’s expectations and organizational systems, and found that among the tools the transformational leader uses to create the vision – and so create the meaning of the organization – is metaphor. By studying metaphors, the modern-day manager will be better prepared to understand organizations and how best to deal with the circumstances they are challenged by, as they strive for results.

1. The nature of metaphors

Metaphors saturate our language and many metaphors already exist in the world of business and organizations. Metaphor is not just a mere ornament; it is a common, frequent and pervasive phenomenon. Different scholars produced different research findings on metaphor frequency.

Table 1. Findings on the frequency of use of metaphor, by different authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Frequency in metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steen et al.11</td>
<td>13.6% of all lexical units in the corpus can be classified as being related to metaphor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs12</td>
<td>5.7 metaphors per minute of speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalen et al.13</td>
<td>3.69 nonliteral statements in past-oriented e-mails (average of 284,90 words) and 2.11 in future-oriented e-mails (average of 221,02 words).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andriessen14</td>
<td>At least 95% of all statements about either knowledge or intellectual capital are based on metaphor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J. Wittink, RELIABLE METAPHOR ANALYSIS IN ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH, Towards a dual, dynamic approach, VU University Amsterdam, http://dspace.ubvu.vu.nl/.

They are often used to understand evasive concepts that we would like to communicate with others. Morgan wrote that metaphor is “…a primal, generative process that is fundamental to the creation of human understanding and meaning in all aspects of life”15. According to Black, metaphors help us sort reality from illusion16.

We instinctively graft abstract and complex concepts such as ‘time’, ‘life’ and ‘organization’ onto more concrete concepts that are easier to visualize. Even theories get visualized, often as structures (we may talk about ‘supporting’ evidence or the ‘foundations’ of a theory). “Metaphors are omnipresent in science. Astrophysicists describe the distribution of mass in the universe as being foam-like,

---

and chemists still ascribe orbitals to atoms as if electrons were planets spinning around a nuclear sun\textsuperscript{17}.

Phrases such as ‘life is a game’ or ‘business is war’ clearly represent expressions by means of which the speaker aims to draw the recipient’s attention to the fact that in life or business, you can either win or lose.

Metaphors have remained an important subject of interest through the centuries. Theory, analysis, research and study have been dedicated to them, from Aristotle until now. Conflicting with common thought, our conceptualization and thinking are pervaded by metaphors, rather than their simply serving as rhetorical and poetic devices. To be more precise, in the field of linguistics and communication it is believed that our cognitive processes and thoughts are highly metaphorical – that human thought is constructed and constituted of metaphors\textsuperscript{18}. It is certain that language is barely metaphor-free, meaning that people reason in metaphors and develop familiarity with new domains as a result of metaphorical thinking\textsuperscript{19}. This is because analogical thinking leads to fresh understanding of either familiar or new concepts\textsuperscript{20}.

Metaphors are basically implied comparisons that bring together two concepts. “Metaphor occurs when a unit of discourse is used to refer unconventionally to an object, process or concept, or colligates in an unconventional way. And when this unconventional act of reference or colligation is understood on the basis of similarity, matching or analogy involving the conventional referent or colligates of the unit and the actual unconventional referent or colligates”\textsuperscript{21}. Dickins, for instance, defines metaphors as “A figure of speech in which a word or phrase is used in a non-basic sense, this non-basic sense suggesting a likeness or analogy […] with another more basic sense of the

same word or phrase”22. According to Deignan “A metaphor is a word or expression that is used to talk about an entity or quality other than that referred to by its core, or most basic meaning. This non-core use expresses a perceived relationship with the core meaning of the word, and in many cases between two semantic fields”23.

We must also stress that metaphors evolve. For instance, until very recently the information superhighway was a metaphor for the internet. But the word ‘cyberspace’ has now taken over24. The question is whether they are the same. Alternatively, will a new word replace the term ‘cyberspace’ as wearable computers cross over from the realm of the exotic to that of mass-produced commodity?

Among various types of metaphors emerging from professional literature, several that are used more frequently in management can be identified. These are presented in table 1.

*Table 2. Metaphor types.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of metaphor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cognitive metaphor</td>
<td>1. A cognitive metaphor associates the object with an experience outside of the object for cognitive purposes, and is the fundamental type of metaphor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core metaphor</td>
<td>2. A core metaphor, which constitutes a fundamental method of interpretation, is used in management with reference to understanding of the organizational culture as being the organization itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended metaphor</td>
<td>3. An extended metaphor allows for development of one interpretational plot. If it is assumed that the organization is a theatre, then their participants may be perceived as actors, strategic options as different scripts, and organizational cultures as acting styles, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of metaphor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mixed metaphor</td>
<td>4. A mixed metaphor is one that leaps from one comparison to another, causing surprise or a paradoxical feeling. In an organizational discourse, such roles are assigned to the postmodern use of a variety of conflicting metaphors (e.g. ‘an organization is a kaleidoscope which transformed into a happening once the machine collapsed’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolute metaphor</td>
<td>5. An absolute metaphor is a linguistically non-reducible concept. A prerequisite for use of these kinds of metaphors is the ambiguity and the problem with reductionism of the basic notions of our sciences, such as organization, management, strategy, structure, culture, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic metaphors</td>
<td>6. Didactic and therapeutic metaphors also play other roles than just the cognitive. In management, metaphoric thinking is used e.g. to educate managers and to diagnose organizational cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead metaphor</td>
<td>7. A dead metaphor is one in which the sense of a transferred image is absent; as in ‘to take the reins’ or ‘hold sway’, wherein the physical act of grasping and holding is referred to, but has historically vanished. However, the linguistic and spatial association remains in the human mind and directs the way of reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td>8. Metonymy is a figure of speech used in rhetoric in which a thing or concept is not called by its own name, but by the name of something intimately associated with that thing or concept. One example is the phrase ‘organization axes employees’, as indeed it is not the organization that axes but the managers employed by the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An implied metaphor</td>
<td>9. An implied metaphor is indirect and refers to a larger lot, e.g. ‘people are the cogs in the organizational machine’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A latent metaphor</td>
<td>10. A latent metaphor signifies that certain words may be omitted due to communicational economy, e.g. the sentence ‘he was sacked’ means that someone was made redundant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of metaphor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synecdoche</td>
<td>11. Synecdoche is a type of metonymy, in which a part of something is used to refer to the whole thing or <em>vice versa</em>. Use of a synecdoche in management discourse can be illustrated by the following sentences: ‘The manager has not decided yet. This demiurge needs time.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An active metaphor</td>
<td>12. An active metaphor is one that is in the process of introduction, therefore, it should be clearly explained, e.g. ‘the culture of this organization is like bipolar disorder; it pushes employees towards hyperactivity, then they fall into depression and catatonic stupor.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submerged metaphor</td>
<td>13. A submerged metaphor is one that hides the first part, which is interpreted through the second part, e.g. ‘a manager goes with the flow thanks to grounded employees.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A conceptual metaphor</td>
<td>14. A conceptual metaphor offers a broad and universal interpretational framework that often is also an extended metaphor, e.g. ‘life consists in organization.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pataphor</td>
<td>15. A pataphor is an extreme, pointless, exaggerated form of metaphor designed to draw somebody’s attention. The sentence ‘this organization is a giant organism, where the managers are the head, the employees are the hands and the management the inner organs’ includes a pataphor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple metaphor</td>
<td>16. A simple metaphor is an accepted and identified, short and relatively unequivocal comparison in use, e.g. ‘to fire.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex metaphor</td>
<td>17. A complex metaphor uses more than one comparison. For instance, the sentence ‘the roots of organization grow in the bedrock of an X’, is a double metaphor because of the words ‘roots’ and ‘bedrock.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. **Cognitive typology of metaphors**

Five epistemological positions that define the significance of metaphoric thinking can be presented.  

---

Table 3. Five epistemological positions that define the significance of metaphoric thinking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemological position</th>
<th>Definition of metaphoric thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neopositivism</td>
<td>Metaphors do not play a significant cognitive role as they do not reflect the organizational reality, but they may play a creative role – they spur the imagination and encourage looking for original solutions. A machine or organization metaphor can be interpreted in neopositivist categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td>Metaphors of organization are contained within a presumption of analogy, which can, assuming the position of methodological pluralism, be included in scientific methods. In this meaning there are few fitting metaphors of organization and management, as they must reflect the key properties and relations of the object described(^\text{28}). Rational interpretation is often used in reference to a ‘learning’ organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitivism</td>
<td>Metaphors are basic structures for interpreting organizational reality in language, and thus, in the way of thinking. Creating a metaphor is a spontaneous, linguistic, and cultural process that organizes a field for a discourse around ascertain basic metaphor. An example of such quasi-metaphors is the formation of sentences around a source metaphor, e.g. ‘an organization is a machine’ or ‘an organization is a container’(^\text{29}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>A pragmatic approach describes metaphor as a tool for action. Transfer of ideas from an organization onto different objects can serve as a diagnosis or initiation of actions. This approach seems to be assumed by G. Morgan in his ‘Images of Organization’. A metaphoric analysis is designed to improve an organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


### Epistemological position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of metaphoric thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postmodernism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphors of organization are only 'linguistic games'; they are incommensurate and open to any use. One can imagine a metaphor comparing the organization to any chosen object: an organism, a text, time, a black hole, a pair of shoes or a dog. Metaphoric relations do not respect cause-and-effect relations and do not have to offer any cognitive content. One does not have to know the object to which he or she compares, the only thing needed is the idea of it. The value of metaphor does not depend on the metaphor itself but on the interpreter. An example of a metaphor using the postmodern approach is a 'vibrating' organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criticism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphors have also been proposed by the authors of the CMS paradigm. Their purpose is mainly to criticize the predominant movement in the theory and practice of management. Among the metaphors there are: management as a disturbed communication, mystification, cultural drug, and colonization of power.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 3. Cognitive linguistics and conceptual metaphor

One group of linguists that trained as part of the generative grammar practice in the 1970s began to see shortcomings with that approach. Ronald Langacker and George Lakoff are two of the most prominent linguists to have turned away from generative grammar. Langacker and Lakoff reacted by setting out to create a new theory of language, which over time would come to be known as Cognitive Linguistics. At the moment, Cognitive Linguistics is considered a broader movement, that includes various methodologies and approaches.

Studies in linguistics have shown that when complex, intricate ideas are talked about, philosophized about and researched, then metaphors abound.

There are two potentially opposing approaches to metaphor: one in which the metaphors plays an ornamental or decorative function, and one in which it is perceived as occupying a central place in thought and language. The second of

---

these views is referred to as the ‘contemporary theory of metaphor’32. The ‘decorative’ approach describes metaphor as a poetic or rhetorical device peripheral to language and thought, while contemporary theory holds it as occupying a central role in thought, and thus in the development of language. Lakoff claims that our understanding and knowledge of many topics is filtered through metaphor.

The assumption that human cognition – i.e. the production, communication and processing of meaning – depends on the mappings between the mental spaces is one of the basic tenets of cognitive linguistics. Human cognition is autonomous from language. The cross-domain linguistic expression mappings are simply deeper cognitive structures manifested on the surface that have important analogue or spatial components33.

Conventional theories have usually painted metaphors as “rhetorical spices”, reduced to the equivalent of literal paraphrases. Understood like this, they become optional linguistic devices. However, cognitive linguistics treat metaphor as just a matter of thought and not as a language which would then make conceptual metaphors pervasive and inescapable34.

Language is “essentially and inherently symbolic in nature”35. This means that conceptualization concerns all linguistic expression. Meaning is thought to be something that will reside in someone’s mind, and language is the means to relate that meaning in the form of sound or written words. Research into conceptual metaphors conducted by cognitive linguists has revealed many innovative and astonishing facts about how we make use of metaphors within the human mind. “Cognitive linguists concluded that the same mechanisms used to create metaphors existed thousands of years ago. People have been creating relationships between a word or words and non-literal meaning to convey a culture’s conceptualized meaning”36. Findings show that metaphors are not just devices that are used by poets or rhetoricians to make their arguments and verses spicier, but are actually fundamental structures that our mind will use to make sense of complicated concepts in our lives.

---

In Cognitive Linguistics language is seen as an important part of cognition. Taylor said that in generative grammar, it is thought that language knowledge will constitute a “separate cognitive faculty, structured according to its own specific principles and which is independent of other mental capacities”\(^{37}\). Still generative grammar acknowledges that grammar exists as cognitive function in the mind of a speaker. Taylor then said that, “…[rather] than a theory of mind constraining linguistic theory, linguistic theory itself inputs into a theory of mind”\(^{38}\).

Cognitive psychologists believe that using metaphors is like thinking about an entity as if it were a different entity, e.g. ‘organization as a human body’.

When people use metaphors, they compare their mental models of one concept in which they are interested (e.g. an organization), with their mental model of a concept about which they already know something (e.g. the human body). This enables them to take a ‘short cut’ to knowledge by building on what they already know, and requires analogical reasoning or analogical thinking: finding similarities in both the target and the source and using these similarities to generate new meanings and understanding about either the target or the source. Metaphors therefore provide a framework to conceptualize targets in a particular way\(^{39}\). For example, the multi-metaphor method uses organizational metaphors in information systems development.

Cognitive psychologists believe that use of metaphors is one of our fundamental ways of thinking. Metaphor:

- Helps view something from different perspectives\(^{40}\);
- Helps explain concepts\(^{41}\) thus supports learning;
- Assists in developing new hypotheses or theories\(^{42}\);
- Challenges conventional assumptions\(^{43}\).

---

Metaphors are a very useful tool in development of theories in the social sciences\(^{44}\). They can provide a means of creating a taxonomy. This is the first step towards description, followed by prediction, and finally understanding\(^{45}\).

4. The social constructivism perspective

Language is the most crucial aspect in the process of any knowledge production that cannot be conceived as describing and representing the universe, but as a way of molding the world, and that is a form of social action by human beings. The meaning of language is gained through the context it is used in\(^ {46}\). Constructivism is an approach that gains meaning through the ability to make things a reality, through many forms of presentation – such as stimulation of a continuous process of creation. According to McNamee & Hosking\(^ {47}\), postmodern intelligence and social constructivism call for a review of modern assumptions about knowledge production, such as a) the individual rationality, (b) empirical evaluation, (c) language as representation, and (d) narrative of progress.

Constructivism’s approach is unique in that it is able to broaden the horizon, and the behaviors, stemming from different cultures, thus creating room for change in society and social norms. This approach shows that knowledge comes

---


from two sources; through social interactions and through dialogue. Burr argues that “knowledge is what someone has or does not have but something that people do together”.

In the world of business, social constructivism brings with it different concepts, such as imagination, co-creation and meaning. These give managers, consultants and leaders tools for organizational interventions. The value of these resources is found in their interconnection and mutual influence. Further, analysis of resources is useful and can stimulate the creativity of a professional to come up with new ways of working with their people.

Dialogue, debate, discussion and persuasion are different from one another. In constructivism’s perspective, dialogue is an ongoing process that is interactive and happening in conversation, and there is a likelihood that many different realities can be shared by the people having a conversation. At the outset of a conversation, different perspectives and understandings are welcomed. In constructivism, the best solution or opinion cannot be achieved through observation or describing the world the way it is, but requires an ever-changing process that considers the existing cultural and even historical features.

When debating, there is a clash of views from both opposing and proposing sides, and only the best view is considered to have won the argument. Persuasion, however, takes a different approach, which is softer and aimed at finding the most convincing way to make people join your side. Dialogue is different in that it creates a place for both parties to bring different ideas – part of the process of co-creating new realities. In a real sense, dialogue is not about finding the ‘right way’, but finding a generative way of doing things that people will be connected to and involved in. This makes the participants feel responsible and concerned for the ongoing project. It is therefore acceptable to say that discussion will be successful if as many people as possible are involved and come up with ideas. In dialogue, the different perspectives given by different individuals culminate in a fresh way of looking at things.

52 Camargo-Borges C., Collaborative group practices: Exercizing dialogue in healthcare setting, Taos Institute Pres, Chagrin Falls, in press.
In the process of dialogue, imagination is very important in coming up with less rigid, spontaneous and original ideas. When the imagination is encouraged, the way of thinking is given freedom and new knowledge is created. Also, getting many people to participate in the same topic of discussion magnifies the potential for creating very important experiences. The ability to use imagination to look at the future generates tremendous potential for social change, and thus organizations should view dialogue as a process that has the ability to change the habitual way of thinking, talking, and creating totally new experiences. Therefore new organizations should engage and include their employees, to generate a sense of belonging and co-responsibility among the employees and management.

Co-creation can enhance the process of building more trustworthy relationships in an organization. Although technology is a critical tool in bringing people together, it should not be assumed that it brings with it a concomitant shift in human relations. The environment for co-creation is enhanced by the use of dialogue in any process or communication which will yield potential for people to be able to invest in other forms of interactions among the people involved. In the process of co-creating in an organization, with the facilitation of a coordinator, in the process they can use their collective thinking to come up with new ideas and interesting stories that can speak about themselves and their immediate surroundings.

In organizational development, imagination and co-creation are crucial in the deconstruction of old patterns of thinking, creating new meanings and opening up transformation within an organization. Consequently, according to social constructionism there is a need to create a place for dialogue in any organization, to increase the use of imagination in the process of change through the co-creation of new possibilities.

Mead’s proposal gives rise to symbolic interactionism which claims to find the processes by which people interpret their social environment, give meaning to actions and form accurate representations of their immediate reality, so that they can develop appropriately within them. It is believed that man is not a passive observer, but an active agent of the environment.

Although analogical thinking can produce a particular interpretation, it forces other interpretations into the background. This means metaphor can reveal as well as hide. Therefore, we should be very careful about the source and target

54 McNamee S., Gergen K.J. (Eds.), Relational responsibility, Sage, Thousand Oaks 1999.
of a metaphor, and use any other additional metaphors to describe the aspects of the intended target. It is also advisable to note that the meanings of metaphors have been extended, from the rhetorical or linguistic devices, to include visual metaphors and metaphors expressed through behavior. For example, the ritual of the Japanese tea ceremony as a metaphor for the natural world\textsuperscript{56}. In the functioning of a business organization, the relevance of metaphors is ranked by:

- Their support for the understanding of the organizational context (that is, explaining the concept),
- How far they enable interpretation of the organizational context in different ways (as viewed from different perspectives),
- Their support for new ideas about the organizational context (developing new hypotheses or theories).

This stands in agreement with specific concerns into organizational conversations that the analysis of an organization’s dialogue should be the important part of organizational studies. This is in line with certain ontological assumptions about the nature of social life, namely, that social phenomena are socially constructed in line with people’s concepts of the world that they live in, and act to contribute to its reproduction and transformation. Dialogue analysis is generally obtained by analysis of ‘text’ in the wider sense of written texts, spoken interactions, multi-media and the internet.

5. Is metaphor universal?

One of the most important observations concerning metaphors is their construct in terms of universalism.

Some conceptual metaphors are shared across very different cultures and are so inherent in the human mind’s capability of relating to abstract concepts, that they can reasonably be labelled as universal. Whereas, others are rather closely connected and limited to the specific society in which they are used. Kövecses described the society as “a system of different ways of understanding reality shared by individuals, characteristic of smaller or bigger communities”\textsuperscript{57}, while a dialect is one of the main of such understandings. Metaphor is not only a cognitive, but also a cultural concept. Conceptual metaphor is embedded in our culture, through which we are able to relate to abstract concepts in the world around

us. As recognized by Lakoff and Johnson\textsuperscript{58}, metaphor use reveals the way we perceive the world and consequently the culture in which we live.

The role of culture in the world of business has been the subject of various research for at least twenty-five years\textsuperscript{59}.

The relationship between culture and communication might appear quite obvious to those influenced by postmodern, poststructuralist or cultural studies’ thinking. Nevertheless, due to Saussere, the turn towards communication has been possible. Without the work by authors such as Wittgenstein and Austin, who stressed that signs cannot be considered in isolation from the actions in which they are produced, Habermas wouldn’t have been able to construct his “communicative paradigm”\textsuperscript{60}. This was characterized by the assumption that culture is constructed through communicative actions. What’s important is the fact that in that paradigm, communicative action is meant to include the performance of social action in the use of language, nonverbal signs, cultural objects and artefacts. “Culture underlies every part of communication”\textsuperscript{61}.

The influence of culture on perception has given guidelines on the structure and interpretation of messages, which is of key importance in organizational life. Scientists have started to take interest in the way behaviors and their meanings differ in particular cultures. Improving understanding of the communication phenomenon itself has become the objective of intercultural communication. Culture surrounded its own members in such a way that they lacked awareness of its existence. According to D. Barnlund, “Cultural standards surround people so completely and permeate thoughts and actions to such a degree that only few people are aware of assumptions on which their life and reason are based”\textsuperscript{62}.

The notion of culture was first defined and intentionally applied by E.B. Tylor, who presented the widely cited and quoted meaning of culture in his work “Primitive Culture”. According to him, culture is a “complex entirety covering knowledge, faith, art, morale, law, customs and other abilities and

habits acquired by human as a member of society”. Culture constitutes a relatively integrated whole, including human behaviors corresponding to the models shared by a community, shaped and assimilated during interaction, as well as outputs of such behaviors. Culture may also be defined as a system, in which the same symbols, beliefs, attitudes, values, expectations and behavior standards are shared. Thus, persons composing a given culture are characterized by the same assumptions regarding the way people should think, behave and communicate and usually behave in accordance with these assumptions.

Contemporary interest in intercultural communication commenced in the 1950s. At the time American anthropologists Edward T. Hall, Ruth H. Useem and John Useem started to analyse efficient communication between people from different cultures. It was then that the notion of intercultural communication was used for the first time. Since that time the intercultural communication discipline has started to develop dynamically. Development of the contemporary knowledge on intercultural communication has very practical sources. Intercultural communication has emerged as a result of strong pressure from practitioners. After the Second World War the American government commissioned anthropologists to conduct research which was supposed to introduce the government to intercultural communication phenomena between the USA and hostile countries. Intercultural communication is the direct result of the growing life internationalization. It was businessmen, diplomats and activists of international organizations that stimulated researchers dealing with the intercultural communication phenomenon.

Knowing terminological problems related to communication and cultural notions, defining the common research field covering intercultural communication might be proposed. Creation of the very definition of intercultural communication different from and, simultaneously, associated with its parent discipline, i.e. communication, may be regarded as the starting point for establishment of the

intercultural communication discipline. Culture is the central term here. E. Folb defined it as “the plan, the guide”, whereas Hall – as “the road map”. P. Harris and R. Morgan stated: “Culture influences and is shaped by each fact of human activity”. The logic of the link between cultural orientation and communication itself is based on two fundamental functions fulfilled by communication: relational (affiliation motives) and functional (reduction of uncertainty). Thus, intercultural communication may be defined as “the act of understanding and being understood by an audience of a different culture.”

Communication is intercultural when perspectives various in terms of culture influence the lack of possibility to create a single, shared culture, i.e. when there are obstacles at the level of sharing symbol meanings. M. Lustig and J. Koester define intercultural communication as “the symbolic, interpretive, transactional and contextual process, in which the degree of diversity between persons is large and important enough to create diverse interpretations and expectations concerning competent behaviors and should be used in the process of creating shared meanings”. In other words, intercultural communication takes place when information has emerged or has been coded in one culture and needs to be decoded in another culture.

When discussing intercultural communication, it is necessary to introduce the notion of the perceived intercultural communication competence, which

is an impression that behavior associated with message transmission (message behavior) is correct and efficient in a given context\textsuperscript{76}. Correctness means not violating principles and standards of a given culture\textsuperscript{77}, whereas efficiency relates to achieving the goal of interaction. Managers communicating in intercultural environment need to ask themselves how much they know about a given culture and what they should know about it\textsuperscript{78}. Becoming familiar with or knowing a given culture is not a goal itself but it should be set within the business context. Negotiations are the proper context for deliberations. It is worth remembering that cultures do not communicate with each other, it is the individuals that communicate with each other\textsuperscript{79}.

Competences connected with intercultural communication have originated from the field of research on interpersonal communication. It is worth noticing that manager competent in communication with representatives of their own culture may lose their competences in case of contact with a different culture. Therefore, competences in the field of intercultural communication should be analysed from a separate point of view.

Managers succeeding in intercultural communication are aware of people’s tendency to evaluate facts from their own perspective, and try to adapt their point of view to the current situation and cultural diversity. According to the researchers E. Hall\textsuperscript{80}, G. Hofstede\textsuperscript{81}, D. Victor\textsuperscript{82}, L. Beamer\textsuperscript{83} and F. Trompenaars\textsuperscript{84}, cultural values influencing behavior and communication are, as follows: perception of the individual’s role, hierarchy, formalism, context, role and time
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perception, the perception of risk and uncertainty, the connection of humans with the universe and the perception of the meaning of one’s own culture. It is worth noticing that in the western models of communication, the critical role is assumed by the sender. R. Yan\textsuperscript{85} criticizes western communication models, which emphasize the active role of the sender. Yan prefers a model in which both parties cooperate closely.

With respect to communication processes the following features of culture are worth emphasizing:

1. Culture manifests itself through language, behavior and activity. It provides standard models, thanks to which it is easier to act in everyday interactions, as well as interactions inside business organizations, thus facilitating communication. Owing to culture, it is possible to function within a given organization or society.

2. It is worth adding that a rigid image of a given group’s culture may lead to emergence of stereotypes which, actually, do not have much in common with reality. Thus, behavior standards shared within a given group should be perceived as possible or probable “forecasts of a scenario” of a given organizational or communication situation. These hypotheses or “forecasts” ought to be tested, modified and improved, depending on the real communication situation.

3. One should remember that there will always be persons whose behavior will significantly deviate from behavior of other members of a given cultural group. Their views, customs and standards will not be the same as those applied by other members of their culture.

4. People within the same culture will differ in religion or even the level of education. Women and men will be two different cultures within one culture. Enterprises, organizations or educational institutions will also have their own cultures.

5. Becoming aware of the way in which the culture of one country is similar and the way in which it is different from the culture of another country is the essence of intercultural understanding. The “another country” phrase has been used here because, when speaking about international environment, culture is usually understood at the national level\textsuperscript{86}.

Culture is such a complex phenomenon that understanding a diverse culture requires many years of contact with it. T. Todorov in “Nous et lesautres” maintains


that during our lifetime we may assimilate one or two cultures different from our own. Real understanding of a different culture occurs only when we have constant contact with its representatives and compare ourselves to them. The Author deals with selected aspects of intercultural marketing in the next chapters.

Researchers have studied the influence or the impact of national cultures on organizational behavior and the way managers from different cultural backgrounds interact with one another. According to Kövecses culture is “a set of shared understandings that characterize smaller or larger groups of people” with language being the most prominent shared characteristic. Hofstede and Hofstede suggest that “culture is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others.” Bjerke expresses the opinion that culture is a mechanism which fuses social structures. Scholars generally agree that variations between groups can exist on multiple dimensions: cognitions, behaviors, and values. Undoubtedly adequate knowledge of both language and culture is needed to communicate effectively in any society, but success in communication relies heavily on the recognition of those cultural patterns and values that shape the cross-cultural communications process.

However, it would be “misleading to separate the more universal concepts completely from the culturally variable ones. This is because even the more universal concepts are formed in a cultural-specific environment. They are also influenced by cultural factors, even though not as much as others.”

---

Johnson claim that “all experience is cultural through and through […] we experience our 'world' in such a way that our culture is already present in the very experience itself”⁹³. Kövecses believes that while a conceptual metaphor may be shared across cultures and languages, the conceptual metaphor may be expressed in very different ways in two languages and cultures⁹⁴.

It is worth stressing that the conceptual system is grounded in a specific way, and that the concepts that get mapped are not mapped randomly, i.e. target domains are usually more abstract where source domains are usually more concrete. Johnson and Lakoff say, "We typically conceptualize the nonphysical in terms of the physical"⁹⁵, meaning that we typically map from a domain that we can touch, feel, understand or see to domains that cannot be seen or comprehended so easily.

Dobrzynska thinks that “dialectal boundaries lie within the boundaries of social groups visible to the naked eye”⁹⁶. She believes that in this case a discourse is based on a combination of opinions and aptitudes, a result of which is understanding organizational reality. Dobrzynska compares the movement of different images of the world and phenomena between discourses, locating the problem in a separate area of phenomena⁹⁷.

The researcher claims that representation has transformed into a different object created by a specific combination of circumstances, which may lead to the emergence of an alternative understanding of the given allegory⁹⁸.

However, Kövecses thinks that some similarities are so immanent to the human ability to identify conceptual ideas that, with a certain degree of prudence, they can be described as omnipresent, and thus as universal. Kövecses attempts to explain the crack in the deliberations of the abovementioned researchers on theoretical analogies and their universality, and the existence of many

---

interchangeable etymological allegories within different dialects and communities. According to Kövecses, despite the fact that metaphors can be transmitted between dialects and groups of people, a specific metaphor can be communicated using completely different channels in both dialects or groups\(^99\).

Trim believes that the trans-etymological comparability is “adaptable in figurative speech, although there are expressions that sound strange in one dialect but not in another”\(^100\). In this context, the researcher functionalised the notion of “dialectal variations”\(^101\), useful in describing these interdialectal differences. Dialectal variations are understood as the correspondence between analogies and the rules of a specific dialect. For example, if a representation in ST\(^102\) seems exaggerated in TL, it is easier to substitute an image in ST for TT. Trim agrees that the interpreting party enjoys greater freedom in understanding written materials than anything else, e.g. a television documentary. The reason for this is silent consent: similarities in ST can appear odd or completely new to a native speaker, and should perhaps be allowed the same unfamiliarity in the TT\(^103\). It may be assumed that journalists most often use analogies introducing linguistic innovation, pushing the persuasive effect into the background. Regardless of the fact whether the person interpreting a press release perceives it in a similar way, silent consent is just asking for being questioned, which has an effect on the interpretation process.

Cristofoli et al. advanced the thesis that there is one more type of contrast between metaphors, viz. between similarities in fiction and non-fiction. In non-fiction texts metaphors should be immediately clear without any considerable effort on the part of the recipient. Metaphors of this type are parts of reproducible convention\(^104\), which increases the probability that the recipient is familiar with them and has already classified them in their mental lexicon. Naturally, it is worth emphasising that this does not mean that in the case of feature or documentary


\(^102\) Source text (ST), target text (TT), source language (SL), target language (TL).


content the convention always imposes the same understanding. Nevertheless, metaphors are subordinate to the general formal logic of the work. Referring to the terms coined by Trim, similarities with a low degree of TL saliency would require greater effort in interpretation than media representations with a high degree of TL saliency, as similarities in ST cannot be directly transferred into TL. Of course, this suspicion can only be deemed justified if one assumes that immediate interpretation of an image requires lower (in subjective terms) effort than the repeated or alternative configuration of a message.

Over the last years we have witnessed an increase in the number of psycholinguistic studies on specific aspects of experiencing metaphors. Within this paradigm one can distinguish neuroimaging, oculography – tracing eye movements, or response time measurement.

For example, the studies by Inhoff et al. from 1984 intensively used the oculographic method in order to analyze the time of reception of metaphorical or explanatory figures of speech. They discovered no difference between the phrases based on associations and unrelated phrases. Two researchers, Blasko and Kasmierski, noted that metaphorical representations could be easily translated in the right context or as part of a fairly clear structure of semantic scopes. Mashal and Faust used neuroimaging to prove that the process of allegorical explanation was influenced by a certain number of variables, such as the metaphorical nature or style of presentation or transmission.

There are two contradictory views on the process of experiencing reality through metaphors. The first one is based on an assumption that the perception of metaphors requires increased intellectual effort, while the process itself entails several stages. Searle claimed that similarities are expressed in a figurative way whenever literal expressions prove imperfect. Researchers Blasko and Connine

called it abnormal processing\textsuperscript{111}. The other perspective\textsuperscript{112} on the perception of metaphors emphasises that they function in a similar way to literal speech and do not require increased effort. Following the terminology of Blasko and Connine, this is immediate processing.

Metaphors can also be understood as a method of broadening imagination within the organizational science. In both cases Morgan says that all researchers – deliberately or not – are driven by mental images underlying their reasoning: “(…) all speculations concerning the functioning of organizations or administration are related to the presence of verifiable images or similarities, thanks to which we develop the ways of understanding and supervising organizations in a specific, yet fragmentary manner”\textsuperscript{113}.

In both cases the question of attitude to metaphors in the organizational science goes deeper, as we do not have any specific data on the influence of national diversity on the processes presented.

In their surveillance study, Gibson and Zellmer-Bruhn (2001) demonstrated how the image of the notion of cooperation proves to be heterogeneous when analyzed, while the concepts of “separation of powers” and “independence” have a significant influence on the development of contrasting tendencies to conceptualise similarities. For example, the concept of cooperation seems overwhelming in societies based on individualism (Hofstede, 1980).

For example, the French organizational science offers more space to individuals as organization members. This is described using the notion of concentration, which cannot be easily compared with any other notion developed by the German organizational science. Concentration is connected with barter procedures. Foglierini-Carneiro and Mélčse used this notion to describe instruments of relationship management, which are adopted by different entities to describe the coordination of elements. Although no university course offers a comprehensive presentation of the structures described here, concentration processes are significant points of reference for many textbooks. All French researchers analyze speculative ideas concerning the administration area as a manifestation of power and connections. (quotation)


Finally, most of them broadly discuss the issue of co-responsibility of employees for the functioning of an organization. One can clearly see that texts by the French treat organization members as the main objects of interest, and they perceive their actions and the structures formed in close reference to them, whereas German researchers treat them as completely separate phenomena. What is more, a group of French authors to a greater or lesser extent based their methodologies on the structuralists’ research. Until now there has been no ordered introduction to the issues discussed herein. The role played by individuals is discussed best and most clearly by Gmür: according to the French, they are the main carriers of the sense of interest or purpose in the organization whereas to Germans they are only data carriers.

According to the view prevailing in the literature, metaphors drawn from the area of developmental studies, related to business, by definition connote aggression. This makes them more focused on certain issues than the original application would suggest. For example, Strand and Freeman are of the opinion that the very use of the word “rival” instead of, for example, “partner” confirms the domination of metaphors mostly based on hostility and opposition within the management. The analogies presented contain a concealed assumption about the inevitable striving for confrontation.

Metaphors used by the management mainly focus on competition. They concentrate on gaining advantage over the enemy in pursuing goals. They are drawn from military and sports areas. Such metaphors suggest that business is a zero-sum game. They are not just linguistic expressions; they have an influence on the decisions and actions taken.

The use of metaphors evoking aggression supports such marked business conduct. We agree with the view that this builds a false image of managerial processes. “Survival of the fittest”, as a metaphor determining the way of thinking, rejects any reflection on moral issues, humanism, or building a supportive community.

Gaining advantage through development is the basic goal business organizations should set themselves. The idea of advantage can be examined in an interesting way in terms of the functioning of the managerial staff. In order to ensure effective and comprehensive management, taking into consideration the local

context, organizations have to surpass their expectations, and thus to evolve and change their organizational DNA.

Gaining and maintaining advantage is not an easy task, neither is it a task devoid of any structure or method. In this case, the metaphorical method seems to be the right solution. What is significant within the concept of management is the procedure and methodology of setting goals of an organization, building a strategy, and coming to agreements in order to achieve the goals set and to spend the resources possessed\textsuperscript{117}. Metaphors are perfect in the case of such tasks.

Scholars studying metaphors from a cognitive perspective show several phenomena as proof that metaphors are in fact dynamic, language-independent, conceptually active structures. Johnson and Lakoff\textsuperscript{118} looked at linguistic evidence that included “novel case generalization” which is the ability to understand entire, novel, linguistic expressions by using shared conceptual structures. Recent decades have seen a growing body of neuroimaging research, as well as psychological studies, that support the case for metaphor’s role in cognitive reality. These studies include predictions of the image-schematic structure of various concepts\textsuperscript{119}; priming experiments\textsuperscript{120}, forced-choice and free-form drawing tasks\textsuperscript{121}; spontaneous gesture studies\textsuperscript{122}; ERP measurements\textsuperscript{123}; response times\textsuperscript{124}, and eye-tracking\textsuperscript{125}. MRI studies have shown that
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cognitive mappings are instantiated neurologically in the brain\textsuperscript{126}, and this suggests that conceptual metaphors as a real phenomenon are part of human cognition.

6. A critique of Conceptual Metaphor Theory

The strength of the cognitive theory of metaphors used in the analysis lies in the fact that it provides us with a tool to better understand the world. We are able to explore our cognitive system through conceptual metaphors. Thus, you can see that the use of metaphors can give an insight into how the cognitive approach to metaphors can contribute to a better understanding of the language of business, finance, and economics.

Like almost every other theory that makes such revolutionary claims, Conceptual Metaphor Theory was bound to attract some criticism, and in the last few decades has in fact received a wide range of criticism. Lakoff and Johnson’s theory was criticized from a semantic aspect by Wierzbicka, who believes that concepts can be truly explained and compared only in terms of their components, which is why she is concerned with finding definitions of words that are inherently meaningful. She finds Lakoff and Johnson’s theory unhelpful because they “fail to break the concept defined into its semantic components”\textsuperscript{127}. Wierzbicka adds that it is “an illusion to think that spatial and otherwise physical notions are inherently clearer to us than frankly mental ones, as it is an illusion to think that the external is more accessible to us, and more familiar to us than our inner world”\textsuperscript{128}. Clausner and Croft\textsuperscript{129} discuss, for example, the difficulties with formulation of conceptual metaphors, due to different metaphor schematicity.

For instance, Clausner and Croft\textsuperscript{130} note that the well-known conceptual metaphor introduced by Lakoff and Johnson\textsuperscript{131} – that THEORIES/ARGUMENTS ARE BUILDINGS – does not generalize the linguistic facts at the appropriate


level. We can say, for example, that “the theory has a solid foundation”, but we cannot say that “the theory has long corridors and high windows”\textsuperscript{132}. Rakova emphasizes that a theory that builds on image schemas and, in general, on the universality of essential physical experiences, “…cannot in the same breath be a theory of cultural variation – especially if embodiment is conceived naturalistically”\textsuperscript{133}.

Although numerous employees holding a metaphor can accurately describe their perception of the business or organization in which they work, any single metaphor will limit their perception by blocking and distorting certain pieces of the information encountered. People perceive, remember, as well as analyze information they receive differently. In that instance, metaphor will be the result of each individual imagination (of what was noticed and what is important and emphasized).

What is more, depending on their feeling and/or state of mind the same employee might potentially use different metaphors, at different times, to represent the same concepts.

Multiple or sometimes even inconsistent metaphors that relate to the same phenomenon prove that conceptual metaphor has a tendency to focus on different aspects or nuances of the same concept\textsuperscript{134}. Different an organization’s members might use diverse metaphors to describe the same organizational problems and concepts, or even the organizations themselves\textsuperscript{135}. This may often result in a situation in which several metaphors are operating simultaneously and in contradiction of one another\textsuperscript{136}, leading to what is known as a “short-circuit in communication”\textsuperscript{137}.

Since metaphors create different perceptions and interpretations leading to different behaviors, and this makes it difficult for an organization’s or business’s
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members to find a common understanding, when their interpretation of basic facts and events is so varied. Common metaphors among an organization’s members can form the basis for stability and a fluent process in the organization. However, finding common meaning in many areas of its life can be quite difficult. What has to be stressed is the fact that managers do not control the development of meaning in the organization; all members of the organization are partners in this process, and they shape the life of the organization through the interpretations and meaning they attach to their daily experience.

7. Metaphor in management and organization theory

A growing dissatisfaction with many theories underpinning organizational studies has motivated scholars to seek alternative ways to describe, analyze and theorize the increasingly complex processes and practices constituting organizations.

“The linguistic turn of the later 20th century has led to a widespread and growing interest in discourse, both in the social sciences generally and in organization studies.”

As a result ‘organizational discourse’ has emerged as an increasingly significant area of study.


Discourse is an element of all concrete social events. ‘Organizational discourse’ refers to the collections of texts embodied in the practices of talking and writing, bringing organizationally related objects into being as these texts are created, distributed and consumed\textsuperscript{143}. Mumby and Clair stress that “Organizations exist only in so far as their members create them through discourse. This is not to claim that organizations are ‘nothing but’ discourse, but rather that discourse is the principle means by which an organization’s members create a coherent social reality that frames their sense of who they are”\textsuperscript{144}.

There are several typologies for organizational discourse, and according to Putnam and Fairhurst\textsuperscript{145} eight types of organizational discourse analyzes: sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, cognitive linguistics (including discursive psychology), pragmatics (including speech acts, ethnography of speaking, and interaction analysis), semiotics, literary and rhetorical analyzes, critical discourse analysis, and postmodern discourse analysis.

The study of metaphor in cognitive linguistics has contributed to organizational analysis in a number of ways. It’s generative qualities are believed to enable new knowledge creation and to provide innovative fresh perspectives of both organizational theory and behavior. Research on organizational discourse encompasses various theoretical and methodological positions and metaphors has often been used as theory-building and methodological tools\textsuperscript{146}. There are also


studies that have aimed to examine metaphors related to particular organizational phenomena. Discourse analysis drawing from a variety of sociological, sociopsychological, linguistic, philosophical, anthropological, communications and literary-based studies is reflected in the sheer variety of ways that researchers talk about and analyze organizational discourse.

Organizational discourse analysts often refer to organizations as discursive constructions. Organizations are places where discourses are built and implicated. In order to understand and analyze them, metaphors are used. Metaphors are used in order to help understand the organizational reality with a supportive image.


Table 4. Interpretivist approaches to organizational discourse - Conceptual orientations and analytical directions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical approach</th>
<th>Main conceptual orientations</th>
<th>Potential analytical directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermeneutics</td>
<td>Focus on the interpretation of texts and on the nature of interpretation itself</td>
<td>Textual interpretations in context and over time, being sensitive to alternative interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removal from the subjectivist stance; some textual interpretations more valid than others, based on textual context</td>
<td>Search for central themes, thematic constructions and thematic interconnections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to in-depth textual interpretation through researchers’ longitudinal immersion in texts’ social and organizational context</td>
<td>Triangulation of patterns in ethnographic and textual data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>Rhetoric as both functional and constructive, employed in both grand oratory and everyday life</td>
<td>Aim to identify agents’ rhetorical strategies and their central themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on study of rhetoric in use, and on its situational, temporal and social contexts</td>
<td>Identity how themes are constructed in positive/normative orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of enthymemes and their functions in context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical approach</th>
<th>Main conceptual orientations</th>
<th>Potential analytical directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Emphasis on constructive role of metaphors in agents’ conceptual systems and their influence on social action</td>
<td>Identification of root metaphors and aspects highlighted by actors over time and in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black\textsuperscript{154},</td>
<td>Nature of epistemic and ontological correspondences between source and target domains</td>
<td>Mapping target and source domains and their implication complexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakoff &amp; Johnson\textsuperscript{155}</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping inter-metaphor systematicity and its implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic interactionism</td>
<td>Meanings arise and are modified through social interaction</td>
<td>Focus on social interaction and on the meanings involved in interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead\textsuperscript{156},</td>
<td>Action arises out of subjective meanings that agents attach to situations</td>
<td>Study of discourse in use and its relation to subjective meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumer\textsuperscript{157}</td>
<td>Actors’ identity itself arises through social interaction</td>
<td>How does discourse in use embody and construct subject identities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Theoretical approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical discourse analysis</th>
<th>Discursive reality construction is hegemonic, biased in favor of dominant interests</th>
<th>Focus on links between discourse and power • Aims to uncover the ways through which discursive reality construction is skewed in favor of dominant interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairclough &amp; Wodak[^158]</td>
<td>Social practices viewed as ‘natural’ are a surreptitious consequence of dominant discourses aligned with the powerful</td>
<td>Analysis is contextual and often historical, relating discourses to social practices and to powerful interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjects’ subjectivity and identity is constructed by dominant discourses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Within both discourse theory and discourse analysis, metaphors are usually seen as devices or units of language which are deployed within particular conversations and contexts. Discourse analysts[^159] believe that metaphors are actively employed to manage specific social interactions between language users. Meanings or uses of a single metaphor can differ among speakers.

The use of metaphors to explain organizational phenomena, including organizational culture, organizational conflict or change, is not new. In recent decades, the importance of language within organizational research has grown dramatically, with the centrality of language emphasized in theoretical and empirical work[^160].


Metaphor has become the subject of an enormous volume of research in the last two decades, across a range of academic disciplines. In 1996 Palmer and Dunford described “a continuing shift by management researchers towards using metaphors to understand challenges and difficulties faced by organizations”\(^{161}\). Metaphor research draw scholars from the areas of philosophy, psychology, literary studies, linguistics and anthropology, all of whom bring their own questions and methodologies to the study of metaphor.

The metaphor in management and organizational theory has, in the literature, an interesting evolutionary pattern. The most influential pro-metaphor author on the subject in the 1980s was Gareth Morgan. However, V. Warren Bourgeois and Craig C. Pinder\(^{162}\), persistently criticized his work by claiming that metaphors only dealt with an obscure understanding of organization. Bourgeois and Pinder have been high proponents of scientifically literal approaches to understanding of organizations. Due to the opposing camps of Bourgeois and Pinder and Morgan\(^{163}\), management and organization theory was motivated to use more complex metaphors as tools. Cornelissen believed that the role that metaphors had in organizational studies could not be dismissed. There is semantic baggage carried by metaphors that involve other projections, which provide insights into the reality of an organization or business’s life\(^{164}\).

Cornelissen et al.\(^{165}\) present an overview of research exploring the use of metaphor in organizational research. The authors’ goal was to uncover differences

---


both in focus and in methodological approaches to research on the use of metaphor in organizational and business contexts. Cornelissen et al. organized the literature on metaphor in organizational research along two key axes: ‘de-contextual’ versus ‘contextual’, and ‘projecting’ versus ‘eliciting’ (see Figure 1 below).

The first continuum (‘de-contextual’ versus “contextual”) refers to the form or methodological approach to the study of metaphor, i.e. (cognitive or cognitive linguistic approaches vs. discursive or discourse analysis approaches). Cognitive linguists\(^\text{166}\) tend to de-contextualize metaphors in that the focus is on identifying metaphors being used across language users, and the contexts of language use. It stresses that metaphors function as organizing principles of thought and experience. The other, discursive approach, tends to contextualize metaphors. It emphasizes identifying locally-specific uses and meanings of metaphors and their interaction with other elements of discourse\(^\text{167}\).

---
The second dimension (projecting versus eliciting) is the focus or basic orientation in metaphor-based research. Here metaphors can be ‘imposed’ or ‘projected’ onto an organization reality, or naturally surface and can be elicited by organizational researchers. The first is a deductive approach to metaphor in organizational research and the latter is an inductive approach. The ‘projection’ approach to organizations is central to organizational theories (OT) whose purpose is to identify abstract constructs, describing and explaining lived experiences within organizations. The ‘elicitation’ approach is central to the area of organizational behavior in which processes of creating meaning are identified around metaphors at the level of an organization’s members’ language use. The ‘elicitation’ approach involves identifying metaphors in the context of an organization’s members’ language use and examining their uses, meanings and impact168.

Researchers concerned with the concept of the organizational metaphor have concentrated their efforts mainly on two areas, i.e. organizational culture and organizational climate. Both concepts deal with the ways in which members of particular organizations give meaning to what surrounds them, and the way it influences their behavior and behaviors of other members. Both concepts are determined mainly by the socialization process and the symbolic interaction between group members169.

Organizational metaphor gives meaning to the environment and becomes a symbolic expression of the atmosphere and processes inside an organization. The social world, in this context, is nothing but a subjective structure of individuals who are creating a social world of meaning through common language and daily interaction170. An organization’s members create their realities individually or in conjunction with others. They are not merely passive observers, but active partners involved in the creation of their experience. One of the more significant ways in which they distinguish and translate the organizational world around them is through explanatory metaphors, which contain patterns of intention, values and meaning, and in this way the organization is given meaning by its members171.

Although metaphors are culturally determined, there are several authors who have determined that development of models through which economic phenomena are interpreted has been entirely Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-American, and this has had a powerful influence in causing similar conceptual metaphors to be established across languages (Chareris-Black and Ennis). One of the most prevalent is the metaphor ‘business is war’.

8. Metaphors and communication in organizational settings

All management functions are performed within the process of organizational communication\textsuperscript{172}. Large cooperative networks constitute the environment of organizational communication. This includes practically all aspects of both interpersonal and group communication. Explaining viewpoints, conflict de-escalation, overcoming barriers with respect to knowledge management, knowledge transfer, motivating and many other processes are conducted in organizations with the help of communication\textsuperscript{173}.

Organizations are nothing else but entities that at once create and implicate various discourses. One of such discourses is the use of family-related categories to describe relationships within a team: “we’re in this together”, “we’ve built this together”, “we’re all responsible for the decisions taken”. Using such an approach or methodology of conduct is aimed at creating implications that clearly indicate not only an image of individuals acting in a rational way and their relationships within a group but also an image of an experience arousing great enthusiasm. It is also worth noting that the nature or in fact the way of formulating thoughts is slightly blurred. Organizations, as entities created intentionally, require certain attributes that make them more coherent or connected, characteristic of family closeness, joint management, and members involved in relationships, helping and supporting each other. The aim of the metaphor is to conceal disputable issues in an organization and its accompanying socio-economic structure. Research into the discourse reveals hidden mental processes underlying such elements as authoritative statements implemented by the management, the ultimate effect of which is supposed to be maintaining stricter control over subordinates. Such assumptions are enhanced by power abuse carried out in the name of the implementation of a broadly understood management process.

\textsuperscript{172} Chmielecki M., \textit{Factors Influencing Effectiveness of Internal Communication}, “Management and Business Administration”, No. 23(2), 2015, pp. 24–38.

\textsuperscript{173} Chmielecki M., \textit{Komunikacja jako element kultury organizacyjnej}, [In] \textit{Metody zarządzania kulturą organizacyjną}, Sulkowski Ł., Sikorski Cz, Difin, 2014.
“Communication belongs to the type of human activity, of which all people are aware but only a few can define in a satisfactory way”\(^{174}\). Communication process research requires combining numerous scientific disciplines. Psychology, anthropology and sociology are only some examples. Communication is an extremely complex phenomenon. “Scientists have tried to define communication many times but establishment of one definition has proved to be impossible and not very fruitful”\(^{175}\).

Due to the fact that communication constitutes a very complex and multifaceted category, its analysis requires making various interdisciplinary theoretical assumptions. T. Goban-Klas notices that “in fact, there is no universal ‘communication science’ but various facets and ways of dealing with it”\(^{176}\).

Organizations can be defined as intentionally created social entities with determined boundaries, operating within constant circumstances with a specific set of goals\(^{177}\), and following a specific strategy. Contemporary ways of understanding organizations were shaped from the second half of the 19th century and they have had an apparent effect on the presently common interpretative and postmodern approaches\(^{178}\). For example, Scott\(^{179}\) attempts to understand or perhaps in this particular case to draw a conclusion how organizations gain sense based on their actual image by examining several basic characteristics of organizations and comparing them with related social groups, such as a family.

There are three main ways of giving sense to organizations\(^{180}\):

- The rational paradigm – organizations are communities, the aim of which is to pursue specific goals and to build a strictly formalized social structure.

• The natural paradigm – organizations are communities, members of which share the enthusiasm related to the survival imperative of their framework and participate in common efforts aimed at the achievement of the goals set.
• The open paradigm – organizations are combinations of interdependent powers that connect groups or communities of their members; these groups are placed in the area they work on (where they are subject to the principles of exchange).

Organizations:
• Have an explicit goal or a composition of goals,
• Are intentionally created as coherent,
• Are entangled in a kind of a web of formal assumptions,
• Are fairly stable structures of power and obligations, free of characteristics of individuals serving specific roles in a given time,
• In most cases are oriented towards lasting longer than a specific act of cooperation between people in a given time.

Grant, Hardy, Oswick and Putnam\textsuperscript{181} and Grant, Keenoy, and Oswick\textsuperscript{182} highlight literature studies that show how attitudes, behaviors and an organization's members’ perceptions of reality are influenced by the discursive practices to which they are exposed and subjected, and in which they engage within certain organizations. Numerous scholars treat communicating and organizing as the same phenomena, although this is expressed in different ways\textsuperscript{183}. Communications and especially language issues are being increasingly recognized as an important effectiveness factor in a range of organizations and professions. C. Stohl\textsuperscript{184} believes that communication constitutes organizations. Scholars researching communication have very different views on the way it can be defined. There are seven traditions rooted in the theory of communication that help to understand and define it:

\begin{itemize}
\item Grant D., Oswick (Eds.), \textit{Metaphor and Organizations}, Sage, London 1996.
\end{itemize}
• Socio-psychological tradition – as the impact of interpersonal communication,
• Cybernetic tradition – communication as the information flow,
• Rhetorical tradition – communication as an elaborate public speaking,
• Semiotic tradition – communication as a process of sharing meaning through signs,
• Socio-cultural tradition – communication as the creation and role of social reality;
• critical tradition – communication as a reflective discourse,
• phenomenological tradition – communication as the experience of self and others through a dialogue.

“The socio-psychological tradition is the personification of the scientific or objective perspective […]. Researchers following this tradition believe that a thorough and systematic observation enables us to discover the truth regarding communication phenomena. They struggle to find cause and effect relations allowing to predict which communication behaviors lead to success and which are doomed to failure. Finding such cause relations enables to assume that we are getting close to the answer to the ever returning question asked by art of persuasion practitioners, i.e. ‘What more can be done to make people change their views’ “185? Socio-psychological fundamentals of management have developed not only with regard to communication processes due to the human relations school, the most important representative of which was Elton Mayo. The socio-psychological school is widely applied in management sciences. It constitutes the theoretical basis for the majority of human resources management tools. Over the last 50–60 years numerous theories and models of attitude change have emerged186. Achievements of the socio-psychological school are of major importance while analysing the communication process in the organization, particularly, in the context of persuasion and efforts targeted at attitude change187.

The cybernetic school defines communication as information processing. C. Shannon developed the mathematical theory of signal transmission. He was

interested neither in the sense of the message nor in the effect it would have on
the receiver. The sense itself is not essential in this model. The model reduces
communication based on the dialogue to algorithms of information processing
by the individual\textsuperscript{188}. According to D. Baecker, the Shannon and Weaver’s model is
characterized by semantic poverty\textsuperscript{189}. This theory dealt only with solving technical
problems concerning faithful sound transfer. According to Shannon, information
relates to the reduction of uncertainty. The message information content
can be measured with the help of its efficiency in opposing chaos. Disturbances
(interferences) are the enemy of information due to the fact that they reduce in-
f ormation capacity of the channel connecting the transmitter with the receiver\textsuperscript{190}.
This relation was described by him in the following equation:
\[
\text{Channel capacity} = \text{information} + \text{disturbances}\textsuperscript{191}.
\]
Achievements of the cybernetic school are of major importance while analys-
ing the communication process in the organization, particularly in the context of
the transfer of information and reduction of distortions and interferences.

“Rhetoric is an art or discipline dealing with the usage of a written or oral
discourse aimed at providing information, persuading or motivating an audi-
ence composed of one person or a group of persons”\textsuperscript{192}. In fact, the Greco-Ro-
man rhetoric remained the main source of knowledge on communication itself
until the 12th century. The Greco-Roman rhetoric tradition, which was intro-
duced by sophists from the ancient Mediterranean city-states, was and still is
cultivated by thousands of speakers. Only thanks to Carl Hovland\textsuperscript{193} and his Yale

\begin{footnotesize}
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Communication Program, rhetoric as art moved to the scientific ground of social psychology and many works concerning persuasion and attitude change psychology were initiated. In recent years research on rhetoric has moved towards dialogue and the speaker’s expectations and needs\textsuperscript{194}.

Efficient and correct communication plays a fundamental role in the contemporary organization. Both public institutions and private initiatives, as well as small and large organizations benefit from achievements of the rhetorical school, including those related to:

- public speeches
- business and commercial presentations, etc.
- effective application of methods, techniques and strategies of the social impact, persuasion and manipulation in organizational communication
- enhancing communication within the organization
- rhetoric of motivation
- television appearances (media relations)
- transferring knowledge and teaching adults, e.g. during trainings\textsuperscript{195}.

The tradition stemming in its contemporary form from Locke is the semiotic tradition dealing with the sign. In a broad sense semiotics deals with analyzing creation and exchange of meanings based on sign systems. One of the most extensive definitions of semiotics was proposed by U. Eco, who claimed that “semiotics deals with anything that could be regarded as a sign”\textsuperscript{196}. In the semiotic sense signs take the form of words, images, objects, gestures and sounds\textsuperscript{197}. “The semiotic theory creates the notion of communication as a process relying on signs and sign systems in order to mediate between breaks of subjective views”\textsuperscript{198}.

The sign is any element which can represent something else. Words are a special type of signs – symbols. For the semiotic tradition communication problems are

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
connected with misunderstandings, which concern differences between symbols and their implied meanings. Signs and codes are necessary for occurrence of communication. “Signs are artifacts or actions relating to something else than they are themselves. They are indicating constructs. Codes are systems, within which arranged and organized signs are located. Codes determine mutual relations between signs included in them. [...] signs and codes are passed and become accessible to other people. Transmission or receipt of signs and codes is one of the social relations activity forms. [...] communication is the central activity within our culture. Any culture must die without communication. Research on communication entails research on the culture to which a given communication belongs”\(^\text{199}\). Thus, application of achievements of this tradition in research on organizational culture seems to be obvious.

Communication is an unusual phenomenon, a superior process, with the help of which human life can be experienced at any time. Communication establishes reality. Within their theory of coordinated management of meaning Barnett Pearce and Vernon Cronen claim that persons participating in a conversation co-construct their own social reality, simultaneously being shaped by the worlds they create. They suggest that the process of communication is not only a tool or an action aimed at reaching an objective but also shaping such individuals and their relationship, which leads to the conclusion that they create organizational reality.

The socio-cultural tradition originates from sociological and anthropological thoughts of the 20th century. This tradition sees communication as a symbolic process producing and reproducing shared meanings, rituals and social structures. Most people assume that words reflect things which really exist. However, theoreticians representing this theory assume that this process works in the opposite way. Thus, the vision of reality is shaped by the language a given individual has been using since childhood. Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf were precursors of the socio-cultural tradition. According to them, the “real world” is, to a large extent, unintentionally built on language habits of the group\(^\text{200}\). While learning to speak, children learn what to look for in their environment. Thus, some elements remain unnoticed because nothing can be said about them. Contemporary theoreticians of socio-cultural research claim that “[...] reality is created, maintained and repaired or reshaped”\(^\text{201}\) through the communication process. This tradition, in particular, deliberations on language, the issue of interrelations between the mind,

\(^\text{201}\) Carey J., *Communication as Culture*, Unwin Hyman, Boston 1988, p. 23.
perception and functioning in the world versus verbal communication, is essential for considerations on organizational culture\textsuperscript{202}.

Socio-cultural tradition is founded on the premise that by communicating, people create and recreate culture, thus creating and recreating organizations. Most people assume that the words reflect what actually exists. Meanwhile, theorists of socio-cultural tradition have suggested that this process is just the opposite. The vision of reality to a high degree shapes the language people use. E. Sapir, and B. L. Whorf were precursors to the socio-cultural traditions. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (linguistic relativism) states that the structure of the language of the culture determines the shape of human thoughts and actions. Thus the organizational world is to a large extent unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group. Stohl conceptualizes organizations as “identifiable social systems of interacting individuals pursuing multiple objectives through coordinated acts and relationships”\textsuperscript{203}. The use of metaphors characterizes our way of searching for meaning, and so influences our way of thinking and acting\textsuperscript{204}.

“In most cases, what is at issue is not the truth or falsity of a metaphor but the perceptions and inferences that follow from it and the actions that are sanctioned by it. In all aspects of life, not just in politics or love, we define our reality in terms of metaphors and then proceed to act on the basis of those metaphors. We draw inferences, set goals, make commitments and execute plans, all on the basis of how we in part structure our experience, consciously and unconsciously, by means of metaphor”\textsuperscript{205}.

Metaphors can influence people’s perceptions and actions, and in turn become self-fulfilling prophecies for how people ascribe the functioning of reality\textsuperscript{206}.


\textsuperscript{204} Grant D., Oswick C. (eds), *Metaphor and organizations*, Sage, London 1996.


Metaphors “guide our perceptions and interpretations… and help us formulate our visions and goals”\textsuperscript{207}, thus potentially allowing members of organizations to connect their experiences with their imaginations and vice versa\textsuperscript{208}.

Metaphors are central to social constructionism, which has emerged as an important perspective within social science. Generally, it can be said that for social constructionism, in contrast to positivism, reality is socially constructed. Positivism states that reality exists independently of the mind seeking to know it, and that reality can be known and understood through objective and rational appraisal. “Social constructs or social constructions define meanings, notions or connotations that are assigned to objects and events in the environment and to people’s notions of their relationships to and interactions with these objects”\textsuperscript{209}. Even the word itself emphasizes the socially created-nature of social life. “Social constructionism is viewed as a set of dialogues and commentaries, rather than a truth or a theory. It lodges our perceptions of reality, and all the moral and ethical imperatives that accompany that reality, in communal relationships. Nothing exists until it is interpreted by a community of people”\textsuperscript{210}.

In his book \textit{The Social Psychology of Organizing} K. Weick focused his attention on the process of organizing, as opposed to its product – the “organization”. He claimed that organizational reality is socially constructed and that language plays a major role in the social construction of organizations. Everyday conversations and meetings constitute the organization, and without these various interchanges an organization would not exist\textsuperscript{211}.


The critical tradition defines communication as a reflexive, dialectical discourse, associated mainly with cultural and ideological aspects of power, oppression and emancipation. The critical theory term originates from the publication of the German researchers known as the Frankfurt School. Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse, representatives of this school, believed that “[…] the whole earlier history was characterized by unfair distribution of suffering.” Social players need to be free from ideological influences so that real, authentic communication could occur. Communication is systematically distorted by power imbalance. Achievements of this tradition equally translate into application capacity in the organizational context.

The phenomenological tradition creates the notion of communication as experiencing ourselves and others through dialogue. Martin Buber, Hans-George Gadamer, Emanuel Levinas or Carl Rogers can be identified with this tradition. Coexistence and the world shared by us constitute the basis for communication. The authentic dialogue requires openness and acceptance of differences while searching for understanding. The dialogue does not necessarily mean sharing already existing meanings, it is understood as joining the process of negotiating meanings. It allows to reconstruct oneself. And through access to new experiences, it provides the individual with new meanings and the ability to understand these meanings.

Contrary to the semiotic tradition, in which interpretation is separated from reality, in the phenomenological tradition interpretation determines reality for a given individual within the organization. In the phenomenological tradition culture becomes a preference for some interactive forms of behavior, shaping perception from the expressive and impressive aspect. Table 1 presents in a form of a list the summary of traditions and areas of their usage in research on organizational culture.

Table 1. Traditions in the field of communication and areas of their usage in research on organizational culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Areas of usage in research on organizational culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-psychological</td>
<td>Persuasion and efforts aimed at attitude change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybernetic</td>
<td>Transfer of information and knowledge, reduction of communication disturbances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical</td>
<td>Internal and external public relations, motivation, human resources development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
<td>Production and reproduction of shared meanings, rituals and social structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Ideological aspects of power, oppression and emancipation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
<td>Coexistence and world shared by organization members. Acceptance of differences while searching for understanding. Mutual negotiating of meanings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following division of organizational culture artifacts into three basic groups has become common in literature:

- language artifacts – language, characteristic vocabulary used by members of a given organization, myths, legends,
- behavioral artifacts connected with organizational behaviors – ceremonies, habits, rituals, tradition, way of communication between members of a given organization, relations with customers, way of communicating with external stakeholders,
- physical (tangible) artifacts – art, technology, interior decor and design, material objects[^217].

Table 2 below shows a list of types of organizational communication and the corresponding specific groups of artifacts.

Table 2. Types of organizational communication corresponding to the specific group of artifacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational culture artifact</th>
<th>Type of organizational communication corresponding to the specific group of artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language artifacts</td>
<td>Verbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral artifacts</td>
<td>Verbal, paraverbal and non-verbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical (tangible) artifacts</td>
<td>Verbal and non-verbal communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Public communication, or rhetoric, traditionally focuses on the public presentation of a discourse. Rhetoric is regarded as the inherent and extremely significant instrument of organizational life.

According to K. Dervitsiotis, the following three types of basic organizational processes can be distinguished:

- material flow processes
- information flow processes
- communication processes.\(^{218}\)

K. Weinstein suggests that the quality of communication in an organization is reflected in its employees’ motivation, satisfaction with work, efficiency, etc.\(^ {219}\) According to W. Haney, organizational communication errors can lead to, for example, hostility between employees, difficulties cooperating or the lack of mutual trust\(^ {220}\), they can also result in retaining bad standards of behaviors.\(^ {221}\)

Organizational communication can be contemplated vertically, horizontally and diagonally. Vertical communication covers, e.g. providing employees with task guidelines, informing them about their efficiency, personnel evaluation, informing employees about the organization’s objectives and mission, as well as informing the superiors about progress in implementing task guidelines, notifying

---


of problems connected with work performance or giving voice to expectations and opinions. Horizontal communication covers developing common positions, delivering supplementary information or confirming information already obtained\(^\text{222}\).

Diagonal communication relates mainly to exchange of information between various levels of management, very often going beyond the formal reporting line.\(^\text{223}\)

Formal and informal information flows are present in most organizations. There are also organizations which intentionally rely on transferring information in an informal way because they are aware of the pace and significance of such a transfer and they accept the associated information distortions. In general, the less efficient and burdened with bottlenecks formal information flow, the richer and more manifold informal flow.

When speaking about organizational communication in the cultural aspect, one needs to realize that both national and organizational cultures will influence its nature. Organizations have their own specific culture. Most of all, organizational cultures reflect national cultures. However, they also include other values and standards. According to Edgar Schein, organizational culture is a collection of basic principles, which the group assimilated while solving problems regarding adaptation to the environment and internal integration and which function so well that they can be regarded as valid and passed on to the next employees as the appropriate way of perceiving, thinking and feeling with respect to these problems.\(^\text{224}\)

The history of research on communication is many years old. Communication processes have been analyzed since the very beginning of science, since ancient times, and by philosophers (e.g. John Locke) since the beginning of modern science. Despite the aforementioned definitional problems and plurality of interpretations, communication remains the foundation of human interaction within an organization. Understanding the substance of organizations and organizational culture requires understanding the essence of the communication processes taking place in the organization.


Part II: Practical applications of metaphors in management

1. Metaphors in economic discourse

Classic and modern economics use metaphors constantly. In economic discourse, metaphor is very common\textsuperscript{225}. Many economic expressions, such as expansion, depression and inflation, are metaphorical in nature.

Nevertheless, it was only in 1982 that W. Henderson began the conversation of metaphor in economics, stressing that there was a scarcity of metaphorical analyzes in economics, despite its deliberate and wide use in economic texts. The 1980s then saw metaphors dragged out of the closet by Johnson and Lakoff\textsuperscript{226}, pioneers in this field. They proved that metaphorical reasoning was prevalent, and stressed that metaphors were essential for humanity’s understanding. In the 25 years since Waterman and Peters’ triumph, the usage of metaphors has grown stronger. Every academic that you can think of now uses metaphors\textsuperscript{227}. This has become most prevalent in the management and business fields.

The ‘metaphoromania’ of the last thirty years has led to a lot of research that deals with the following processes: juxtaposition; comparison and identification of the two scopes of metaphor (i.e. the tool of thinking that is used in shaping a specific discipline), and ironically, the result of the light that has been shed on the metaphorical process. Thus, metaphor is thought to be both a tool for creating several sciences and an outcome of the way that these sciences have developed.

In fact, all great economists used some metaphors to explain the essence of certain processes or social phenomena. Naturally, one of the most common metaphors in the economic analysis was proposed by Adam Smith. It is the metaphor of the “invisible hand”, referring to the spontaneous order of the market economy. Another example of such an economist is J.M. Keynes, who often referred to the metaphor of the “animal instinct” when describing the activities of entrepreneurs and profiteers on the market\textsuperscript{228}.

\textsuperscript{226} Lakoff G., Johnson M., Metaphors we live by, Chicago University Press, Chicago 1980.
\textsuperscript{227} Knowles M., Moon R., Introducing Metaphor, Routledge, Abingdon 2006.
\textsuperscript{228} Keynes J.M., Ogólna teoria zatrudnienia, procentu i pieniądza, PWN, Warszawa 1985, chapter 12.
The metaphor of an organism compares an organization to a structure characterized by a certain cycle or nature, which is born, develops, and dies. Hence, health, illness and the human body are involved as the common source domain names in conceptual metaphors. It is notable that drawing a parallel between the body as well as the market is old in economics. Francois Quesnay (1694–1774), an 18th-century French doctor and economist, was the first to examine the financial markets as a biological system. He associated the circulation of capital to the blood flow in the body between the organs, which symbolize the different sectors of the market. In his perspective, the stomach which creates the blood and sends it to the heart is represented by the agricultural laborers. The industrial workers are the lungs that keep metabolism going and provide the body with oxygen. The landowners can be portrayed as the heart that sends out the blood, i.e. the capital to the entire organism\textsuperscript{229}.

Metaphorically, the parts or aspects of the market are comprehended as organs of the body, which can additionally separately become sick and can then change the entire body. So long as the organs function well, the market functions well, hence in economic terms the general wellbeing of an economy is comprehended as its economic ‘health’. Nevertheless, occasionally difficulties or ailments can appear both in the function of the market as well as a human body. In the former, medical aid is essential to healing the sickness of the body. Likewise, there are also some dangers to economic health. The market can also suffer injuries or fall ill, and then a market can also get medical treatment – an ‘injection’ or a ‘cure’. In other words, economic measures are taken to save it from falling. The market, just like a patient, will recover. And if not, then the market will fail.

Now let’s see what facets and components of the body can function as source domains in the cognitive evaluation of subjective expressions used in the language of economics, finance, and business. All of these are as follows: the healthy condition of a human body; illnesses; physical, mental and psychosomatic ailments and their concomitant effects (i.e. the symptoms of sicknesses – pain, headaches, spasms, etc; the treatments of sicknesses (e.g. pills, medication, injections and surgery, etc), and the healing or the passing of patients. As far as the goal domains are involved, we can discuss the proper and inappropriate state of an economy, the signals of issues and issues of an economy, measures taken to solve economic issues, and healing or failure of an economy.

The metaphor that economy is an organism shows the importance underlying the cognitive model for conceptualization of the economy as a whole. The extension of higher level metaphors has also been found in a number of lower-level metaphors. The most visible was the conceptualization of the economy as a patient with a number of metaphorical expressions: recovery, healthy, qualms, flu, limping/hobbling along, sweating, depressed, among others. Charteris-Black argues that the underlying notion of conceptualizing economy as a patient shows that the economy is a passive entity whose condition is determined by good decisions; this perception allows the economist to be a doctor or surgeon that can play a role in influencing the economy to heal (Charteris-Black).

Authors such as Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Karl Marx used biological metaphors to explain or form economic theories. Hirshleifer says that the relationship between biology and economics cannot be straightforward, even though Alfred Marshall said that economics is a branch of biology, or as Ghiseling pointed out, that biology is natural economics. The French physician Francois Quesnay related economics to biological references by pointing out that in history, the natural states of the economy can be described as situations where the flow of income between economic sectors and the social ‘organs’ maximize the net product, just as blood circulates in the human body.

Biology is a particularly inspiring source of metaphors and analogies in general. Naturally, such analogies are also used by business and economics, and especially the current of evolutionary economics, which has been developing rapidly over the last decades. An almost classic example is a comparison of company or product development to a biological life cycle. The basic metaphor used by evolutionary economics is a biological concept of natural selection. One of the most interesting metaphors in evolutionary economics is the metaphor proposed by A.A. Alchian, looking for ways to substitute the neoclassical concept of maximization with the biological concept of natural selection. The application of the idea of “natural selection” in the company model was first discussed by
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Alchian\textsuperscript{234}. As Alchian argued, competition between companies is not determined by the motif of profit maximization but by “an adaptive, imitative, and based on trial and error search for a possibility of increasing one’s profit”\textsuperscript{235}. This is why, in the spirit of Darwinism, “those who achieve profit survive, while those who lose are eliminated from the market”\textsuperscript{236}. Alchian suggestively presents an analysis of companies’ behavior in a competitive environment. He states that “economic counterparts of genetic transmission, mutation, and natural selection are imitation, innovation, and profit”\textsuperscript{237}.

For instance, the flower garden is a great metaphor for looking at economic growth and income distribution. A flower’s growth depends on the \textit{individual characteristics} of the flower and the seedlings. It also depends on common \textit{factors} shared by other flowers in the garden (local climate, pests, the skills and diligence of the gardner, etc), as well as particular factors and advantages that are relative to the flower. These might be \textit{better sunlight, soil and water} in one part of the garden than other parts. However, although there might be some interdependence, the rapid growth of a sunflower at the end of the garden largely does come at the expense of a struggling tulip. The sunflower has advantages that the tulip does not have, but the fast-growing sunflower is not in any way taking growth from the slow-growing tulip.

In the metaphor of a stock market as a bubble, the ‘bubble’ connotes the situation where the prices sometimes become higher than actual value. It is so common in English-language business and economic articles that it can be seen as conventional metaphor. The conceptualization of the economy as a ship which is based on a solid systematic structure and the captain as the president of the central bank, also has the crew as the clerical assistants and the sea as the socio-economic environment of the country. Obstacles to the ship (reefs, storms) are critical situations that require use of nautical instruments (anchors, compasses, maps) that are in fact the bank’s various guidelines and directives. These assume that a central bank knows exactly where the ship should be heading, how the ship is working and the effect of the crew’s actions on the its course. However, it can be
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argued that they are working in a world where nothing is certain. When we look at recent socio-economic events, environmental consequences have brought about the downfall of many corporations.

Many a time, people also draw comparisons between business and war. We see how the mappings occur in the metaphor ‘Business is War’. War carries images of battles, battlefields, military forces, headquarters, soldiers, weapons, strategies, and the outcome of the war. In cognitive terms, these are the source domains. Business negotiations, market, business partners, strategies in business, and outcomes in business comprise the target domain. One can easily establish connections between the two domains. For instance, when you compare business negotiations with battles fought on battlefields, you draw a comparison between the business representatives, bankers and marketers with soldiers. Strategies are required in both fields. War strategies include images of military operations, formation of battlefronts, minefields, attacks, counterattacks, defense, ceasefires, etc. Similarly, in business negotiations you can find comparisons in the representatives of different groups attacking each other, defending their positions and interests. You can draw parallels in the way they take risks and ‘redraw the battle lines’. The outcome of a war is either a victory over the enemy or a defeat. You can also come to a ceasefire agreement and reach a compromise. Similarly, business deals also end in agreements, deals, and compromises.

2. Metaphors for organizations

There are many different theories of organizations. However, all of these theories “are based on implicit images or metaphors that lead us to see, understand, and manage organizations in distinctive yet partial ways.”238 The abundant metaphors in the literature are definite evidence. For instance, organizations such as: coalitions of individuals contracting with each other239; verbal systems240; psychic

prisons, political systems and instruments of domination\textsuperscript{241}, to name but just a few.

The notion of “organization” can be distinguished from the notion of “institution” understood as rules of structuration of interaction processes created by people, whereas “organization” is a social group aimed at achieving goals in an organized way\textsuperscript{242}. Moreover, a social organization is considered to be a relatively permanent system of diverse and coordinated activities of people, using a set of human, capital, ideological, and natural resources, interacting with other systems of human activity and resources of the environment\textsuperscript{243}. A social system understood as an organization can be described as:

- Morphology, i.e. the internal structure of these social constructs,
- A structure co-created by its constituents linked with different relationships,
- A unique system of positions and functions performed by its individual elements,
- A hierarchy characteristic of the given system,
- A value system,
- An ability to make active and passive adaptations, related to social practice\textsuperscript{244}.

In the light of management science, organizations can be perceived as isolated from the environment, internally ordered and correlated sets of elements. The way they are ordered and correlated determines the organizational structure, thanks to which a given set of elements can function as a coherent whole, or a system\textsuperscript{245}. According to A. Koźmiński, “organizations are created and developed by people. They do it in order to ensure that goals, tasks, and functions assumed

\begin{itemize}
\item Morphology, i.e. the internal structure of these social constructs,
\item A structure co-created by its constituents linked with different relationships,
\item A unique system of positions and functions performed by its individual elements,
\item A hierarchy characteristic of the given system,
\item A value system,
\item An ability to make active and passive adaptations, related to social practice
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{242} Marshall G. (ed.), \textit{Słownik socjologii i nauk społecznych}, PWN, Warszawa 2004, pp. 246, 379. In the light of anthropology, Hofstede agrees with this view, saying: “Organisation is a social system by nature different from the state, if only in the fact that its members were not raised in it. Being a member of a given organization is to a greater or lesser extent a matter of choice (...) one can resign from this membership”; Hofstede G., Hofstede G.J., \textit{Cultures and Organisations. Software of the Mind}, Geert Hofstede BV, 2005, pp. 47–48.
\textsuperscript{244} Dyoniziak R. i in., \textit{Społeczeństwo w procesie zmian. Zarys socjologii ogólnej}, ZCO, Zielona Góra 1999, p. 93.
are performed. People not only create organizations, they are their material. Cor-
related units and groups pursuing certain goals and performing tasks together
form the social subsystem of an organization. Participants occupying different
positions within the formal structure usually use different technical devices and
techniques of acting. The formal structure, machines, devices, and acting tech-
niques form the technical subsystem of an organization. Almost all modern or-
ganizations (involved in production, teaching, providing medical treatment, and
dealing with defense or administration) are thus complex social and technical
systems.”

Ch. Bernard defines this phenomenon as a system of consciously
coordinated activities of two or more people. H. A. Simon believes that coor-
dination of the course of activities, establishing precise boundaries of power, and
the sphere of activity and power of each organization member create a formal or-
ganization, and constitute abstraction and more or less permanent relationships
having the dominant influence on the behavior of every employee. G. Hofstede
describes an organization as a social system by nature different from the state, if
only in the fact that its members were not raised in it. Being a member of a given
organization is to a greater or lesser extent a matter of choice (...). Organiza-
tional metaphors serve as something more than pure theoretical
constructs. Metaphors allow us to link our experiences in different areas, which
help us to understand various concepts in different ways. Morgan wrote that
metaphors “generate an image for studying a subject”. They are principally a way
of conceiving of one thing in terms of another.

A metaphorical analysis is now common in the discourse of management sci-
ence, and it is extensively used both as a tool for the creation of organizational
theories and culture, and for their analysis, diagnosis, and management.
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In his book, G. Morgan presented the possibilities of using metaphors in research into the problems of organizations and management.

Table X. Organizational metaphors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Associated concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization as a <strong>machine</strong></td>
<td>The default modern notion of the business, derived from the industrial model of centralized control and subdivided work, and the roles of all-knowing bureaucratic management spelling out the work that the laborers perform. Reduces the organization to a form of engineering, management as the engineers, and the dehumanization of the workers as cogs in an effort to construct the “one best way” to function.</td>
<td>Efficiency, waste, maintenance, order, clockwork, cogs in a wheel, programmes, inputs and outputs, standardisation, production, measurement and control, design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization as an <strong>organism</strong></td>
<td>The naturalistic view that an organization is similar to a living thing that seeks to adapt and survive in a changing environment. Useful when management is confronted with circumstances with they believe require organization change. And the greater metaphor of competition for scarce resources against other organism in a Darwinian struggle fits other cultural norms, and justifies certain attitudes, like openly aggressive behavioral norms.</td>
<td>Living systems, environmental conditions, adaptation, life cycles, recycling, needs, homeostasis, evolution, survival of the fittest, health, illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization as a <strong>brain</strong></td>
<td>Emphasizes learning over other activities, and lines up with the perspective that places information processing at the centre of organizational action, and accords with practices like Total Quality Management and Kaizen.</td>
<td>Learning, parallel information processing, distributed control, mindsets, intelligence, feedback, requisite variety, knowledge, networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Associated concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization as a culture</strong></td>
<td>Organizations possess their own values, rituals, ideologies and beliefs. They can be collections of semi-independent and contending subcultures, or uniform and homogeneous. Organizational cultures can also be seen as contiguous with ethnic, national, or regional cultures, inheriting some values and beliefs. A great deal of the application of this metaphor in the business setting can be seen as an attempt to impose a specific and clearly-articulated set of norms that are intended to proscribe and define the culture, and to indoctrinate employees as a means to direct their behavior. This discussion will be expounded upon below, as it is particularly relevant to various recent discussions.</td>
<td>Society, values, beliefs, laws, ideology, rituals, diversity, traditions, history, service, shared vision and mission, understanding, qualities, families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization as a political system</strong></td>
<td>In this perspective, the interplay of various factions is viewed as a political contest for power and dominance. In this model, effective managers are skilled politicians who balance competing interests and apply their power for the benefit of their constituencies and political faction. Organizations can be identified as autocracies, bureaucracies, technocracies, or democracies. This view boils down all striving as self- and group-interest oriented, and justifies conflict and factionalism as inevitable and maybe even advantageous.</td>
<td>Interests and rights, power, hidden agendas and back room deals, authority, alliances, party-line, censorship, gatekeepers, leaders, conflict management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization as a psychic prison</strong></td>
<td>This metaphor plays up the perspective that the natural impulses of humans as social animals are never far below the surface, like sexual attraction, anxieties, fear, obsessions and dependencies. As a result, the psychic make-up of the powerful can come to dominate the organization's dynamics and competencies.</td>
<td>Conscious &amp; unconscious processes, repression &amp; regression, ego, denial, projection, coping &amp; defence mechanisms, pain &amp; pleasure principle, dysfunction, workaholism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Associated concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization as <strong>flux and transformation</strong></td>
<td>This understanding is derived from the growing understanding of complexity and chaos, and casts the organization as a nexus for these phenomena. This approach considers the feedback loops within a system, as opposed to characterizing linear relationships and causal chains. While this can be an attractive set of ideas for theorists, it doesn't provide a groundwork for management to push from.</td>
<td>Constant change, dynamic equilibrium, flow, self-organization, systemic wisdom, attractors, chaos, complexity, butterfly effect, emergent properties, dialectics, paradox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization as <strong>instruments of domination</strong></td>
<td>Here, organizations are portrayed as actors that exploit people, the natural environment, and the global economy for the benefit of the organization. This is the canonical evil corporation of film and literature, exploiting seemingly rational and even legal processes to control the world, or as much of it as it can wrest away from others.</td>
<td>Alienation, repression, imposing values, compliance, charisma, maintenance of power, force, exploitation, divide and rule, discrimination, corporate interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Both metaphors and analogies are used constantly to help us make sense of organizations and businesses. In fact, they shape our understanding of the organization and mental models of organizational reality. By using metaphors, managers both explain and try to understand certain phenomenon on the basis of their precededent experience of different phenomena, or in Morgan's words, “to understand one element of experience in terms of another”\(^\text{253}\). Metaphors can assist managers with making more effective decisions and choices in their daily work, and also help inspire and motivate employees on a daily basis. They influence employees’ beliefs, values, and attitudes by providing unconscious emotional associations with words or phrases that they equate to as being good or bad.

(Charteris-Black). Charteris-Black defined this as: “...a linguistic representation that results from the shift in the use of a word or phrase from the context or domain in which it is expected to occur to another context or domain where it is not expected to occur, thereby causing semantic tension”.

According to Morgan, the power of metaphors lies within their ability to frame complex concepts. They can be applied to diagnose and treat numerous organizational problems (Grant & Oswick). When applied to existing or new phenomenon, they have the ability to uncover complex behavioral patterns. Metaphor helps managers by giving clarity to complex organizational issues. Morgan believes that effective managers can then become more skilled at understanding the situations in the organizations they manage. Metaphors facilitate communication. If managers understand the power of metaphors and use them as foundations in the process of studying organizations, their understanding of them will automatically increase.

It is, however, argued that organizational theory is dominated by perspectives that view organizations as machines or organisms. Just like all metaphors,
every one of these are “the tip of a submerged model” which carries with it (metaphorically) a weight of symbolism and associations, which can be problematic within the wider pursuit of organizational growth.

M. Wheatley explains that organizations should be understood less as machines and more as organic and living entities. She believes that the right metaphors should be drawn from quantum mechanics rather than classical Newtonian physics. One of the central contrasts in this case is the emphasis on the global and not fragmentary understanding. Paradigms understood as a whole matter, and weight is attached to relationships within systems. As Wheatley notes, “when we look at operational paradigms from this perspective, we enter a field of a completely new organizational science, the science of miracles that cannot be reduced to a simple juxtaposition of circumstances and outcomes or examining individual elements of the system separately. We move to the area where stable principles of procedures and the process of determining them as a set of cultural practices and forms are of significance.”

In the modern understanding of organizations within different systems, there are relative foundations for many types of results, however, specific circumstances are dynamic and changeable. Indicator-based management and cause-and-effect logic might seem trustworthy on diagrams and graphs but in the reality of fluctuating human relationships they can turned out to be quite dangerous.

Organizations perceive themselves as networks of connections, quickly adapting to risks and opportunities. The role of leaders is to create administrative structures that enhance and streamline operations of organizations without corporate mediators. Project teams take quick decisions depending on new data. The system is the means and not the end, while the management only focuses on facilitating the form, and not on achieving the goals set.

In-depth criticism is more and more frequent, focusing on the typical model of an organization and basing it on the metaphor of a machine, within which workers function as small cogs in the great machine of power. Maintaining structures and paradigms of work in stable systems is a difficult and costly task in a highly

---

changeable world. Talented individuals are discouraged from unconventional actions, which means ignoring the whole knowledge accumulated in their heads.

The machine metaphor draws upon 19th century understanding of classical mechanics as well as Taylor’s formulation of scientific management\(^{263}\). According to the machine metaphor, organizations more often than not act in accordance with rational economic principles and also have a hierarchy in their organizational structure. Besides that, the substantive goal is to increase wealth and the productivity of employees considered as mechanical parts within the organization. Another attribute is that the failure of a function is considered as the failure or malfunctioning of a part. In this setup, the pursuit of efficiency is supreme. Normally, the external environment is ignored as the organization is essentially closed\(^{264}\).

In the event that it becomes accepted that metaphors eventually do influence perception and action\(^{265}\) then our thinking concerning organizations through the use of the machine metaphor is infused with a particular mode. This mode perpetuates ‘othering’ and dehumanisation. First and foremost, the metaphor requires us to consider and act as if humans within the organization are only functional components, whose utility is only extended in so far as they enable the continued operation of the organization. If the components are defective, those

---


parts must be replaced. On top of that, the machine metaphor’s implications of hierarchy create a type of separation between the users of the metaphor and those to whom it is being applied, usually referred to as the functional components. Accordingly, the metaphor not only separates, but also fails to consider the whole human person beyond their function. The truth is that the human is a cog in the machine and a resource that has capabilities which need to be exploited for the good of the particular organization. This theory thus fails to enable sustainable development and the entire narrative of humans and humanity that is implicit in the concept. Secondly, the metaphor debatably perpetuates a synecdoche whereby the organization becomes the focus of concern while making the user create a focus on the abstract, the organization. In effect, rather than a particular set of individuals who are applying a metaphor, with their own concerns being paramount, through their application of the metaphor the synecdoche instead moves the organization “to being the subject and thus dehumanises both the users of the metaphor, and also reinforces the dehumanisation of those operating within the organization.” In this view, the metaphor perpetuates individuals taking an orgocentric view of the world, in which the concern is the continued operation of the organization. Given this argument, the narrative perpetuated is an organizational narrative and not a human narrative. By using the metaphor, one can find themselves trapped into defining everything relative to the organization as the subject, rather than the humans as the subject – a result not complicit with the Sustainable Development concept.

In summary, a metaphor that perpetuates a mode where the organization is the locus of concern and the human members of an organization are mechanical parts facilitates a form of slipperiness that dehumanises both ourselves (we are now parts), and our social constructions (organizations). It separates us from our organizations and thus detracts from our ordinary definitions of organizations that strengthen the central role of humans. Consequently, this slipperiness perpetuates an epistemology that an organization is a separate subject, and as such an epistemology that an organization and its environment are separate categories. Therefore, the machine metaphor either wittingly or unwittingly perpetuates an epistemology that separates, de-emphasizes, and dehumanises us while simultaneously emphasizing organizations – a result that is not conducive to organizational growth and development. A note of optimism here is that the

metaphor is simple to convey and enables a focus on efficiency, which is potentially useful\textsuperscript{267}. Nevertheless, this metaphor was developed in the 19th century, with all the social class, conflict and consciousness of those days.

Moving on, the twentieth century was the era of the development of production technology, which had a considerable influence on society and defined the logic of business and various types of organization. In a similar way, there is a domination of information technology in the twenty-first century. This modern development of information technology affects our methods of communication. One can see a change in the conditions of organizations and business as far as the production of goods and services are concerned. This development has led to an increase in the interconnectivity and transparency between various sections of society – there is an improvement in the speed of transactions coupled with a reduction in the cost of information. This results in the empowerment of individuals. Organizations have to use a combination of efficiency, flexibility, and innovation\textsuperscript{268}. There is a demand for flexibility among organizations resulting in the assembly of various forms at short notice. These organizations have a limited purpose and life\textsuperscript{269}. Production of services and products in new configurations can be seen, and people should have the ability to use both external and internal resources to solve tasks. In fact, this has become very common now. Organizations and businesses are becoming more involved in value networks and business ecosystems. But they have limited control over these networks\textsuperscript{270}. When we use the word 'organization' in this paper, it includes a whole range of institutions and business entities, from traditional companies to temporary networks of actors.

Handing over control to people outside an organization is a challenge. The new organizational form has a different way of looking at things. It challenges


the role of the management and the value of the experts. It also feels the need to have control over customer experience and stresses the importance of quality assurance. Hence the machine metaphor is not fully applicable in 21st century management characterized by co-participation, amorphous and project-based organizational structures.

Morgan is of the view that the use of metaphors is necessary to think and understand the world. Organizational forms such as value networks, mass collaborations, multi-unit enterprises and user contribution systems exhibit a lack of metaphors. It is a challenge for the management of contemporary organizations to manage complexity rather than reducing it.

Similarly to the machine metaphor, the organizm metaphor as applied to organizational understanding faces plentiful difficulties. It is often not specified, for example, whether the organizm is a person or a single cell amoeba, either of which imply different actions and considerations. The major downside of the organizm metaphor is that it implies that the organization is a form of life separate from its human constituents, and hence needs to be considered alongside other forms of life in terms of survival, growth, decay, death, population ecology thinking and Darwinian understanding.

Organizm metaphors don’t need to be discussed explicitly. Consider the similarity between an organization and an organizm: an organizm has a goal to survive despite all odds. Similarly, you can infer that the organization is a form of life with the goal of the organization being to survive. This implies that the organization is a separate entity from its human constituents. The human constituents are merely the facilitators or detractors from the continued survival of
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the organization\textsuperscript{276}. In stark similarity with the machine metaphor, the organizm metaphor causes an engagement in slipperiness, dehumanising our social constructions and ourselves and raising the organization as the focus of concern. The organization takes prime importance over the humans, and thus the metaphor does not enable the pursuit of sustainable development.

In cases where metaphors help constitute reality, they exhibit a unique power in guiding action. Hence, their application is likely to result in actions fitting the metaphor to make the 16 experience coherent\textsuperscript{277}. Hence, organizations function as machines and organisms. The metaphors imply that we dehumanize the individuals in the organizations and treat them as functional components. This makes us to detach from the organization and makes the organization a subject and focus of concern – and it is the metaphors that ask us to do this.

Thus, when we apply the metaphor of machines and organisms to organizational phenomena, we encourage dehumanization of some members of the organization and view them as components rather than fellow humans. We view them as machine parts whose function is to serve the organization's needs, instead of as human beings whose value is greater than their utility. When we use these metaphors, we promote organizations as the locus of concern and treat them as a separate subject. This is known as ‘orgocentrism’. We define issues in relation to the organization and its continued operation\textsuperscript{278}. These two outcomes
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have a strong impact, and the use of these metaphors makes us move away from the aspect of humanistic management.

One of the many metaphors used involved comparing an organization to culture, which, according to the author, was one of the most appropriate and creative references.

In semantic terms, organization as a culture emphasizes the element of creating social reality within itself and its operations. According to the Morganian understanding, culture was a metaphor of the organization itself.

As cultural phenomena, the nature of which involves the cultural context of an environment, organizations create culture and include subcultures expressing their complexity.

In spite of the evolution of various organizational forms, there is not much change in the existing principles of management\textsuperscript{279}. Modern management principles rest on the foundations of Fayol, Taylor, and Weber, as follows.

- Their main aim is stability.
- Analyses can be made by reducing things to smaller parts.
- The cause and effect mechanism between individual parts can be studied.

In the past, managers have used an easy language to solve simple, static problems while facing challenges pertaining to the complex, dynamic realities of the current business environment. Senge\textsuperscript{280} described this about twenty years ago.

Employees can use metaphors to describe the image they have of their organization. They give meaning to their organization\textsuperscript{281} and can practically express their feelings, not always necessarily positive, in an illustrative and imaginary way. For instance organizations dominated by a high level of internal competition become ‘battlefields’, or those where a specific climate of distrust and suspicion dominates ‘spy rings’ or ‘secret police forces’\textsuperscript{282}.


Working through metaphor can be extremely advantageous, as it has a symbolic and not a direct nature. Metaphor has the power to show the same situation from many angles and points, some very close and some quite distant. It can also provide a complete dictionary of words and phrases with which to describe a situation without using terms that would automatically provoke anger or anxiety283. In this case it alleviates all the difficulty that exists in the direct expression of sensitive issues, and in many cases brings out meanings, understandings, and analysis from deep in the unconscious284.

Successful managers are able to read the organization from numerous angles285. If they are open and ready to learn, they can delay immediate judgment until they have a comprehensive view of the situation to create a whole new agenda of possibilities. Less efficient managers usually interpret their environment from a constant perspective. Thus, they are less effective as they encounter obstacles. Rigid managers are often trapped in their image of themselves and of the organization286.

Metaphors are particularly useful for bringing clarity to situations dominated by ambiguity and vagueness. “The more ambiguous a situation is, the more important metaphors become for ordering the situation and making sense of our organizational experience”287.

In these cases, metaphors help managers understand how certain unconscious factors influence individual and group decision-making processes. For example, managers can gain insight into time management concepts if they understand why people spend or do not spend time on certain activities288. Morgan noted that there are some activities at work which can be highly valued, because they are designed to leave a legacy. Individuals who need to leave a legacy can then be focused more on these activities. This helps leaders communicate effectively with subordinates.

Organizational metaphors influence researchers in the formulation of their theories. They also influence practitioners in shaping structures and processes. They work because of paradigmatic assumptions about the organizational reality\(^{289}\), bringing them together in a self-contained and consistent analogy. Gareth Morgan\(^ {290} \) brought to light a range of eight metaphors of organization. He used the same framework that is used for ordering in organizational science. He viewed organizations as machines, organisms, as well as brains and cultures, political systems and psychic prisons, and viewed flux and transformation as instruments of domination. Other literary figures have repeatedly extended this set of organization metaphors. We can take the example of the theatre metaphor of Mangham and Overrington\(^ {291}\), or the jazz metaphor of Weick\(^ {292}\). There have been subsequent debates around metaphors in organization research, which have tended to concentrate on two main issues. The first is the fundamental question of the scientific status of the metaphor approach and its uses in organizational science\(^ {293}\). The second issue does not have much dispute, and focuses on the use of metaphors in the process of organizational change and transformation\(^ {294}\).

Metaphors have great use in communication of broad, abstract concepts. These concepts include organizational mission and strategy. They are also useful in situations requiring innovative concepts and approaches\(^ {295}\). Using metaphors in management increases the understanding of complicated and intangible concepts, in alignment with simpler and tangible concepts. An image can help in
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studying something, and metaphors help with this. These images can provide the basis for detailed scientific research. Research determines the extent to which you find the features of the metaphor in the subject of inquiry\textsuperscript{296}. This enhances and amplifies the view of the organization, allowing members to become more enlightened about the impediments faced by the organization. They understand how the organization can become unburdened and more effective. Metaphors are complex by nature and can have multiple interpretations and implications. They require careful examination to understand the message they convey\textsuperscript{297}. However, we should not forget the actual purpose of organizational metaphors. They simplify the explanations of the workings of the enterprise. In doing so, they bring increased understanding, by delimiting the mind. Thus, they encourage practitioners to think outside the box. One metaphor is enough to understand certain aspects of an organization. But it can be an imperfect understanding\textsuperscript{298}. We included multiple images instead of allowing the domination of a single perspective when reading organizations. It is true that most organizations require more than one metaphor to bring out reality.

Despite the fact that the Morganian theory based on metaphors rejects classic principles of formal logic, according to which a given object cannot be itself and its opposite at the same time, the metaphorical approach agrees to the multidimensionality of organizations, which can be “a bit of everything”, e.g. a culture, an organism, and a brain. However, one should realize that metaphors cannot and should not be used completely freely.

Metaphorical thinking puts us on certain tracks, indicating hidden characteristics of the object studied, at the same time concealing certain aspects of the phenomena.

3. **Metaphors in organizational culture**

Organizational culture itself is often understood as a metaphor and described with the use of a number of metaphors. The issue of organizational culture is considered to be on the borderline between two discourses and numerous


\textsuperscript{298} Itkin H., Nagy M., *Theoretical and Practical Use of Metaphors in Organizational Development and Beyond*, <http://pmr.uni-pannon.hu/articles/3_4_itkin_nagy.pdf>.
scientific disciplines. On the one hand, it is immersed in the theory of culture, which is the subject of such sciences as sociology, social psychology, cultural anthropology, cultural studies and other humanities. On the other hand, it is also the subject of research studies in the field of management, both in terms of theory as well as methodology and pragmatism. The consequence of its interdisciplinary nature is an abundance of inspirations, as well as a multiplicity of approaches, resulting in disparities and inconsistencies in many concepts of organizational culture.

The interest in organizational culture in the literature dates back to the beginning of the 1980s. Among other things, the fact that the shared way of thinking and behaving contributes to the shaping of organizational culture was emphasized then. The shared way of thinking and behaving is classified as a soft factor, and soft factors more and more often become subjects of research into organizations, and particularly organizational culture. National culture and organizational culture have a number of common characteristics, however, it has to be said that both these notions refer to different phenomena, as national values should be treated as acquired factors that are developed during childhood, while organizational values are trained factors, mainly manifested in the area of organizational practice. The first definition of organizational culture appeared in the middle of the 20th century, and it read as follows: “The culture of the factory is its customary and traditional way of thinking and doing things, which is shared to a greater or lesser extent by all its members, and which new members must learn, and at least partially accept, in order to be accepted into service in the firm.”

Organizational culture is created by units, people, and processes taking place in the organization. As such, it is not superior to the organization, as it is its internal element, a kind of an imperative.

299 Chmielecki M., Komunikacja międzykulturowa w procesie zarządzania negocjacjami, rozprawa doktorskia, Społeczna Wyższa Szkoła Przedsiębiorczości i Zarządzania, Łódź 2010.
Organizational culture is associated with the deeply hidden organizational structure, based on assumptions, beliefs, and values held by employees. Meanings are determined as part of the socialization process within groups of different identities, which coexist in the workplace. Interactions build the world of symbols, which on the one hand ensures high stability of culture, but on the other hand makes it a bit unstable and fragile, which results from the dependence of the system on the behavior of individuals and cognitive processes. “In the context of the functioning of organizations, the culture of one organization can become a source of competitive advantage in certain institutional and market conditions, the culture of a different organization makes it a perfect workplace, while the culture of yet another organization is an element promoting innovation or making it possible to develop operations on an international or even global scale.”

According to C. Christensen, organizational culture is derived from human resources that, right after setting up an enterprise, form its most significant potential. As an organization develops, people cooperate, co-creating processes. After a business model of a company crystallizes, one can indicate actions that should be prioritized. Thus values appear. When organization members start fostering them and behaving in accordance with established norms, for example by following procedures, it can be said that a unique organizational culture has been created.

H. Steinmann and G. Schreyögg examine organizational culture from the anthropological perspective, i.e. they assume that it is a historically formed and coherent value system and a way of thinking, together with symbols expressing them, created as a result of human interactions. In their works, the authors claim that “enterprises develop their own patterns and orientations, which effectively leave their mark on the behavior of employees and the functioning of the enterprise. (...) Thus, organizational culture is a kind of an intellectual community, understood as the basis for the whole organizational activity.” According to the authors, organizational culture aims to reflect the way organization members perceive the world, on account of which “organization members create an image of
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conditions for the performance of tasks on common bases, (...) making a new organization member realize how to act in accordance with the cultural tradition.”307

Organizational culture has a significant influence on the functioning of an organization, and from the perspective of effectiveness it can serve both positive and negative functions. According to E. Schein, organizational culture has two important functions, which concern problems connected with the adjustment of external factors and problems connected with the internal functioning of the organization.

Table. 5 Functions of culture in terms of internal and external adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In terms of internal adjustment, culture serves the following functions:</th>
<th>In terms of external adjustment, culture serves the following functions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It makes it possible for its participants to understand the mission and the strategy of an organization, and to identify the basic organizational objective, • It enables integration of its participants, • It enables integration focusing on measures adopted to fulfil the company's objectives and it increases the involvement of employees, • It makes it possible to use uniform measurement methods and criteria for evaluating effects, • It makes it possible to improve the ways of acting and reformulating objectives when necessary.</td>
<td>• It offers a common language and conceptual apparatus, • It defines group boundaries and criteria for acceptance and rejection, • It determines the rules of power and criteria for status, and makes it possible to avoid conflicts over power, negative emotions, aggressive actions, • It determines the ways of acquiring authority as well as how and when one can criticize those holding power, their decisions and proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sułkowski Ł., Procesy kulturowe w organizacjach, Dom Organizatora, Toruń 2002, p. 56.

“Organizational culture is a set of values and norms helping its members to understand what the organization supports, how it operates, and what it deems important.”308
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The significance of culture in an organization results from the three functions it serves in the working environment, and these are perceptual, integrational, and adaptive functions\(^{309}\).

Table 6. Functions and descriptions of organizational culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual function</td>
<td>Organizational culture is formed by a system of collectively accepted meanings. <strong>The perceptual function</strong> consists in determining the way the environment is perceived and in transmitting a clear image of the world. By making it clear and comprehensible to the organization members, one gives meaning to the social life. In order to be able to perform their tasks, people need to operate in a reality they perceive as ordered, with clearly stated requirements. The image of the organization created in the employees’ minds depends on their own culture and perceptual abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrational function</td>
<td>Thanks to <strong>the integrational function</strong> culture serves as a bond holding the organization together. Identical elements of organizational culture support the creation of common patterns of thinking and values, and they give employees a sense of security, enhancing their sense of affiliation to the organization. Integration can be achieved thanks to the arrangements concerning the language of communication, and the shared understanding of certain notions. The bond forming in a group of employees ensures a sense of security and satisfies the need for affiliation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Function Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive function</td>
<td>The adaptive function regulates the life of an organization by providing ready schemas of responding to all changes taking place in the environment, or it consists in the development of schemas of action by the group. It plays an adaptive role in situations of high uncertainty, resulting from difficulties encountered in the workplace. Through its actions, the organization explains incomprehensible issues or doubts, and it can provide means and patterns of behavior that speed up the process of adaptation. These patterns of behavior followed in the organization allow its members to feel confident as well as to plan and foresee their behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own study.

When referring to organizational culture, many authors use the notion of the “network of meanings created by man”. For example, C. Geertz believes that an analysis of culture is not an experimental science looking for laws but an interpretative science looking for meaning\(^ {310} \). Similarly, L. Smircich emphasizes the need for studying organizational culture understood as a network of meanings\(^ {311} \).

E. Schein assumed that there are three levels of organizational culture:

1. Artifacts and products, i.e. visible manifestations of culture, including its language, art, architecture, and other physical objects as well as its visible system of organization of interpersonal relationships, status levels, gender roles, and age-related roles;
2. Values, ideologies, i.e. rules, principles, norms, values, morality, and ethics, which orient both the objectives of the given society (group) and means to achieve them;


3. Basic assumptions and conditions, which the author understands as essential, usually unconscious, assumptions concerning the nature of truth and reality, human nature, relationships between people and nature, relationships between people, and the nature of time and space\textsuperscript{312}.

Metaphors has been used in management practically since its very beginning. A metaphorical analysis of organizational culture is characteristic of the discourse of humanities.

An analytical scientific reflection on the cognitive value of metaphors within research into organizations is only related to the development of the cultural current\textsuperscript{313}. The end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s saw rapid development of the concepts of organizational culture and culture in management.

Anthropological analyzes of culture and intercultural comparative studies (mostly related to the works of Hofstede) contributed to an increased interest in values and culture in the management science.

Some organizations perceive their own organizational culture as a strategic tool, which is used for orienting all employees and departments towards common objectives. Numerous enterprises try to create their own culture and transplant its standards and values to their employees. Enterprises functioning very efficiently for a long time are characterized by a strong corporate culture. In numerous international corporations the culture of the parent company has a very large impact on standards and cultural behaviors at its branches in other countries. It is worth noting that it is communication that substantially influences an organizational culture’s shaping\textsuperscript{314}.

Organizational culture and communication are linked with each other. Organizational culture has a fundamental influence on communication processes taking place inside a given organization and, simultaneously, communication processes have an impact on the shape of organizational culture. The ability to systematically raise awareness concerning the role of communication should be the pillar for developing competitiveness by contemporary enterprises. Success of the contemporary enterprise is, to a large extent, based on the capacity to efficiently manage communication, and knowledge and information related to


\textsuperscript{313} Kövecses Z., Metaphor in culture: universality and variation, Cambridge University Press 2005.

\textsuperscript{314} Chmielecki M., Culture as a barrier of knowledge sharing, “Journal of Intercultural Management”, 2014.
this sphere constitute today the enterprise’s strategic resource determining its competitive position, survival and, above all, development. M. Kostera regards organizational culture as a system of interpersonal communication. In this sense culture offers both “audible” and “inaudible” language and provides the common image of the world, ourselves and our role. It teaches us how to function in the world or how to evaluate what is right and what is wrong and allows us to arrange the rules of social coexistence.

The development of the cultural trend in management entailed more metaphors describing organizational culture. As a result, there appeared clear differences between representatives of different paradigms, who perceive culture in different ways.

The functionalist paradigm is dominated by metaphors of organizational culture understood as a method for integrating members or elements of an organization.

In metaphors characteristic of this current, key values of culture, philosophy of management, and directions of the organizational development are combined. Interpreted in functionalist terms, organizational culture can be thus compared to “social glue”, “clan”, “resource”, or “compass”. In the literature, the ideal is a cohesive, strong, and integrated organizational culture, which bonds the whole organization like “glue”.

In this context, it can be a source of the employees’ identification with the organization, which can increase their loyalty and create a coherent and positive internal image and unity related to the set goals and values.

Functionalists believe that culture yields to control and management, depending on the needs of the organization and its managers. Thus, it is a management tool allowing to achieve higher work effectiveness and increase the involvement of employees.

As organizational culture can determine the direction of the organization’s development, it can be understood as a kind of a “compass”.

In the case of non-functionalist paradigms, metaphors of organizational culture and organization are actually the same. If one assumes a root metaphor, according to which an organization “is a culture, and does not have culture”, then

comparing any object to an organization entails comparing it to organizational culture. The most common metaphors of an organization and, in consequence, of organizational culture include comparisons to a temple, theatre, text, language, work of art, acting and drama, flow, autopoiesis, and brain. In interpretivism, metaphors focus on comparing culture to complex social processes or beings.

In the cognitive sense, metaphors within the functionalist paradigm can be accused of lack of faith in the possibility of interpreting and explaining reality. This results from the fact that these metaphors explain management processes which are difficult to interpret with the use of equally complex phenomena, such as language or brain. On the other hand, interpretative metaphors focus on indicating complex social processes.

In the CMS current, there are many cultural and organizational metaphors connected with oppressiveness and inequality, perceived from the critical perspective. The most popular metaphors within this paradigm include comparing an organization to a political system, ideology and totalitarianism, war and battle, psychological prison, and a tool of domination and repression. It is worth noting that describing culture as “a tool of domination and repression” is commonly and often literally quoted within the critical current to describe negative aspects of control in organizations. Metaphors of the critical current are rather one-sided and they focus on the repressiveness and control in organizations.

In the postmodern understanding, organization and management are mostly of metaphorical character. In postmodernism, ideas and theories are figurative rather than literal. This is related to the fact that postmodernism refers to the “language game” and “linguistic turn” proposed by Wittgenstein.

Postmodern metaphors are mostly exploited in the literary and not cognitive meaning. Postmodernists representing radical humanism believe that literature often has a more positive influence on the understanding of the world than the strict scientific method.

As one can see, metaphors can be attributed to different paradigms. This means that the way metaphors are interpreted highlights the assumptions made and brings to mind associations and images rooted in different cognitive perspectives.

A metaphorical analysis can be used to study and change organizational culture. Its unquestionable advantages include high reflectiveness and a possibility of an in-depth exploration of phenomena. A metaphorical analysis is a highly

unorthodox and creative method, which is particularly useful for examining and understanding complex processes and phenomena, such as organizational culture. However, it is worth noting that the use of metaphors in cultural research in management has a number of limitations.

1. Although it is a reflective method, it is also non-structured and non-standardized, which narrows down the possibility of applying it to creative aspects rather than broader, systematic analyzes and measurements on a larger scale.
2. Such interpretation of reality entails a high risk. Freedom of comparisons can lead to losing cognitive functions and substituting them with the creative function related to imagination.
3. A metaphorical analysis gives rise to problems connected with distinguishing metaphors from literal phrases. As it is often emphasized, language as such is metaphorical.
4. There are obvious problems connected with attributing a metaphor to only one paradigm, as everything depends on the way it is interpreted. The meaning of a comparison is relatively fluid.
5. Equating organizational culture with the whole organization is characteristic of non-functionalist paradigms, and it entails the broadening of the sphere of comparisons, as a result of which they become too general and not very specific.

The essence and problems of the metaphorical approach to organizational culture presented in this book by no means exhaust the complexity of the phenomenon. It is also worth paying attention to the issue of the multitude of proposals and lack of a consensus about a kind of a canon of metaphorical methods in management.

M.J. Gannon mentions the metaphorical understanding of organizational culture as a computer, a tree, a whale, a gene pool, a rainbow, a prism, a school, a skyscraper, or a filter.

The metaphorical approach in management described is applied in research as well as managerial and advisory practice all over the world. The metaphorical analysis of organizational culture is part of the field of humanities. On one
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hand, metaphor, like metonymy, parable or synecdoche, is a figure of speech that is used in literature and that has been described and analyzed by philologists and linguists (Black). On the other hand, metaphor serves as a cognitive tool that uses analogies and images to compare complex and abstract objects and processes to those that are simpler and easier to understand (Davidson).

Metaphors have always been applied in management. However, it is only since the rise of cultural management studies that scholars have been investigating the cognitive value of metaphors in organizational studies (Kövecses). The end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s witnessed rapid development in the concepts of organizational culture and culture in management. A number of comparative cross-cultural studies, anthropological analyses of culture, and best-selling publications addressed to managers contributed to the increased interest in values and culture in management studies. In his book *Images of Organization*, Gareth Morgan suggested the possibility of using metaphors to examine organizational and management-related problems. One of the metaphors presented by Morgan, which he considered most creative, was based on a comparison between an organization and culture. Since the publication of Morgan’s ground-breaking book, metaphorical analysis has become popular in management studies and is now commonly used both as a tool to help create theories of organization and organizational culture, and as a method of management.

Metaphorical thinking serves as a useful way of studying organizations and as a crucial aspect of the cognitive process in management. Metaphors are a feature of language and their changes reflect the transformations in our ways of thinking and speaking, as well as in our organizational activities. Depending on the perspective, a metaphor can be perceived as a useful technique or a foundation facilitating the understanding of organization. However, it must be remembered that the use of metaphors should not be completely arbitrary. Metaphorical thinking gives us certain clues, indicates features of the object of our analyses, and stimulates creative thinking, but identifying the given object with a metaphor does not make any sense. Still, using and discovering the *quasi*-metaphorical process in interpreting management should enhance our understanding of organizational life (cf. Schmidt).

Organizational culture is often interpreted as a metaphor and described in metaphors. After all, in Morgan’s understanding, culture is a metaphor for organization.

---


As a result of the development of cultural management studies, a number of metaphors describing organizational culture have emerged. This has also led to the clear distinction between the representatives of various paradigms who perceive culture in their own ways.

Functionalists mainly use metaphors of organizational culture understood as a method of integrating the organization, which brings together its key values, management philosophy, and directions of development. Interpreted from a functionalist perspective, organizational culture can thus be compared to: “social glue,” “a clan,” “a resource” or “a compass”\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^4\). The ideal model presents a strong, coherent, and well-integrated organizational culture, which bonds together the whole organization (like “glue”). It can therefore be a source of employees’ identification with the organization, strengthening their loyalty, giving them a positive image of the organization, and building a sense of unity reinforced by common goals and values (“a clan”). Organizational culture is subjected to control, the scope of which depends on the needs of the organization and its managers. According to functionalists, it therefore serves as a tool that facilitates increasing productivity and employees’ commitment by unlocking the social and emotional potential of the organization (“a resource”). Organizational culture also determines the direction of the organization’s development. It expresses goals and values, and serves as an organizational creed (“a compass”). Furthermore, organizational culture is also the source of organizational philosophy, which influences people in both conscious and subconscious ways.

In the case of non-functionalist paradigms, the metaphors of organization and organizational culture are basically identical. If one accepts the assumption informing the root metaphor, according to which organization is not “something an organization has” but “something an organization is”\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^5\), a comparison between an object and organization is equivalent to comparing the object to organizational culture. Among the most common metaphors of organization are: a temple, theatre, text, language, a work of art, acting and drama, flux, autopoiesis, and a brain. The metaphors of temple, theatre, and language have been used by, among others, Linda Smircich (“Organizations”), Mary Jo Hatch, and Barbara Czarniawska-Jorges to describe interpretive and symbolic aspects of organizations. The metaphors of acting, drama, and works of art were taken from Ervin

Goffman, one of the founders of symbolic interactionism. The metaphorical approach to organization, and also to organizational culture that is depicted as a brain, flux, and autopoiesis was put forward by Gareth Morgan. Interpretive metaphors compare culture to complex social processes and complex entities (a brain). It can be argued that, in cognitive terms, their potential to interpret and explain reality is limited, because they explicate difficult management processes by making references to equally complex and difficult entities such as a brain, language, or social processes. At the same time, however, these metaphors point to the uniqueness and exceptionality of management, understood as a complex social process.

Critical management studies (CMS) uses many cultural and organizational metaphors which convey the essence of oppressiveness and inequality, perceived from a critical perspective. One of the most popular metaphors compares an organization to a psychic prison, a tool of domination and oppression, a political system, an ideology and totalitarianism, war and battle, and the panopticon. The metaphor of the psychic prison was proposed by Morgan, who in his book *Images of Organization* mostly used it to describe certain obsessive, repressive, and self-censoring aspects of the human psyche. The perception of culture as “a tool of domination and repression” is quite popular and is commonly used in critical management studies to describe the negative aspects of cultural control. This is also true of such metaphors as an ideology, war, and the panopticon. According to representatives of CMS, organizational culture is a source of ideologically “false consciousness,” “symbolic violence,” as well as conflict that is inherent to the system and the struggle of social groups. The panopticon, by contrast, is a historical metaphor. Borrowed by Michel Foucault from Jeremy Bentham, it refers to a perfect model of surveillance and control. Alluding to Hugh Willmott and Mat Alvesson, Michał Zawadzki proposes a metaphorical understanding of organizational culture as an emancipatory tool. The metaphors used by the proponents of critical management studies are rather one-sided and ideologically laden, since they focus only on two aspects of organization: oppressiveness and control. Underscoring the above-mentioned aspects of management, these comparisons tend to neglect its positive dimensions. Still, they do accurately reflect the nature of radical structuralism.

Generally, the postmodern understanding of organization is metaphorical. This means that the majority of ideas and theories are based on metaphors and analogies, rather than being constructed in a literal way. This phenomenon is closely connected to the fact that postmodernism is much indebted to Wittgenstein’s “language-games” and “linguistic turn,” as well as to its literary, artistic, and textual roots. As described by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, a rhizome is one of the earliest cultural metaphors, used by postmodernists to describe a shapeless tangle of threads whose roots are hard to trace. “Simulacra” and “the matrix,” by contrast, communicate the idea of postmodern hyper-reality, in which the essentialist notions of sense and truth are no longer valid. Cultural processes are a game, a simulation. They serve as multiple curtains behind which no core truth or reality can be hidden (Baudrillard). The metaphors of a supermarket, collage, and happening represent culture as an eclectic, indeterministic and unpredictable entity, which can be internally contradictory and develops spontaneously. Most postmodern metaphors are used in their literary rather than cognitive sense. This is because postmodernists, as supporters of radical humanism, claim that literature is a better tool for understanding the world than the authority of science. Such a way of thinking, however, leads to excessive attachment to popular cultural metaphors, which are too often used uncritically. Zygmunt Bauman, for instance, has published extensively on the concept of the “liquid modern world.” He has written fascinating essays in the field of cultural philosophy. However, apart from various un-systematized observations, they do not offer any results from empirical research.

Metaphors can therefore be attributed to a specific way of thinking connected with a particular paradigm. This means that each interpretation of a metaphor accentuates certain prior assumptions and brings to mind associations and images that are characteristic of a given cognitive perspective (see Table 35 below).

Table 35. Metaphors in various paradigms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neo-positivist-Functionalist-Systemic paradigm (NFS)</th>
<th>Critical paradigm (radical structuralism, critical management studies, CMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social glue,</td>
<td>a political system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a clan,</td>
<td>an ideology and totalitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a resource,</td>
<td>war and a battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a compass</td>
<td>a prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a shooting range and a labyrinth</strong></td>
<td>the panopticon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>obsessive-compulsive neurosis</strong></td>
<td>an emancipatory tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive-Symbolic paradigm</td>
<td>Postmodernism (radical humanism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acting, theatre, drama</td>
<td>a temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion and a temple</td>
<td>a performance and a happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flux, transformation, autopoiesis</td>
<td>a work of art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a brain</td>
<td>a rhizome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text and language</td>
<td>a collage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a chameleon</td>
<td>a matryoshka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a <strong>masked ball</strong></td>
<td>a matrix and simulacra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schizophrenia</td>
<td><strong>a house of mirrors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>autism</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own work; words in bold are this author’s own metaphors.

The metaphors given above for organizational culture correspond to the four paradigms proposed by Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan. However, it is important to note that, depending on the interpretation, many of them can also be used in various other paradigms. This brings us to one of the features of metaphorical thinking, which is that the cognitive and pragmatic functions of a metaphor depend on its interpretation. The metaphor of the organization as a brain can, for instance, be
functionalist if we assume the computational theory of mind to be true. Organizing is thus primarily seen as being based on learning and processing information. However, if we assume that the brain is responsible for perception, interpretation, and understanding the world, then we put emphasis on reflective processes and we can contextualize the metaphor in the discourse of symbolic interactionism. Other metaphors used in the management discourse, such as a temple, text, and language, similarly have multiple meanings and fit in various paradigms.

The classifications in Table 1 cover metaphors which are deeply rooted in the management discourse (glue, a clan, a resource, theatre, language, a prison); are used occasionally, but are not very popular (a work of art, a collage, a chameleon, a matryoshka); have been taken from other discourses of humanities and social sciences (the panopticon, a rhizome, simulacra and a matrix), or are totally new (a shooting range and a labyrinth, obsessive-compulsive neurosis, pride, etc.). The last two metaphors in each category ironically illustrate the thesis of the interpretive character of metaphors. When interpreting a given entity, we can compare it to another, because of the nature of language and our cognitive apparatus. Thus, culture can, for instance, be compared to various attractions in a theme park, or even to mental disorders or emotions. Interpreted as “a shooting range and a labyrinth,” organizational culture is oriented towards one effective solution – success. The metaphor of “a haunted house” alludes to the dark side of human nature. The comparison to “a masked ball” brings to one’s mind an instant association with multiple organizational roles and identities. The metaphor of “a house of mirrors” evokes multiple, distorted reflections. As regards the metaphors of cultural processes depicted in terms of mental disorders, one can also easily find various arbitrary points of reference. Organizational culture in the NFS paradigm can ironically be read as “an obsessive thought” about the need to reach cognitive certainty and perfection in management, which is conspicuous in “compulsive actions” such as an obsessive search for methodological perfection – “the perfect scholarly method” of cognition and culture management. Organizational culture in the paradigm of Critical Management Studies (CMS) can sometimes be reminiscent of a paranoid vision caused by persecutory delusions. Consequently, culture can be seen as a tool of oppression, “false consciousness,” and psychological manipulation, and as a social engineering technique used to control and exploit employees. An uncritical attitude to these persecutory delusions might cause paranoia among the seemingly healthy members of an organization. In the paradigm of symbolic interactionism, organizational culture can be compared to schizophrenic psychosis. Culture understood as “schizophrenia” is characterized by a split (Greek schisis) between emotions and reflective thinking,
which unfortunately leads to permanent dysfunction. In a similar way, the post-
modern “autism” of organizational culture can be interpreted as an instance of
the management discourse being enclosed in its own world.

The metaphorical method is commonly used to examine and change organi-
zational cultures. Its key advantages include: openness and a reflective nature,
thanks to which this method is both unorthodox and creative. This is particularly
useful in studying and understanding as complex and ephemeral phenomena as
organizational culture. On the other hand, using metaphors in cultural manage-
ment studies has a number of limitations:

6. The reflective method is unstructured and unstandardized, and thus its use-
fulness is limited to its creative aspects and does not cover systematic analy-
ses and measurements. After all, metaphors are only used in qualitative and
interpretive research.

7. The analysis of “new metaphors” (culture as “a theme park” or “a mental dis-
order”) indicates the dangers inherent in this way of interpreting reality. The
arbitrariness of comparisons can lead to the total loss of the cognitive func-
tion. It could then be replaced by the creative function, which is itself con-
ected with imagination and associations (Oswick and Jones).

8. Discriminating between a metaphor and literal presentation can be difficult.
In general, language is metaphorical, a fact to which most people do not usu-
ally pay much attention. Is “a resource” a metaphor? When this article talks
about the metaphor of “a resource” which “helps unlock employees’ poten-
tial,” it is using two further metaphors – “Unlocking” is a mechanical meta-
phor that compares starting an action to opening a lock with a key, while the
term “potential” is borrowed directly from physics.

9. It is often very difficult to assign a metaphor to only one paradigm, since its
understanding depends on its interpretation. The meaning of the compari-
son is rather fluid – for instance, although “organizational glasses” originally
derive from the functionalist paradigm, in time they have become a method
of interpreting organizational culture in accordance with other paradigms.
“Organizational glasses” are an interpretive metaphor as well, since culture is
also seen as synonymous with the perception of reality. “Black organiza-
tional glasses” could represent the perception of reality by culture, approached
from the perspective of the critical paradigm.

10. The perception of organizational culture as being synonymous with the
whole organization is characteristic of non-functionalist paradigms. It con-
siderably broadens the area of comparison, which makes these paradigms
too general and imprecise.
The analysis of the nature of the metaphorical approach and its problems presented in this chapter does not address all aspects of this complex issue. It is possible, for instance, to name other cultural metaphors used in research and management education. For example, M.J. Gannon describes the metaphorical understanding of organizational culture as a computer, a tree, a whale, a gene pool, a rainbow, a prism, a school, a skyscraper, and a filter. Another problem resides in the multiplicity of ideas and the lack of consensus regarding the canonical metaphorical method in management.

4. Metaphors in strategic management

Johnson et al. define strategy as “…the direction and scope of an organization over a long term, achieving advantage in a changing environment with the aim of fulfilling stakeholder expectations through its configuration of resources and competences”. Metaphors help the management to cope with the key challenges in developing management strategy. These include assurance and management of creative insight as well as sense making.

It cannot be denied that present-day strategic management is metaphor minded. For example Porter’s ‘Five Forces’ model is a mainstay of strategic management textbooks that directly calls upon metaphors from a source domain entrenched in the competition with the military and war. The Five Forces model itself includes adversarial terminology indicative of military language, such as ‘threat of new entrants’, ‘bargaining power of suppliers’, and ‘rivalry amongst existing competitors’. Correspondingly, corporate executives often draw upon military and war metaphors such as GE’s former CEO Jack Welch, who consistently included war metaphors in his annual letters to stockholders, talking about GE and its competition. Similarly, sports metaphors are everywhere in strategic


management, and like military metaphors they also conclude that business is a zero-sum game. Even a quick glance at the non-fiction business bestseller list reveals that anthropomorphism is omnipresent.

These days, businesses are operating in a disordered manner, with organizations seeking procedures that will allow them to enhance their performance and competitiveness. There is strength in the argument that managers cannot operate as scientists. This is because they operate in complex and unpredictable market environments. They have their own limitations as far as their judgment is concerned. Nevertheless, upper management still expects them to conceive new creative solutions with their limited resources. This is a psychological process, intuitive and symbolic and not merely institutional, formal, conscious, or rational. Real conditions demand autonomous personal judgment. This is the key quality enabling strategic decisions. There is much literature available on strategy development with rich ‘rational’ analytical tools, such as SWOT analysis. However, there are not many tools available aimed at intuitive, symbolic, or pre-rational aspects of strategy. One of the few that is, is metaphorical thinking. Managers can use metaphors to improve their thinking and sense-making abilities. These metaphors pertain to implicit assumptions, intuition, creativity, and reflexivity.

Hunt and Menon argue that the four most commonly used frameworks in competitive strategy writing are all based on metaphors. These are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 7. Dimensions of metaphoric transfer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Theories</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>Military science</td>
<td>Nations, armies, divisions battalions, non-combatants, combatants, allies, military academies</td>
<td>Strategy, tactics, missions, intelligence deployment, action diplomacy, echelon, fortification, espionage, pre-emption rules and level of war, mobilization</td>
<td>Theory of absolute war, theory of cold war, voluntary theory, Douhet's theory of war</td>
<td>Victory, defense, retaliation, honor, duty to country, territory, conquest, economic gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Teams, players, fans, coaches, writers, commentators, referees, scores, audience, bookies, sponsors, leagues championship</td>
<td>Offense, defense, cooperation, team spirit, score</td>
<td>Zero-sum game theory, finite game theory, infinite game theory, prisoner's dilemma</td>
<td>Sponsorship, gamesmanship, competition, exercise, pleasure, relaxation, release of energy, physical fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizm</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Cells, humans, plants, animals, ecosystem, genes</td>
<td>Life-cycle, growth, adaptation, nutrition, niche, environment, resources, progress</td>
<td>Evolutio-nary theory, natural selection, adaptation theory</td>
<td>Life, growth, survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>Theories</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>Sociology, home economics</td>
<td>Spouses, family, household children, orphans, relatives, step-relatives, father, mother, sister, brother, neighbors, marriage, marriage counselors</td>
<td>Kinship, relationship trust, reproduction, partners, divorce, extramarital affairs, alimony, child support</td>
<td>Marital theory</td>
<td>Commitment, love, harmony, financial security, protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As we can see in the table X – business is often portrayed as a war or a battlefield, football, or a game of chess where not just brilliance is required, but also intelligence, logic and planning. These regularly conveyed metaphors imply that business is, on a very basic level, about rivalry or competition. Hence, the goal of strategic management has to do with figuring out how to 'get the upper hand' for their firm.\(^{337}\)

*The use of sport as metaphor and analogy can be advantageous. Not only can sports idioms and phrases be used in non-sporting contexts to explain meanings, but we can understand other concepts through their link to sports. Sport has been used as an analogy to relate and to direct life experiences.*

*The rhetoric that is conveyed from the playing field to daily life (such as in advertising, business and politics) has created a function that Hardaway\(^{338}\) calls “public doublespeak”, which serves to influence its users as well as its audiences and which, she argues, can allow conscience to be ignored. Also, Gozzi\(^{339}\) suggests that the game metaphor is used in society without much reflection, and*

---

has become so pervasive that in time we will not be able to see any differences between life and games.

The dominant metaphor in strategic management is the war metaphor. It offers an insight as to how the business field can benefit from application of strategic approaches and knowledge from the military field. Sun Tzu’s battle stratagems are the basis for development of model of business strategy development of Ho & Choi. The thirty-six stratagems have various strategic uses. They employ a ‘strategy as deception’ metaphor.

The supremacy of a competitive metaphor and goals in gaining the upper hand can attract a competitive environment that misleads the reason of business from being about ‘worth creation’ and hinder deliberation toward morals, humanism, and sustainability; ‘the ability to keep business on and going’.

Bracker records the historical evolution of the strategic management concept. He describes its basics as deeply entrenched in a militaristic/war tradition that is attached to the intellectual complement of economics. In 2010 Audebrand built upon Backer’s account, to describe military and war metaphors that control strategic management and how these prevent the progression of the sustainability agenda. For instance, militaristic and war metaphors are fictitious abstracts and models found all through strategic management textbooks.

Kim & Mauborgne use the (blue) ocean metaphor in a different manner. It is an effective strategy, and not necessarily a deceptive one. It attempts to make competitors irrelevant. There are other relevant strategic metaphors such

---


as Design\(^{344}\), Theater\(^{345}\), and Jazz\(^{346}\). These have one thing in common. Strategy should be understood in a more open, improvisational, and flexible manner as compared to the traditional strategic planning framework. This is the strategy as discovery metaphor\(^{347}\). Vein Prahalad and Ramaswamy\(^{348}\) also use this method, in which strategy is a process of continuous experimentation, innovation, and discovery that requires co-creation with customers and collaborators. One interesting example is the work of Minzberg et al.\(^{349}\), which uses ten different animals as metaphors to explain the differences between ten different schools of strategy.

Table 1 below portrays the interrelations between theoretical paradigms and views of metaphor and strategy. It suggests that particular views of strategy are associated with particular social science paradigms, and have a corresponding view of metaphor.

The use of military and other popular metaphors have a limitation to anecdotal illustrations\(^{350}\) or a qualitative research method\(^{351}\). Management tends to neglect the more operative and systematic use of metaphors for strategic purposes. Many people have doubts about the usefulness of metaphors in strategic management. However, they can be very relevant tools when used in an appropriate way. It is important for strategists to have sufficient knowledge of the context and content of a particular domain when choosing their metaphors. This is a prerequisite for productive metaphor transfer.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivist organization theory (Donaldson\textsuperscript{352})</td>
<td>Essentialist realism; reality is rule-governed, external, fixed, independent of observers’ perception and experience</td>
<td>Rationalism; knowledge derives from pure reason and can be expressed and analyzed in terms of formal logic or other symbolic systems. A-priori knowledge is thus possible</td>
<td>Strategic planning. Strategy is rational and objective, determined via a structured process, and implemented through appropriate resource allocation decisions. Strategy content orientation</td>
<td>Metaphors are merely ornamental and expendable linguistic devices. They distort analysis of ‘facts’ that should be stated literally, and have no place in an objective, rational science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Constructionism (Berger &amp; Luckmann\textsuperscript{353}; Gergen\textsuperscript{354})</td>
<td>Ideationism; social (and for some authors even material) reality is context dependent, shifting, based on perspective, values and interests of observer. There are no fixed essences but only ephemeral social constructions</td>
<td>Early philosophical empiricism; we can only know reality through our sense perceptions or mental constructs rather than a-priori. Relativism; there are no universal laws, only contingent contexts</td>
<td>Interpretive approach to strategy. Shifting managerial paradigms shape strategizing processes, and to understand strategy we need to understand cognitive maps and relevant strategy practices. Strategy process orientation</td>
<td>Metaphors are constructive of social and organizational reality, as well as social science. They pattern ways of seeing that influence action. Views differ as to metaphors’ creative potential (e.g. comparison vs domain interaction views)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Paradigmatic approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Ontology: Nature of Reality</th>
<th>Epistemology: Theory of knowledge</th>
<th>Strategy approach</th>
<th>View of Metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embodied realism (Johnson(^{355}), Lakoff(^{356}), Lakoff &amp; Johnson(^{357}))</td>
<td>Experientialism; we perceive and understand the reality of external, independent elements through the way our body shapes our experiences and perceptions; social reality is shaped by the features of our bodily being</td>
<td>There is no unmediated perception. We know social reality via our image schemas, themselves being metaphorical and based on the way we exist, experience and reason about the world in and through our bodies</td>
<td>Strategy as crafting. Strategic actors construct embodied metaphors of strategic significance through a practice of metaphorical reasoning and praxis, involving processes of recursive enactment.</td>
<td>Metaphors, particularly spatial and orientational ones, are fundamental to our reasoning and interpretation of the world, and are derived from our embodied existence in the world. Embodied metaphors can be a medium of strategic enactment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A crucial component of success in strategic management is to expand the metaphors that provide a universal clue, capturing the real meaning of the organization’s actions, summarizing its strategic objectives and organizational cultures, and showing its principles and business stance. Strategists can utilize the strategic management metaphor to combine the activities of the organization with its mission and aim.


5. Metaphors in organizational conflict

We tend to think of the term ‘conflict’ negatively. Conflict is usually seen as the product of a ‘squeaky wheel’. Conflict causes anxieties in the short term, and people want to ‘resolve’ the conflict. In the business world, we unwittingly refer to it as an ill that makes jobs much more difficult, a force that diminishes productivity and something that needs to be expunged before a company can achieve its goals – instead of conflict being seen as a natural business derivative.

Conflict has become more pervasive than ever as the 21st century’s second decade comes to a close, and it has never been more difficult to diffuse. This can largely be attributed to the speed-and-stealth model that competing in a global, lightning-fast business environment forces modern businesses to adopt. Multi-functional teams, diversified in skill sets and knowledge, composed of members picked from across the organization, are an important part of the new model. Team members often feel that they owe their allegiance firstly to the manager of their function, and not to their team leader. This makes it hard for team leaders to correct unproductive behavior or enforce deadlines as they only have an influence, but no direct control. Teams working asynchronously, in shifts, tend to be rife with conflict, as workers can never see the person demanding that they produce results.

Conflicts are without doubt part of organizational life, as the aims of different stakeholders are often incompatible. Conflicts usually arise when employees interact in groups and contend for limited resources. Employees in different organizations are sorted into groups to accomplish a common objective; therefore, the probability of conflict emerging is very high. These days, most serious organizational conflicts become a front-page headline in the newspapers, which might influence the public image of the company. Conflicts have both negative and positive results for the individual employees and the organization in general. There are many sources of conflict which occur in organizations at all levels of management. Loomis and Loomis argue that conflict is a continuous process in human relations. Conflict is unalterable in any organizations as long as people are

contending for jobs, resources, power, recognition and security. Furthermore, dealing with conflicts is a great challenge to management\textsuperscript{361}.

Conflicts in a work environment, which are psychological phenomena, can be described as a clash of contradictory interests in view of at least two non-contradictory needs that are impossible to satisfy, stimulating and hindering activities of individuals at the same time. With different personality traits, even in a small group of people there can easily arise disagreements, which can lead to conflicts.

Conflict relationships are characterized by a negative evaluation and a hostile emotional attitude, connected with the intention to harm and to devalue someone's achievements or social position. In most cases, conflicts are initiated by the so-called conflict situations involving differences of opinion, attitudes, or needs. On the one hand, there should be no conflicts in an enterprise, as each disagreement between employees slows down the pace of work and reduces its effectiveness, but on the other hand, in situations involving collaboration between people, there can always arise differences of opinion leading to conflicts, particularly when such differences intensify contradictions between personalities.

Conflicts arise whenever there are differences of interests, goals, opinions, tastes, habits, and values, underpinned with negative emotions, and particularly anger, aversion, grudge, fear, pain, or anxiety. Moreover, people who fell out with each other believe they are right and feel fully entitled to blame the other person for the whole situation.

According to J.H. Turner, conflict is a form of an open interaction, which can be described as observable efforts of the parties aimed at preventing their partners from accessing rare resources, and a form of interaction leading to the creation of mutual consciousness and contact between the conflicting parties\textsuperscript{362}.

After a period dominated by “pure” functionalism, in the second half of the 20th century a new tendency appeared within sociology. Firstly, the issue of conflict was included in the concept of social change, which entailed an analysis of its positive functions, such as the enhancement of integrative and adaptive mechanisms producing coherence and balance between social systems. At the same time, the functional model of dynamic balance still excluded revolutionary changes, changes resulting from structural contradictions and conflicts arising

within the system as well as changes occurring as a result of long-lasting, gradual disintegration\textsuperscript{363}.

Each community establishes its own social order, consisting of the previously discussed and accepted norms, institutions, values, and social roles. Such a system does not have to be equal to harmony, however, it provides a context for the existence and development of the community.

In an enterprise, conflict can mean a disagreement between two or more members or groups, resulting from the necessity to share limited resources or tasks, or the fact that they occupy different positions, have different goals, values or attitudes\textsuperscript{364}. Reasons for conflicts in an organization frequently involve: hurt pride, despotism, idleness, arrogance, passivity, broken promises and arrangements, jealousy, giving private matters priority over the organization's goals, suppressed criticism, and failure to fulfil one's obligations. Due to the fact that people differ in the extent to which they control their emotions, they get involved in different conflicts more quickly or more slowly.

Conflict resolution is “a journey toward a land totally unfamiliar.”\textsuperscript{365} Conflict is almost never comfortable. This has led to it being easily thought of as a destructive force, as people remember the bad experiences that occur during conflict. Most people tend to avoid addressing conflict when they are faced with it; they do not see the merit in dealing with conflict and just keep hoping that it will go away. Linking strategic goals to conflict management is the most effective approach to getting value out of conflict in organizational contexts. Division managers or leaders of a company usually focus on achieving the strategic goals that they have developed. They are aware that there are many challenges that could prevent the achievement of these goals, but they are rarely aware of one challenge in particular – conflict that is poorly managed.

This can polarize workers, destroy their morale and divert energy from meeting business goals. According to the University of Colorado's staff and faculty assistance program managers spend an estimated twenty five percent of their time in workplace conflict resolution; this leads to a decrease in office performance. A survey of 1,400 workers made by the University of North Carolina discovered that conflict with colleagues had caused more than half of them to loose time at work. Conflict had led to a decrease in commitment to employers in more than a

\textsuperscript{363} Białyszewski H., \textit{Teoretyczne problemy sprzeczności i konfliktów społecznych}, PIW, Warszawa 1983. p. 29.


third of the workers and conflict had led to a reduction in productivity in twenty two percent of them.\textsuperscript{366}

Conflicts at work do not only come from relationships between employees, but in some cases from clients too. However, conflict can still result in hugely positive outcomes, e.g. making better decisions by taking advantage of the wide range of information from different people sharing diverse opinions. Research has shown that teams where the world is seen in the same way by everyone (lack of diversity), tend to make worse decisions even though they feel confident and quickly agree; psychologists call one aspect of this ‘groupthink’. In every organization, backgrounds vary from one individual to another. Finding a common ground is not a simple task. Developing the work culture of an organization is not just the work of the manager alone, but the entire team. Together, they shape the future development of the organization through their daily experience. In the view of Smircich, such action leads to different metaphors acting all at the same time, each working against each other.\textsuperscript{367} Smircich went further to describe such situations as a “bridge of communication.”\textsuperscript{368} When this happens, team members of an organization tend to have different perception, interpretation and attitude. In the end, there will be poor understanding amongst members of an organization, leading to conflicts. In most cases, the conflict worsens due to what is known as social categorization. This is the likelihood of team players miscalculating their connection and differences. Marshak\textsuperscript{369} believes that every manager has to be conscious of the image his actions are creating.

It is commonly known that conflicts in an enterprise cannot be completely eliminated. Not all employees share goals, not all of them know their rights or fulfil their obligations properly.\textsuperscript{370}

\textsuperscript{369} Marshak R.J., Managing the Metaphors of change, “Organizational Dynamics”, No. 22, 1993, pp. 44–56.
The communication system is considered to be the basic and direct source of conflicts in an enterprise. Communication failures, such as improperly formulated messages, overgeneralizations, illogical messages, or misinterpretation of the partner’s intentions, lead to conflicts, and during a conflict they escalate it\(^{371}\).

Over the last years, conflicts have been treated as justified and sometimes even desirable phenomena in an organization. They are justified because modern enterprises are designed as systems, within which competition and cooperation intertwine. People have to cooperate because they have a common goal but they also fight, compete for their position in an organization, career development, all kinds of privileges, limited resources etc.\(^{372}\).

Those who are in favor of treating conflicts as desirable phenomena believe that a certain level of conflict, limited to a constructive dialogue, can have a positive influence on the search for new and better ways of acting and an increase in motivation, creativity, innovation, and initiative\(^{373}\).

Furthermore, conflicts make it possible to identify differences between the parties, to name and openly present them, and they allow the weaker party to speak up, formulate their opinions, put forward arguments to support their position and defend it, and thus defuse the suppressed tension. Stating the previously concealed differences in interests, opinions, attitudes or value systems helps to identify and resolve employee-related or professional problems. Conflicts also contribute to the consolidation of the employee group or the whole staff of an organization when competing against a different group or a different organization\(^{374}\).

For one’s social world to function, it is argued that one must share particular purposes and understandings with others\(^{375}\). Hardaway\(^{376}\) expresses similar concerns.

---

Moreover, shattering the apparent calm, stagnation, and universally accepted intimacy as well as breaking informal or even familial relationships can be the driving force behind positive changes, the driving force behind progress, and a factor stimulating and integrating hostile parties.

Nowadays, a conflict can be described with the use of its characteristic features that define it as a phenomenon\(^{377}\):

a) Normal – it is not only a consequence of pathological conditions of a social structure within which they occur, but it results from different contrasts that exist in nature and the society;

b) Omnipresent and continuous – both these features result from the same conditions that allow to say that it is a normal phenomenon; so far, no one has identified social structures free of conflicts; moreover, no one has ever managed to handle conflicts in a way eliminating them forever;

c) Useful – it exposes significant contrasts and deficiencies of a given social structure, and it serves as a spur for people to act and introduce innovations.

Authors Hocker and Wilmont maintain that “Conflict brings up such strong feelings that metaphoric analysis, of both the process of conflict and specific conflicts, aids in analysis, intervention and lasting change.”\(^{378}\)

It is said that metaphors can be divided into three main categories, according to their impacts on conflict resolution dynamics:

1) Negative – undermining the capacity for conflict resolution,
2) Neutral – that do no harm or good,
3) Positive – expanding the potential for strategic transformation.\(^{379}\)

These three categories are presented in more detail in the table below.


Table 7. Conflict metaphors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Negative Metaphors</th>
<th>II Neutral Metaphors</th>
<th>III Positive Metaphors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict as a Battle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conflict as a Game</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conflict as a Tide</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocker and Wilmot observe that “war and violence is the central metaphor of conflict in the United States and Western Europe.” They list numerous “military” and “explosive” metaphors which are commonly used in U.S. speech. For example: accusations are ‘hurled back and forth’, arguments are said to be ‘right on target’, people are described as ‘having a short fuse’, or ‘are about to blow up’.</td>
<td>The most typical example in this category is to compare conflict to a game. That is why people often talk about “toss[ing] the ball into his court,” or “go[ing] back and forth.” Comparatively speaking, a “game” has a more friendly and amicable connotation than “war”, and indicates less bitterness than “struggle.” Meanwhile, by recognizing all parties as equal game players, this metaphor alludes to conflict and tides are similar in that both are “repetitive, powerful, and inescapable.” But they can be understood and worked with to advantage, not disadvantage. It is arguable that the pattern of conflict, however elusive it appears to be, is not completely beyond comprehension. Intractable conflicts ebb and flow just as tides do. If participants understand the pattern, it can seem less threatening. Seeing the pattern also helps reduce the fear of uncertainty, especially in the context of intractable conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Negative Metaphors</th>
<th>II Neutral Metaphors</th>
<th>III Positive Metaphors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Such hostile metaphors greatly restrict the emergence of original ideas for conflict resolution, since a perception of warring groups fighting against each other on a battlefield usually provokes parties to take antagonistic positions, each pushing hard for a ‘win-lose’ outcome, instead of a mutually acceptable resolution. | certain degree of mutual respect. Nevertheless, since this metaphor is based on the assumption of existing rules, its effectiveness is limited in intractable conflicts. Only when parties involved follow the same set of rules, can desirable goals can be achieved. | **Conflict as journey**
Journey is the ideal metaphor for conflict because it highlights the cooperative aspects of problem solving and downplays competitive behavior. We have made no claim that the ‘journey’ metaphor eliminates all competitiveness. But we think it minimizes the aura of war and adds an aura of cooperation where it barely exists. If (A) uses only war metaphors (highly competitive) and the mediator uses only journey metaphors, (A) is probably going to change from the war perspective. However, he'll still want to finish ahead of other participants, probably by changing the journey to a race.
The journey by its nature is future-oriented. In contrast, the war metaphor is used to describe the problem and the past. Listeners find solutions that look to the future more attractive than a past problem. |

---

I Negative Metaphors | II Neutral Metaphors | III Positive Metaphors
---|---|---
**Conflict as a Struggle**
Conflict is also framed as a struggle: we are “on a sinking ship with no lifeboat,” “traveling a rocky road,” or “working with a checkbook that won’t balance.” These metaphors all suggest struggle, frustration, even hopelessness. Indeed, chances are good that the complexity and uncertainty of intractable conflict will lead to such emotions. Framing a conflict with this type of metaphor emphasizes how draining it is and that efforts to continue the struggle can ultimately prove worthless.

**Conflict as a Dance**
As Hocker and Wilmot observe: “The whole idea of dancing with partners is to create something beautiful, graceful, and inspiring that depends on each person’s skill, training, and individual expression.”
An article dealing with the remarkable impact of ever-increasing economic independence between Mainland China, Taiwan and the US, for instance, is titled “Dancing with the Enemy”.

**Violence as Animal Behavior**
Conflict is sometimes described as “a zoo” in which people label the other parties “stubborn as a mule”, or agitated and in a “feeding frenzy”. One particular characteristic of this

---

I Negative Metaphors | II Neutral Metaphors | III Positive Metaphors

kind of metaphor, which distinguishes it from the previous two, is its exclusive application to parties other than the one using it. Based on the perception that other parties are less-than-human and inferior, animal-like references can be responsible for enemy images, escalating mutual incrimination and spiralling hostility, thus significantly obstructing the creation of an atmosphere in which meaningful conversation can take place with mutual understanding and appreciation.


Gerald Monk and John Winslade, through their application of the “narrative approach” to the mediation process, have enriched the field of conflict resolution. Their focus on “how the mediator helps the parties to alter their attitudes and perceptions” is a relatively neglected part of the mediation process. The mediation approach that has been practiced and taught over the last few years assumes that conflict or problems are always solved rationally. But mediation frequently fails when a high-degree of irrationality and emotionality limits people’s ability to solve problems. The interpersonal and emotional “baggage” brought to the mediation by people in conflict frequently obstructs conflict resolution, and the conventional techniques – separating people in z caucus, normalizing emotions and enabling catharsis – are ineffective and insufficient.

The control that the conflict has over people’s views starts to shift in the narrative mediation process. Rather than working as contestants, parties start working together against the problem as collaborators.

Stories are culturally and socially constructed. Moreover, stories that get to control other stories are part of the power that creates social relations. From a narrative perspective, the cultural world and power relations are placed in the center or midst of the mediation process, rather than as an afterthought on the outside.
The storytelling metaphor is what narrative Mediation builds on. It is both a methodology and an approach, presenting mediators with a means of integrating stories into the core of mediation. Narrative Mediation comes from David Epston and Michael White’s tradition of Narrative Family Therapy, developed in the mid-1980s. This approach itself developed from the tradition of postmodernism and specifically, its embrace of contingency and multiplicity. Postmodernism accepts that a person’s perspective can never be totally objective and is inherently linked to their point of view. By extension, people’s perceptions of events are directly influenced by socio-cultural factors.

With its post-modernist underpinnings, Narrative Mediation challenges the positivist foundation of the problem-solving orientation that is widespread in today’s understanding of mediation. Cob, Millen and Rifkin insinuate that a myth of objectivity has been developed in the field of mediation which states that mediators can separate themselves from their own historical and cultural context. The metaphor chosen influences the participants’ behavior because it sets the tone that the negotiation will follow. In this dialogue, war and journey metaphors will be focused on. The Parties in a mediation who cite war metaphors usually believe that ‘all is fair in love and war’. They believe that they will be a loser and a winner and accept that war tactics can be used to attain victory.

Narrative practices have always been very helpful in therapeutic settings. Over the last twenty years, this trajectory has led mediators to apply narrative techniques within the realm of conflict resolution. The theoretical basis

---

supporting these practices is Foucault’s concept of the discourse defined as ‘practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak’\textsuperscript{396}.

A number of studies have demonstrated that narrative mediation is fruitful in the resolution of conflicts of low complexity, for example unhappy couples\textsuperscript{397}. However, Holmgren\textsuperscript{398} has recently proven that narrative practices also have potential as mediation tools in complex organizational contexts.

A narrative approach invites conflicted parties to step outside of their positions within the conflict story. Parties are encouraged to comment on the conflict itself, rather than focusing on the other side.

“Our mind works largely by metaphor and comparison, not always (or often) by relentless logic. When we are caught in conceptual traps, the best exit is often a change in metaphor – not because the new guideline will be truer to nature (for neither the old nor the new metaphor lies “out there” in the woods,) but because we need a shift to more fruitful perspectives, and metaphor is often the best agent of conceptual transition.”\textsuperscript{399}

Conflict has to be accepted by employees as inevitable in a work environment, therefore the real concern for management should be how to deal with conflict, not how to avoid or mitigate it. If conflict is not properly managed, morale, business productivity, and operational effectiveness can all ‘take a major hit’.

When expertly managed, positive outcomes, such as improved solutions, major innovations and a better understanding of others, can result from conflict. Conflict can lead to positive outcomes and results, that if the conflict had not been initiated, would not have been achieved. Conflict that is poorly managed has various direct costs to an organization or business, such as loss of good employees and customers. Another clearly visible cost is the time lost to conflict resolution; time that could have been spent achieving work goals is used instead to smooth ruffled feathers and manage disagreements, although this might be

---

\textsuperscript{396} Foucault M., \textit{The archeology of knowledge}, Tavistock, London 1969, p. 49.
seen as an investment where the outcome is positive. Metaphors can certainly add value to the process of conflict management.

6. Metaphors in knowledge sharing

Dynamics of changes on the market, as well as the market extensive complexity, require economic organizations to undertake innovative actions determining the necessity of creation, development, usage and protection of their intellectual capital, i.e. intangible resources and knowledge resources. Knowledge management is not a problem of free choice. It is a contemporary requirement, a condition of further development, concerning not only organizations but also the whole economies. It should be emphasized here that knowledge-based economy is becoming the leading paradigm of the world economy.\textsuperscript{400}

In order to identify the notion of knowledge management, the “management” and “knowledge” terms need to be defined. It is worth noticing that both terms are defined ambiguously. F.W. Taylor provides a general term of management, defining it as “(…) precise understanding of what is expected from people and then ensuring that they will do it the best and the cheapest way.”\textsuperscript{401} J. Zieleniewski defines management as “(…) a specific type of directing occurring when power over people arises from property rights to objects necessary for them and work tools(…)”\textsuperscript{402} J. Kurnal describes management in a similar manner, claiming that this is a specific type of directing based on organizational power resulting from ownership rights to measures.\textsuperscript{403} H. Steinmann and G. Schreyogg distinguish two approaches towards the notion of “management”:\textsuperscript{404} “institutional” – understanding management as a group of persons entrusted with authorizations to issue instructions within the organization, and “functional” – referring to actions aimed at directing the work process, i.e. any activities necessary for the pursuit of the organization’s tasks.\textsuperscript{405} A.K. Koźmiński and K. Oblój find that the essence of management consists in “(…) ensuring functional balance of the organization.

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
(…) Instruments aimed at maintaining such functional balance include organizational structure, operating procedures, strategy and organizational culture. There are numerous definitions of knowledge. Some define it as information in action, other ones – as framed in the context and allowing action information, next ones assume that knowledge is what we acquire through experience, communication and interference in order to believe in and evaluate something on the basis of possessed information, and still others – as a business tool in the processes of making decisions, planning, evaluating and forecasting.

A. Brooking distinguishes data as numbers, sings, images and facts, which are deprived of context. She defines data framed in the context as information and calls knowledge the ability to use information. Knowledge can also be treated as a sort of combination of experience, values, information on the context and the expert’s insight into a given issue, allowing to create frames for evaluation and incorporating new experiences and information. Knowledge is characterized by:

- predominant nature – it prevails over other resources of the organization and constitutes the main factor of its success,
- inexhaustibility – the sum of knowledge increases, not decreases, over time,
- immateriality – knowledge is elusive, difficult to measure and present,
- occurrence simultaneity – knowledge can be used simultaneously in numerous applications without value losses.
Furthermore, knowledge is characterized by such features as: nonlinearity, complexity, assimilability, applicability and the possibility of protection.\textsuperscript{414} As far as the nature of knowledge is concerned, explicit and tacit knowledge can be distinguished, whereas, with regard to its subject, knowledge can be recommended, relational, procedural and axiomatic. It should be emphasized that knowledge serves specific employees or groups of employees, whose roles, functions and tasks, thus, needs connected with knowledge, can be very different\textsuperscript{415}.

Knowledge management has been one of the most important areas of research of management sciences over recent years. This thesis is confirmed by, e.g. a relatively large number of publications. These include both theoretical studies and results of empirical research\textsuperscript{416}.

Knowledge management is a collection of processes enabling creation, dissemination and use of knowledge for achieving the organization's objectives.\textsuperscript{417} Knowledge management takes place at two levels. The first level covers creation and use of knowledge for achieving objectives the organization has set for itself. The second objective covers use of knowledge already existing in the enterprise.

Knowledge management targets concern acquisition, collection and use of knowledge in a way allowing success, competitive advantage and increase in the organization's value and wealth. Possessed and increased knowledge resources determine development of each organization and, consequently, of economy\textsuperscript{418}.

Metaphors are very important in the development of abstract ideas. However, they show us the main points and hide others from the eye of the public,
and also, if taken literally, can be very misleading when taking into considera-
tion the details of a situation. In the same breath, knowledge is an abstract idea
and according to existing research, in the three most quoted KM (Knowledge
Management) texts, about 99% of the references to knowledge are metaphorical. Andriessen discovered a total of 22 different metaphors for knowledge,
of which three were very dominant in Western KM literature.

The KNOWLEDGE AS A RESOURCE metaphor itemizes the source do-
main of resources to help people reason about knowledge. There are many at-
tributes for ‘resources’ here, since knowledge can be stored, shared and used
in a production process. People can also talk about the ‘amount of knowledge’
they possess. This metaphor considers knowledge to be an input/output (logis-
tical) system. The English language also allows for characteristics of resources,
such as the ‘size’ and ‘weight’ of knowledge, which might seem impossible to
measure. Other characteristics of knowledge also not covered by this meta-
phor, such as the lack of rivalry in knowledge and its non-additiveness are
not covered. Even knowledge being ‘tacit’ is not covered by this metaphor.
By treating knowledge as a resource in the KNOWLEDGE AS A RESOURCE
metaphor, the knowledge itself becomes part of an organization’s logistical dis-
course.

The KNOWLEDGE AS AN ASSET metaphor uses the source domain of assets
to help the reader think about knowledge. There are several terms taken from the
field of finance and accounting that are used here, including that an organiza-
tion or person can control knowledge to generate future economic benefits for
their business/organization. Indefinable costs are explained that are used in the
production, and thus should be included in the organization’s reporting system.
The KNOWLEDGE AS AN ASSET metaphor enables us to think of knowledge
as part of the accounting practice in an organizations.

The KNOWLEDGE AS AN ASSET metaphor also uses the source domain of
‘assets’ to help individuals think about knowledge. Several factors or terms from
accounting are used in this metaphor, including showing how much knowledge
can costs or how can it be measured, utilized and even used in the production
process to generate benefits that flow into the organization for a long time.

419 Andriessen D., On the metaphorical nature of intellectual capital: A textual analysis,
420 Andriessen D. G., On the metaphorical nature of intellectual capital: A textual analysis,
421 Lev B., Intangibles: management, measurement and reporting, The Brookings Institu-
Through use of the KNOWLEDGE AS AN ASSET metaphor, knowledge becomes part of the accounting world in the organizations in which it is employed. In a business or organization, there are people concerned with management, planning and control and reporting of knowledge as an asset. This metaphor shows that knowledge-related problems are a result of the inability to control and manage knowledge. This is caused by the lack or inability of the business/organization to identity knowledge and constantly manage information, and not giving it the attention it needs. This also touches on the idea that what can be measured, can be managed. The ‘Intellectual capital’ movement started Sveiby\textsuperscript{422} in the mid-1990s advocated the inclusion of knowledge in the measurement systems of an organization, and thus inspired the popularity of the KNOWLEDGE AS AN ASSET metaphor.

Although traditional economies used to depend on tangible assets such as land and capital only, in the 21st century we have evolved and the knowledge of individuals is the primary factor in every production process which gives a business a competitive edge\textsuperscript{423}. The most valued characteristic of knowledge is its uniqueness and novelty, which cannot be imitated or substituted and which makes knowledge a strategic resource for every business\textsuperscript{424}.

The KNOWLEDGE AS PROPERTY metaphor makes knowledge usable, like any other legal property, in case of legal issues. This enables thinking about knowledge as something capable of being owned, having value and being exclusive. This brings up:

- The legal rights aspects of knowledge,
- Knowledge being transferable,
- Knowledge that could be commercialized.


Use of the KNOWLEDGE AS A RESOURCE metaphor applies the source domain of resources to help the reader reason about knowledge. Many characteristics of knowledge are used in this reasoning about knowledge. Also, knowledge is used in the production process and can also be stored, and even shared. There is also the possibility of talking about the amount of knowledge, and this metaphor also allows for placement of knowledge in the context of an input/output system. From that perspective, people very often talk about the ‘size’ or ‘weight’ of knowledge. At the same time, there are some characteristics of knowledge that are not covered by this metaphor, such as the non-rivalry and non-additivity of knowledge and the tacitness of knowledge.

To bring out these characteristics there is a need to address other metaphors. Use of the KNOWLEDGE AS A RESOURCE metaphor is, however, not without consequences. It also makes logistics part of the discussion about the organization, and logistics is dominated by individuals focused on the ICT perspective and ways of maximizing production or managing quality. The KNOWLEDGE AS A RESOURCE metaphor endorses a view of knowledge which faces problem of distribution – that it is not in the right place at the right time. This view gives meaning to ICT solutions which enable storage and distribution of knowledge.

The KNOWLEDGE AS PROPERTY metaphor is mainly used in legal matters in organizations. It gives people the ability to think of knowledge as a resource that can be owned, given value and be exclusive. It brings out the legal part of knowledge and the ability of knowledge to be transferred or even commercialized to generate income. The KNOWLEDGE AS AN ASSET metaphor provides the view that knowledge can be appropriately and legally protected. This is part of the solutions provided as a result of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), as part of the licensing of knowledge.

Knowledge, data and information should not be confused, because data is raw facts, measurements and statistics that have not been interpreted, while knowledge is more advanced than information, which is a result of processed data that makes sense. Knowledge is the result of interpreting information based on the understanding of someone and their views. Knowledge is mainly based on the interpretation of the person, because it needs the judgment of, and incorporation of the intuition, beliefs and behaviors of that individual.

Although in traditional knowledge management the emphasis is placed on the technology or the ability to build the system that can efficiently process and leverage knowledge, current systems of knowledge management focus on people and their actions in organizations. They are mainly designed to create an environment where power is based on sharing knowledge and not just keeping the knowledge acquired. The transfer of knowledge requires people to share it with other people, to achieve mutual benefits. Al-Alawi emphasizes that knowledge management initiatives are weak organizations which ignore the cultural and organization development issues in knowledge deployment. These are very seminal issues that are highly critical in any successful knowledge management system.

Table 8. Entailments of the CAPITAL metaphor.

- Capital is valuable and important
- Capital is an asset for the future and not an expenditure
- Capital can be invested in
- Capital can be capitalized
- Capital itself can be invested
- Capital allows for a return
- Capital resonates with managers and CFOs
- Having more capital is better
- Capital can be owned
- Capital can be valued financially
- Capital often appears on the balance sheet
- Capital is additive
- Capital is a stock
- Capital can and must be measured and managed

Daniel G. Andriessen, Stuff or love? How metaphors direct our efforts to manage knowledge in organizations, Knowledge Management Research & Practice (2008) 6, 5–12


Table 9. Results of the KNOWLEDGE AS WATER metaphor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge does not flow</td>
<td>Build canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate source of knowledge</td>
<td>Flush out and freshen knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is not channeled</td>
<td>Tap knowledge from people leaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dispersion of knowledge</td>
<td>Create knowledge map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocephalus: people keeping knowledge to themselves</td>
<td>Managers as knowledge channels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Andriessen D.G., *Stuff or love? How metaphors direct our efforts to manage knowledge in organizations*, "Knowledge Management Research & Practice", No. 6, 2008, pp. 5–12.

Table 10. Results of the KNOWLEDGE AS LOVE metaphor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is not cherished</td>
<td>Provide time and space for sharing knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust</td>
<td>Match people’s passions and tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrequited love</td>
<td>Go out and date more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivalry and forced marriages</td>
<td>Hire marriage counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive but lonely singles</td>
<td>Partner-swapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-breeding</td>
<td>Don’t manage and systemize knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We only talk about our wedding certificate but not about our relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Andriessen D.G., *Stuff or love? How metaphors direct our efforts to manage knowledge in organizations*, “Knowledge Management Research & Practice”, No. 6, 2008, pp. 5–12.

It is interesting to note that different writers can use different or the same metaphors to portray very different views on knowledge. In their papers, the American writers Davenport and Prusak often use the KNOWLEDGE AS STUFF metaphor. The Japanese writers Nonaka and Takeuchi have predominantly used the KNOWLEDGE AS THOUGHTS OR FEELINGS metaphor. To some extent, this portrays cultural differences in the use of metaphors in KM.

Numerous models showing how knowledge is created and transferred within the organization are dealt with in literature\textsuperscript{430}. Alazmi and Zairi\textsuperscript{431} have found in their research that there are several key factors determining success of implementation of programs connected with knowledge management. These factors include: culture, training, support from the management team, technological infrastructure, knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer. Other studies confirm the role of culture, procedures, organizational structure, tasks and motivation.\textsuperscript{432}

Actions within knowledge management should be supported by culture, which identifies, promotes and rewards them. Interaction and cooperation between employees are necessary for tacit knowledge transfer, as well as for changing tacit into explicit knowledge and transformation of knowledge from the level of the individual into the organizational level.\textsuperscript{433} Karlsen and Gottschalk believe that culture is an important factor because it shapes assumptions regarding knowledge worth transmitting and the relation between knowledge at the level of the individual versus organization\textsuperscript{434}; moreover, it shapes the context of social interactions determining the way individuals will share their knowledge in specific situations, as well as shapes processes creating knowledge.\textsuperscript{435}


There are numerous barriers associated with knowledge management. Knowledge management often faces difficulties caused by organizational culture.\textsuperscript{436} Ernst and Young’s research shows that organizational culture can constitute the greatest barrier for knowledge transfer.\textsuperscript{437} Among 453 enterprises participating in another research more than half of them indicated that organizational culture was the greatest barrier before success of any initiatives connected with knowledge management.\textsuperscript{438} Similar conclusions can be drawn from the KPMG report.\textsuperscript{439} These and other studies\textsuperscript{440} show that organizational culture has an extensive influence on knowledge management.\textsuperscript{441}

Metaphors are the key issue here. Understanding knowledge and its role and being able to transfer the concepts properly requires an active use of metaphor. According to Martin\textsuperscript{442}, knowledge management processes should, for example, connect knowledge with workers, connect employees with information, facilitate knowledge transfer and disseminate knowledge within an entire organization. In order to achieve these goals, the organization needs to establish processes

\begin{itemize}
\item Watson S., \textit{Getting to "aha!" companies use intranets to turn information and experience into knowledge — And gain a competitive edge}, “Computer World”, No. 32(4), 1998.
\end{itemize}
promoting joint problem solving, streamlining and simplifying work and enhancing efficiency.443

7. Metaphor in negotiation

The metaphorical approach to organizational culture is used both in management studies and in management and consultancy practice around the world.444 In Poland, however, the concept of metaphors and the metaphorical method are not very popular among scholars, not to mention managers.445

Works addressing the issue of negotiation are very diverse in terms of scholarly sources, typical of their various disciplines and areas of academic interests. In other words, these works are amorphous. Most Polish publications are prescriptive – they have very little or even no descriptive value.446 The authors of these texts attempt to answer the question of how one should negotiate. Analyzing different approaches and directions of these studies, it is possible to point out many features common to all of them.

A paradigm as understood by philosopher Thomas Kuhn – author of The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, in which he put forward his theory of paradigms – is a collection of terms and theories which form the foundations of the given field of research. It could be said that a paradigm is a prism, through which we look at reality. It contains our major premises about reality and determines our research directions and trends. The paradigms presented in this chapter cover the basic cognitive assumptions which reflect the dominant ways of perceiving the process of negotiation. These approaches are often incommensurable or even contradictory. The above-mentioned paradigms also include the dominant assumptions concerning negotiations and the methods of their analysis.

Specialist literature offers many definitions of negotiation. Those mentioned in this chapter are the most well-known and popular, and have had a significant impact on scholarly research in the field under discussion.

Robert Fisher, William L. Ury, and Bruce Paton – authors of a book entitled *Getting to Yes* and founders of an important model of negotiation – define this term in the following way: “Negotiation is a basic means of getting what you want from others. It is back-and-forth communication designed to reach an agreement when you and the other side have some interests that are shared and others that are opposed” (xvii).

Negotiations are defined in a similar way by Roy J. Lewicki, David M. Saunders, and Bruce Barry, who state: “Negotiation is a process by which we attempt to influence others to help us achieve our needs while at the same time taking their needs into account” (v). In an earlier edition of the same book, Lewicki and Joseph Litterer define negotiation as:

the process of getting two people from the point where they have a problem or a conflict to the point where they have a solution or an agreement. Negotiation is a process of offer and counteroffer, of concession and compromise through which the parties reach a point that both understand is the best (for them) that can be achieved. While this process is the heart of negotiation, it cannot be understood and cannot be successfully carried out without a knowledge of how these other factors affect the process.447

According to Richard Walton and Robert McKersie, the authors of foundational works in the field under discussion, negotiations are “the deliberate interaction of two or more complex social units which are attempting to define or redefine the terms of their interdependence” (3).

A similar definition was put forward by Alan Fowler, author of *Negotiation Skills and Strategies*, who posits that negotiation is “a process of interaction by which two or more parties who consider that they need to be jointly involved in any outcome, but who initially have different objectives, seek by the use of argument and persuasion to resolve their differences in order to achieve a mutually acceptable solution” (3). Yet another definition was coined by Dean Pruitt and Peter Carnevale. As they put it, negotiation is “a discussion between two or more parties with the apparent aim of resolving divergence of interest and thus escaping social conflict. The parties (also called 'disputants') may be individuals, groups, organizations, or political units such as nations. Divergence of interest means that the parties have incompatible preferences among a set of available options”.448 According to William Zartman, negotiation is “the process by which conflicting positions are combined to form a common decision” (5). Furthermore:

[A] theory of negotiation is essential for understanding topics as diverse as marital decision making, industrial relations, inter-office coordination, corporate mergers, intragroup decision making, and international relations. The arenas just named differ, to some extent, with respect to the way negotiation works. But, in our view, there are more similarities than differences among them, making it possible to develop a general theory of negotiation.449

It is crucial to realize that practically everyone negotiates on a daily basis. “Negotiation is not a process reserved only for the skilled diplomat, top salesperson, or ardent advocate for organized labor; it is something that everyone does, almost daily. Although the stakes are usually not as dramatic as peace accords or large corporate mergers, everyone … negotiates.”450 Negotiations are present in so many areas of our lives that being familiar with their basic mechanisms is essential for everyone who works with other people. It is also important to point out that the above-mentioned definitions are very general and capacious, thanks to which many situations may be considered as negotiations. These definitions are similar and have a number of common elements. 451

According to the paradigm, negotiation is seen as a social institution, which plays a crucial role in conflict situations and situations of mutual interdependence. The code of conduct in negotiation is defined by the parties themselves, except for the situations of mediation and arbitration – in other words, the socially acceptable intervention of a third party.452 Negotiation is considered to be a process which consists of certain phases or elements. The process is influenced by three basic variables: the goals of the parties, their mutual relations, and the values they cherish. Each party tries to realize its own interests as fully as possible and to influence the other party so that it will agree to the proposed conditions, in order to reach an agreement. At the same time, the parties may – but do not have to – develop a solution which will be beneficial to everyone by formulating and solving problems.453

452 Chmielecki M., Komunikacja międzykulturowa w procesie zarządzania negocjacjami, rozprawa doktorska, Społeczna Wyższa Szkoła Przedsiębiorczości i Zarządzania, Łódź 2010.
To recapitulate the above-mentioned definitions, negotiation can be described as the interaction between two or more parties with the goal of transitioning from a conflict situation to a situation of mutual agreement. Some of the characteristic features of any negotiations are:

1. A situation that involves at least two parties – institutions, groups, or persons (cf. de Mesquita). It is, of course, possible to negotiate with oneself, but real negotiation is a process that takes place between different parties, within a group or between groups.

2. There must be a conflict of interests between the parties – in other words, they must be pursuing incompatible goals. The goal that one party wishes to achieve does not correspond with the other party’s goals. The parties must then look for a solution to this situation. “We are less interested in why a particular objective is chosen by a company than in the fact that it conflicts with an objective of a union.” However, the emergence of a conflict and the incompatibility of objectives are not enough to begin negotiations – the parties must also be interdependent. It is useful to perceive this situation in terms of the lack of possibility to achieve one’s aims without collaboration or without the other party remaining neutral. The author of canonical publications in the field of negotiation, Fred Ikle, describes this interdependence as a common interest: “two elements must normally be present for negotiation to take place: there must be both common interests and issues of conflict. Without common interests there is nothing to negotiate for, without conflict noting to negotiate about” (2).

3. The parties negotiate because they think they can influence the other party, and thus achieve benefits that will be greater than those gained by accepting the offer of the other party. Negotiation is a conscious and voluntary process. People are rarely forced to negotiate.

4. Instead of coming into an open conflict or breaking contact, the parties prefer to search for a consensus, at least for a short time. Negotiations begin in situations in which there are no rules or procedures for solving conflicts, or when the parties prefer to seek a solution outside a given system.

5. At the start of negotiations, the parties agree to compromise. They expect that the other party will change its initial stance, requests, and demands. The parties may at first defend their positions, but usually they gradually develop common solutions. Still, creative negotiations do not have to be based on

compromise. The parties may come up with a solution which will enable all of the partners to achieve their goals. This is closely connected with the issue of synergy, which will be discussed further in this chapter.

6. Negotiations concern concrete problems (prices or shipments), as well as the management of abstract issues. Abstract issues are understood as important psychological incentives which have an impact on the parties involved in the process of negotiation. They also include fundamental beliefs and values. These factors have a substantial influence on the process and results of negotiations.

Figure 1. A dynamic model of negotiation.

For the needs of this article, negotiation is defined as a dynamic, complex, multistage process of communication in which interdependent parties exchange a series of messages to achieve an agreement on so-far incompatible needs, and resolve their conflict (fig. 11).
Negotiations are successful if the parties reach a consensus that is durable and completely or partly satisfying for both parties\textsuperscript{455}. Relationships based on trust and a reduced level of uncertainty lead to long-lasting engagement, thanks to the fact that the parties experience greater satisfaction\textsuperscript{456}. Furthermore, having in mind the rapid pace of change in the surrounding world, it is hard to predict the issues or problems that could emerge at further stages of negotiations, or even after their completion. This means that practically every agreement is always, in a sense, incomplete\textsuperscript{457}. Grant T. Savage, John David Blair, and Ritch L. Sorenson claim that such unquantifiable elements as general satisfaction, the status of the relationship, or the degree of engagement are as important as signing a contract and reaching an agreement on contentious issues. It is also crucial to note that if negotiations have successfully been completed before, in the next negotiations the parties will display a considerable amount of trust towards one another, and this is known as unconditional trust\textsuperscript{458}.

In reality, people use very different negotiating strategies. Styles of negotiation cover a whole spectrum of behaviors, ranging from a desire to collaborate to fierce competition. Drew Martin et al. argue that a transparent strategy of negotiation is the most important factor in deciding the improvement of business relations.

Every negotiator and every manager has certain features that impact the way in which they approach a negotiation. Some negotiators adopt an aggressive stance, hoping that the other party will make all the required concessions, while others avoid confrontation, hoping for a friendly interaction. What is more,

“culture is always relevant. If we define culture broadly, that is, including many types and levels of difference, all conflicts are in the end intercultural. This comprehensive definition has the benefit of admitting culture as an element of every conflict analysis, even at the cost of an over-emphasis on cultural factors.”\textsuperscript{459}

The works of Max Bazerman and Margaret Neale on the use of heuristic models in negotiation heralded a new epoch in this field of studies. The earlier research on negotiation, carried out by, among others, Dean Pruitt and Peter Carnevale, and Morton Deutsch, focused on mutual bargaining – on the study of actions and counteractions, aspirations and goals, and to some extent, expectations. The birth of the cognitive negotiation theory was made possible thanks to three advancements in social sciences. First of all, in their empirical research of 1982, Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman, together with Paul Slovic, proposed a novel perspective in behavioral studies: the behavioral decision theory. Richard Nisbett and Lee Ross also carried out empirical research, and their book \textit{Human Inference: Strategies & Shortcoming of Social Judgment}\textsuperscript{460} contributed to the legitimization of the behavioral decision theory as a research area in its own right. Secondly, the social cognitive theory in psychology encouraged scholars to focus on the mental imperfections of social actors. Finally, Howard Raiffa put forward a conceptual framework for the process of negotiation – an asymmetrical prescriptive/descriptive approach. In Raiffa’s view, a negotiator should not only understand his or her role and obligations (the rational perspective), but also his or her behavioral tendencies (the behavioral perspective).

Most publications on negotiation define economic success as absolutely necessary to the success of negotiations, while the process of negotiation is in fact a conversation about common expectations. It is a process of reaching a consensus and constantly redefining the aim of the negotiation. Achieving a consensus, as a key process in social transactions, covers not only defining acceptable conditions of agreement, but also developing a common understanding of the situation.

Negotiation is a communication exchange whose participants “define or redefine the terms of their interdependence”\textsuperscript{461}. It is one of the most common forms of social interaction, which has its roots not only in the formal sphere, but also


in various informal contexts, such as relationships with friends or the process of making decisions together with other family members\textsuperscript{462}. Although negotiations are crucial to those who are a part of a network of diverse relations, research has shown that the agreements reached through negotiation are usually far from being optimal\textsuperscript{463}. They indicate that the cognitive frameworks that are used by negotiators and that have a particularly harmful effect on the quality of economic decisions include: perceiving negotiation as a war or a zero-sum game\textsuperscript{464}, taking an inflexible stance\textsuperscript{465}, or assuming that a task-oriented approach and a focus on interpersonal relations are mutually exclusive\textsuperscript{466}.

One of the main issues addressed by psychologists dealing with negotiation is the analysis of the negotiator’s actions in the context of the above-mentioned cognitive frameworks – in other words, the strategic use of information in order to define and articulate the given problem or situation\textsuperscript{467}. Despite the fact that negotiation is a dynamic process of mutual persuasion, most of the existing publications, with few exceptions\textsuperscript{468}, have been written from a static perspective. In the majority of studies, negotiators are categorized, for instance, as having either “prosocial” or “proself” motivation\textsuperscript{469}, or as acting within either the relational or task-oriented frameworks\textsuperscript{470}. Such approaches, of course, help build
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some knowledge. However, the solutions they propose suggest to negotiators that they are facing static processes which are largely predetermined. Furthermore, relatively few studies have examined the possibility of a conflict between two different cognitive frameworks when used by different parties. This leaves many questions unanswered about the consequences of such a disparity, and the impact of the change of the cognitive framework on the results of the negotiation. The process of negotiation and its results oscillate around a shift towards a common perspective. It is not so much about what the parties are entitled to but, above all, about the very nature of negotiation.

The basic model of negotiation is a psychological representation of a situation which facilitates predicting, analyzing, and explaining. Such a model creates in our mind an image of the elements that contribute to the given situation and of their mutual relations. Representing how people perceive their closest environment and thus bringing out certain concepts (Rouse and Morris), the models of negotiation explain our cognitive processes related to our understanding of reality, the ways in which we translate reality into its internal representations, and the ways in which we use these representations to solve problems. These models are a useful tool, because they help people understand a given situation, react to it and predict its future changes (Johnson-Laird; Holyoak; and Gentner).

We all tend to make assumptions. These assumptions can be made consciously, but most the time we make them subconsciously, and consequently judge people and situations incorrectly. During negotiations, incorrect assumptions about the other party or the nature of the issues under discussion can have undesired consequences.

Our assumptions result directly from our functioning mental models. In his book *The Psychology of Intelligence Analysis*, Richards Heuer defines a mental model as a simplified image of reality in which sensory stimuli are mediated by complex mental processes. Our mental models determine what we focus our attention on and what we ignore, as well as how we organize the obtained information and give meaning to it. Our models are modified by “past experience, education, cultural values, role requirements, and organizational norms, as well as by the specifics of the information received”.

---


According to Herbert Simon, the author of *Models of Man*, our rationality (i.e. our mental capacity) is rather limited. This means that “the mind cannot cope directly with the complexity of the world”\(^4\). Due to our limited capacities, we build simplified models of reality, which we then use as the basis for processing sensory information.

Peter Senge, who authored *The Fifth Discipline*, also discusses this issue, and defines mental models as “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action. Very often, we are not consciously aware of our mental models or the effects that they have on our behavior” (8).

At the negotiating table, the assumptions that inform our mental models can manifest themselves in the way the parties perceive each other and the most important aspects of conversations. When these assumptions prove to be faulty or unacceptable, problems can arise and fruitlessly absorb all of the effort invested so far in the negotiation.

In order to expose all of the pitfalls of the assumptions they have made, negotiators should analyze the mental models at work in the given situation. They should ask themselves the following questions: What assumptions inform my perception of the other party (as people), their interests, and their paths? What assumptions have I made concerning the alternatives that are available to them, their communication style, their understanding of justice, and their need to protect their image? Afterwards, they should try to answer these questions from the other party’s perspective. It is, of course, impossible to become familiar with the models according to which the other party will act. But the system that may be informing the other party’s perception of our own interests, our possible alternatives, our sense of justice, and our need to protect our image should also be thought about.

Metaphors shed light on the ideas underlying negotiation behaviors and give us an opportunity to learn more about what the other party offers, or what they want and why they react in a given way to a certain strategy or tactics.

Language, in the general understanding of the term, is used to construct and reconstruct the surrounding social reality. It can therefore be claimed that a metaphor can help understand the meaning of the surrounding phenomena, including negotiations. At this point, the question could be asked of why using metaphors might be so important for the understanding of the essence of

negotiation, and why metaphorical descriptions of this phenomenon could turn out to be very important to the negotiation.

Thanks to metaphors, one can understand how the negotiator treats the notion of power in negotiations, how he or she perceives ethics and the role of trust, or understands the nature of persuasion. Skillfully analyzed metaphors help negotiators predict the strategy or tactics that will be used by the other party. Metaphors can also help answer the question of how the negotiator understands the issue of trust in negotiation and determine his or her initial level of trust.

One should point out that having in mind how today’s organizations function, the range of possible applications of negotiation increases, especially with regard to work with external partners. Negotiations are not only used as a tool for making transactions, but they also help shape relationships with strategic partners. Negotiations are in fact an intrinsic part of any business, and more and more often tend to be intercultural. Every negotiation is accompanied by the processes of building, reinforcing, and regaining trust. Thus, the metaphors that describe the process of negotiation can be helpful in determining how trust is perceived in a negotiation.

8. Metaphor in management consulting

Metaphorical thinking is a very precious way of interpreting and diagnosing organizations. Metaphors are parts of a language, and their skillful application is related to the transformation of the ways of thinking and, in consequence, also organizational activities. A metaphor can be seen as a useful technique for the understanding of organizations. Metaphors are now among the most significant research instruments in both management science and management consulting.

The aim of metaphors is to help us understand different aspects of organizations. Metaphors are commonly used in colloquial and scientific discourses as the means for analysing organizations, while using the quasi-metaphorical process in interpretations of management should lead to the better understanding of the organizational life.

Researchers note that the usefulness of metaphors for interpreting and getting to know organizations is indisputable, and more or less original and appropriate

attempts are constantly being made to build new images of an organization, forming a kind of an archetype.

The function and types of services offered by business consultants are both indistinct and complex. There is an abundance of information examining the role of business consultants, but first, the reason why corporations utilize the services of external professionals must be tackled. Massey⁴⁷⁶ as well as Pellegrinelli⁴⁷⁷ note that at present, it is common practice for the services of business consultants to be employed by top-level managers to help their organizations select “the correct strategies from the abundance of available ones.”⁴⁷⁸

Academic interest in management consulting has grown rapidly in the last few years as the size and economic impact of the consulting industry has grown, particularly during the 80’s and 90’s, as that was the time when the management consulting industry grew heavily and became one of the knowledge economy’s top growing sectors. About 80% of today’s firms were actually set up during this period⁴⁷⁹. Business academics, the business media, management gurus and consultants were all perceived by many researchers as the parties who led to the formation, distribution and transfer of new ideas into management⁴⁸⁰.

The literature suggests that there exist different schools of thought on the role played by business consultants. It is argued by some that consultants mainly fulfill a single role, while others, like Lippitt and Lippitt⁴⁸¹ think that consultants ‘perform a number of functions that they consider appropriate for the customer, the

---


circumstances, and their style. Chapman\textsuperscript{482} appears to be in agreement with the Lippitt and Lippitt’s argument.

Indeed, when the capability of business consultants that work with non-profit organizations was investigated, Chapman\textsuperscript{483} reached the conclusion that “there are a variety of roles that can be filled by consultants, depending on what the situation demands.” Others see business consultancy as a practice in which both consultants and clients equally participate and benefit. Massey and Walker\textsuperscript{484} presume that “…if the roles selected by the consultant are appropriate and align with the expectations of the client, then the process of management is unimportant as the assignment already has a very good chance of success in attaining the agreed goal.”

In those early days, the knowledge provided by consultants was not only new, but was also important to organizational strategy and consequently molded much of modern management practice. And so management consultancy was viewed as both carrier and influencer of new management strategies, ideas and organizational forms amongst organizations\textsuperscript{485}.

It is argued by Fincham and Clark that a lot of the writing on management consulting developed in the mid-1950s through to the mid-1980s was written primarily from a single perspective, aimed at Organizational Development\textsuperscript{486}.

The strand in the literature that was actually critical was focused on the techniques and strategies employed by consultants in convincing clients that they offered a high-quality service. In this critical literature, the problem in question is the method used by consultants to convince their clients and show them their knowledge. When Compared to Organizational Development, the critical view doesn’t automatically assume that consultants play the part of professional helpers\textsuperscript{487}. The statement that consultants were constantly acting in their client’s best


interest and the values they claim to provide for their client was mostly questioned. This was then mainly answered by observing the type of consulting strategies and advice given, along with the power to influence. Rather, management consultants were perceived as interlopers who used theatrical skills or impressions to convince clients that their services were valuable. As a result, critical literature became greatly interested in the knowledge and rhetorical skills provided by them.

The critical perspective, when compared to the functionalist perspective, moves the distribution of power towards the consultant. From this viewpoint the consultant is seen as the controlling party in the relationship, and the client is focused on as a victim of the rhetorical skills of the consultant.

The critical perspective puts forward that managers are plagued by two parallel challenges during their working lives. The first is how to control the organization, and the second is how to manage their identities as managers. Consequently, the skills of the consultant play an essential role, and in such a way that makes it possible to improve, change, control, and reinforce a managerial identity that is positive. The critical perspective argues that consultants attempt to reproduce management's image as important, powerful and being in control. Therefore, the client is said to be heavily influenced by the management consultants, who set up and define the context and roles in which the client’s managers are to act, in addition to the roles they enact. Authors Sturdy, Fincham, and Clark, while supporting the critical perspective, assert that consultants tend to use impression management owing to the fact that there is a lack of a distinct body of knowledge.

---

for them to draw upon. Consequently, the skill of the consultant lies in their presentation of themselves as specialists in order to persuade clients of the necessity of their services.

The relationship between the consultant and the client in the functionalist perspective is depicted as a temporary, arm’s-length and contractual relationship where providing the client with the service of knowledge is the goal. It is presumed that the client and consultant are independent of each other; this makes it possible for the consultant to view organizational problems objectively and to remain isolated from hidden agendas, power struggles, etc. Furthermore, a main feature of the relationship is that it is defined clearly when it comes to duration, terms and content.

The client-consultant relationship in the functionalist perspective is perceived as an assisting relationship, which is time-limited and contractual, with defined tasks to solve.

Fundamental to the functionalist perspective is that the consultant is dependent on the client and the client is in control, as the client can fire and hire the consultant. Given that the consultants’ aim is to have the client continuously buying their services, this makes the consultant the client’s subordinate. So, trust is seen as a key factor to success in the relationship. Some inconsistency does exist in this relationship, as the functionalist perspective is built on the supposition that the consultant’s knowledge is superior to that of the client’s, therefore the client’s contractual power shifts.

A list of roles and functions played by consultants has been identified by some academics, who have over time been trying to ascertain the role played by business consultants. Steele revealed how wide the function of consultants is. Nine

---
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roles that consultants adopt while working on a client’s project were identified; ritual pig, advocated, talisman, monitor, clock, barbarian, detective, student and teacher. Others\textsuperscript{498} acknowledged two roles that are basic to business consultants – “the resource role” and “the process role”. The former being when consultants help their clients with their appropriated knowledge and experience, and the latter when helping the organization solve its issues by making them aware of the organizational processes\textsuperscript{499}.

The element most significant to innovation consultants in respect to their knowledge claims is building a collaboration between practice and theory, which means that they can “…design a future that is desirable and devise ways to bring about this future.”\textsuperscript{500} Innovation is therefore often sought after by professionals.

In the framework of technical rationality, a bearer of uncontested knowledge is a professional. An area between profession and vocation (where knowledge that is uncontested is unavailable), is addressed by an innovation consultant. A profession and an vocation are complete opposites. A profession comprises applying general principles to problems that are specific\textsuperscript{501}. While knowledge is the basis of professions, vocations come from passion and are based on emotion. Ratio and general principles are not applied with a vocation, but instead use the ‘heart’ in problem solving.

A useful set of metaphors that aim to better understand the roles of consultants has been provided by Massey\textsuperscript{502}. Three consultants were asked to use metaphors to describe their roles; the first consultant compared his functions to those of a pilot ship taking a voyage. The second one chose to compare himself to gardeners looking after an eco-system, while the third described his role as a guide. This shows that the role of business consultant is subjective. In fact, it helps us realize how hard it is to define.

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
One of the first writers to suggest that the roles taken by consultants be classified was Tilles. Three roles were seen by him as being assigned to the consultant. These were “business doctor dispensing cures”, “information supplier” and “seller of services”\textsuperscript{503}. The first term paints the consultant as a business doctor who cures an ill patient. The second defines the role as an individual who supports the information flow, while the third defines the consultant as someone involved in a sales-purchase transaction (traditional). Generally, they are seen as professional doctors or helpers who have the cure for an organization’s illnesses\textsuperscript{504}. Clark’s reasons for this are largely due to the fact that many of management consulting’s writers were themselves successful consultants\textsuperscript{505}. The roles sought by them therefore reflect their understanding of what roles they think should be adopted by consultants, in order to create a relationship with the client that is successful.

Based on research, it might be concluded that the focus is on the services offered by different consultants and the organization. The organization’s environment has far less attention paid to it, meaning that innovation consulting has no real professional approach, because if there was, a consultant would have to address their unbiased knowledge of the organization’s environment of the reality of their innovation. In this respect, the consultant is focused more on the practical facets of the consultant-client relation, and not just on the theories and knowledge that help with achieving innovation.

The identified methodologies in consulting are those of doctor-patient and process consulting\textsuperscript{506}. The consultant is greatly focused on the process and not on the results of the process; this suggests that this is a process-based approach. The depiction of the organization in the ‘change process’ denotes that the model is a doctor-patient one, where a diagnosis that is good leads to results that are good for the organization. These two approaches take the client’s situation into account and do not claim to have a body of knowledge that is ‘objective’; this is usually the case with an ‘expert’ approach. In the source domain of metaphors, consultants apply variety. The logical nature of consulting calls for logical conceptual metaphors.
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As mentioned earlier, the consultant serves as a mediator between the client’s cognition and their ‘reality’. In the process of knowledge adoption, the mediator-consultant depends on direct communications with the innovation surrounding them, and also on anticipated long-term, indirect innovations. In this respect, the consultant is not a free change agent, but has their own network forces, expertise, and preferences that form public opinion on reality.

Demonstrating knowledge of the foundation of concepts exemplified in metaphors offers cognitive support to clients and the consultant in the process of adjusting, advising and managing expectations on both sides. Abstract ideas for projects based on these concepts therefore become innovative and rational solutions to the problems of the client. The nature of this knowledge production is largely dependent on the consultant’s ability to translate an abstract variety of concepts and have them placed in organizational contexts.

A metaphor is obviously generative in quantity; it enables a “…procedure through which new viewpoints on the world come to exist.” In this sense, metaphors can both be descriptive and can indicate a new problem-solving direction to business problems. A lot of the studies of metaphor focus on its heuristic role; this is the role where it provides new ways of understanding the results of new definitions of problems and their alternative solutions. The generally accepted view is that metaphors are vital for explaining knowledge, by making it more familiar. Alternatively, metaphors are also essential in reflecting on the issue and can even ‘make the familiar strange’.

In essence, metaphors are not a part of rock-hard theory construction and strict theory testing, though they are a part of the heuristic scheme; a setting in which less scientific or scientific results are created. The course of a thought process is addressed by the usage of metaphors and even other tropes. At the commencement of a consulting project, a metaphor is usually part of the heuristic scheme, during which, in dialogue with the client a consultant can perform his task.


There has been a shift in focus on metaphor research in organizations. What is now important to modern scholars is how metaphor and language denote organizational life. Scholars now consent to the fact of the existence of metaphors, and that they play a part in organizational research, after the early years when there was a scientific debate on the importance of metaphors in practice and theory.

Everyone knows metaphor as a figure of speech. It is a tool as well as a lens. The observer can obtain a multidimensional view. This enables them to gain a better understanding of an organization. It is true that seeing through this lens enables filtering of information. At the same time, there is a distortion of the original picture. Thus, a “way of seeing” becomes a “way of not seeing.” Gareth Morgan’s Images of Organizations introduce a better understanding of organizations by utilizing the concept of metaphor. Metaphors can be used to gain additional insight into organizational understanding. However, there are limitations. The metaphor is just a tool. It is a means to an end, rather than being the end. There should be a hidden meaning in the metaphor to be meaningful, and there should be some insight into the overview of different images of organizations.

9. Metaphors for creativity and problem solving

Each organization has to cope with habituation and habits. Growing accustomed to something – whether it is an idea, a method, or a system – is a trap. Surprisingly, where creativity and creative intuition count, unsuitability of the skills possessed is of significance: the better we cope with something, the lower the chance we will approach it from a different angle, in a more creative way. The broader our knowledge of a given area, the less frequently we will have an opportunity for trying out various methodologies.

Systems of innovative problem-solving, conceptualising, and horizontal speculation are undoubtedly commonly used in management.


The use of metaphors in practice becomes the key system of turning subjective experiences into objective problems.

Regardless of the definition adopted, innovation requires a different, fresh look at the world and testing new ways of dealing with the problems arising. One of the obvious ways of changing the rational reasoning is figurative thinking. Comparing similarities can be an interesting form of expression, as part of which a word or a string of words suggesting one thing is used to describe an object or a thought it cannot be fully applied to.

The ability to think figuratively increases the probability of looking at a given thing from a different perspective, which suggests links or configurations one could hardly expect to see in normal circumstances.

According to M.E. Porter, “a competitive advantage should mostly be viewed as the ability to be innovative, to constantly increase its level, and thus to achieve proper effectiveness”\(^\text{514}\).

Organizations viewed as creative have a greater chance of success. Openness to innovation often gives them a competitive advantage. Thanks to innovative solutions and the ability to introduce changes, it is easier for them to find their place on the market and respond to such challenges as globalization, new technologies, growing competition, or market saturation.

Creativity of employees translates not only to the implementation of product innovation. Openness and creativity translate in a positive way to the functioning of an enterprise, which is manifested in such elements as effective determination of work processes, resolving problems, employee satisfaction, and in short, organization improvement. Considering the benefits a company (regardless of the trade it operates in) can gain from it, fostering a pro-active attitude of the employees should be the key objective of every manager.

Innovativeness and enterprise come down to more than just an inspiration and an accidental stroke of luck. They form a discipline with its own principles. They do not require genius but they indicate self-discipline and conscious work\(^\text{515}\).

Continuous changes in the economy, mostly related to the development of modern telecommunication technologies, and the growing number of relationships and correlations between units on the market have an influence on the communication strategy employed by an enterprise and change its character. Effective competition, both on national and foreign markets, requires enterprises


to competently prepare and undertake marketing activities, among which a special role is played by communication within an organization.

Creativity is an ambiguous term. It is discussed in terms of personality traits, lifestyle and forms of activity, personal development, cognitive processes, training and courses, and resolving problems both at work and in private life516.

According to R. Luecke, creativity is the process of developing and expressing innovative ideas aimed at solving problems or satisfying needs of the widely understood (internal and external) customer. Thus, it is not so much talent but a deliberate intention to produce innovations. Creativity is composed of knowledge, creative thinking skills and motivation517.

Organization improvement is at the moment one of the critical success factors on the market. This is why it is important to support enterprising people who develop innovations and look for solutions. Flexibility of actions, new solutions related to management, and innovation are of key significance to the maintenance or improvement of a competitive position.

Using the creativity of employees in an organization does not always have to be directly related to new products. Thanks to a creative approach one can introduce improvements in all areas of an enterprise, not only in production. In short, one can improve the organization.

“Creativity constitutes non-schematic and divergent (searching for numerous possibilities of solving a problem) thinking using knowledge and information from various fields and sources in order to create new, original solutions”518.

Creativity can be accidental or intentional. Accidental creativity is often compared to child creativity or a coincidence. We start to think creatively already in childhood through acquiring various experiences, which, paradoxically, can constitute a barrier to creativity later in life. Facing an obstacle, we try to eliminate it with the help of an already well-tried scheme rather than creating new methods. Thinking schemes limit creativity. Intentional creativity consists in understanding the essence of the problem and intentional application of unconventional thinking aimed at solving it519.

E. Nęcka attributes occurrence of the following four levels of creation to the creativity phenomenon (Fig. 6):

1. Liquid creation – the lowest level of creativity covering innate features. It is based on the assumption that each person is creative and inventiveness at this level relates to creating new solutions which will be useful, particularly, for a given individual. Breaking routine by the employee, i.e. organization of one’s work in a different, more efficient way, can serve as an example of liquid creation in business.

2. Crystallized creation – is not limited to producing new ideas but focuses also on defining the problem to be solved. It is a deliberate action, which lasts longer and, due to this fact, requires perseverance and the ability to motivate oneself from the creator. Building the strategy of the enterprise development is an example of crystallized creation in business.

3. Mature creation – reveals itself as the effect of acquired knowledge and experiences. It is associated with a longer period of time (about 10 years) necessary for obtaining knowledge at the specialist’s level in a given field. Consulting ideas and actions with counsellors (experts) outside the enterprise can serve as an example of using this type of creativity in business.

4. Outstanding creation – mature creation highly evaluated by the environment. This type covers implemented, efficient and famous ideas.

The notion of creativity is connected with innovation. It is thanks to open and unconventional thinking that cutting-edge solutions, i.e. innovations, emerge. Any change which improves something, adds new quality or creates a new product or service is regarded as innovation.

J. Westland provides a short formula for innovation:
Idea + Commercialization = Innovation

According to J. Westland, innovations:

- are connected with creating new products but they also consist in improving the already existing products,
- require “insane” creativity – a large number of ideas, a few of which are chosen for execution,
- require time and means for their implementation.

---


Four types of innovations are distinguished in business practice but they often occur together, comprehensively covering various areas of the enterprise:

1. Technological/technical innovations – provide the largest added value and generate the highest entrepreneurial income. However, they are the most expensive innovations. They lead to the development of products and services. They are based on results of scientific studies and research activities. This type of innovations is often the source of organizational and process innovations.

2. Organizational innovations – changes in the method of work or enterprise management organization. They are often implemented without incurring costs. They are aimed at better functioning of the enterprise or adaptation to changing environment conditions, e.g. legal provisions or customers’ requirements.

3. Process innovations – mostly associated with implementing cutting-edge technical solutions, e.g. changes in the production or service provision process.

4. Marketing innovations – connected with sales and distribution of finished products and services, i.e. new packaging or new marketing strategies.

“Innovation is an idea, procedure or object which is new and better in terms of quality. The notion of innovation can be perceived in two basic aspects. Some authors understand innovation as changes in the production sphere leading to new process solutions and new products; others interpret it much more widely, believing that innovation covers any processes of research and development aimed at application and usage of improved solutions with respect to technique, technology and organization.”

Another division of stages of creative thinking has been proposed by J. Wheeler, who has detailed:

1. Preparation – understanding the problem, searching for and verifying information.
2. Maturation – keeping aloof from the problem.
3. Emergence of the solution.
4. Check – evaluation of the idea, verification.

---

Metaphors are especially useful in such creative domains as marketing. One can observe wide use of metaphor in marketing literature. These range from the marketing ‘mix’, the ‘globalization’ of markets, market ‘segmentation’ and ‘viral’ marketing, to ‘the consumer is King’, brand ‘DNA’, and the product ‘life cycle’. This is because analogical thinking and imaginative juxtapositions predicate creativity in marketing. Metaphors conceal as much as they reveal. You can navigate through complex, inter-related ideas using metaphors and storytelling options. When narrated in the proper form, they bring coherence and delight. Stories are a serious tool for bringing complexity to life. They make complex issues accessible and usable to the world. The world can benefit a lot by learning more. When applied as straightforward market management tools, metaphors can even damage brands, products, and company performance by creating underlying or overarching exchanges and relationships.

Metaphors are actually an implicit or explicit statement about the product. Marketing metaphors can have different linguistic, visual, or symbolic components:

1. Slogans such as “Budweiser, the king of beers,” “Chevrolet, the heartbeat of America,” and “Pioneer, the art of entertainment”.
2. Brand names such as Safari (a perfume), Tide (a laundry detergent), Fiesta (car).
3. Visual or symbolic metaphors such as the image of nude young females in adverts for the “Obsession for Men” aftershave.

Metaphors describe abstract phenomena in concrete terms. Similarly, in marketing the use of metaphors involve embodiment of abstract characteristics into products and services. However, such figurative imputations are the need of the hour in marketing. It has to be accepted that marketing literature is a rich brew of eye-catching comparisons. However, the question often asked is whether this is good or bad. Five decades ago, the use of metaphors in marketing literature was certainly unwelcome. Strunk and White were the primary protectors of proper literature in this case. They warned against extravagant use of language and exuberant metaphors. They considered metaphors to be unnecessary, unseemly, and unfit for use. There was a prohibition on the use of mixed metaphors.

too. They advocated use of plain prose in true academic style, aspiring to respectable scientific status.

Nowadays, both marketers and marketing scholars are very active in using metaphors to achieve their objectives. They use metaphors to gain consumer attention, evoke imagery, as well as provoke comparisons. The make use of metaphors to explain the similarity between a product and its concept. Use of metaphor to explain a complex or technical product and influence the customer’s beliefs is not new. Developing metaphors requires time and money. Marketers do this to achieve their objectives. Thus, it would be safe to assume that marketers benefit from customer behavior towards metaphors. They know how consumers process and store metaphors in memory. They have knowledge regarding the understanding of metaphors by consumers. They can judge consumer preferences.

Language, with its amazing complexity of structure and rich vocabulary, is naturally the main tool people use to express their thoughts and feelings. On the market, companies gaining advantage are those that manage to create a network based on effective cooperation between the entities involved. Thus, the ability to establish and enhance relationships with the company’s environment is becoming more and more significant, while communication plays a special role in the process of establishing these relationships.

The fact that the awareness of the communication process is essential in the organizational environment is indisputable. Knowledge of the notion of communication and the whole course of the process becomes the foundation for the process of creating message in an organization.

Naturally, when analyzing factors determining the course of communication and its effects, it would be a mistake to omit the natural limitations of the process. As it is possible to make different interpretations of the environment around us, there is no perfect message. This is particularly true in situations when the communication process is limited with such a specific form as the message within an organization.

Aristotle considered the ability to think metaphorically, i.e. illustrating, as virtuosity. He believed that people who are able to see similarities between two completely different spheres and connect them must possess a remarkable gift. If two similar things are indistinguishable in one aspect, they can differ in others.

When thinking figuratively we mostly move the area of reference, which refreshes the perspective on a given issue in an organization, and we also organize

the space between the issue in question and a different field, which can lead to innovative conclusions.

Numerous studies have been conducted\textsuperscript{530} in order to identify the usefulness of allegory to team activities. For example, Nambu and Harada\textsuperscript{531} examined the relationship between the usefulness of allegory and the nature of communication channels. For this purpose, the critical aspect of selected allegories was examined. An analysis of messages that were riddles to the researched was used\textsuperscript{532}. According to the results, the use of analogy encouraged to harmonious communication and critical thinking in relation to individual messages of members of a given organization. They believe that analogies aimed at describing the riddle as a whole were used to build a certain mental foundation at an early stage of critical thinking, whereas analogies describing individual elements of the imagined whole were used to describe places of particular interest at the following stages of the process of specifying the problem. At the moment, the turn towards metaphors rooted in the acts of cooperation is more and more frequent. One can see that the managerial staff have withdrawn from the imperative of “gaining advantage by force” and turned towards the imperative of “a helpful point of reference”.

10. Metaphor in organizational change and innovation

The new, globalized world, sees the state of change as “…a constant feature of organizational life”\textsuperscript{533}. Businesses and organizations are becoming more and more complex. The constantly accelerating pace of change has forever changed how work is delivered within organizations, that are themselves becoming more and more diverse. The impact of globalization, the integration of markets and increased IT capabilities mean that rigid organizational structures and plans no


longer seem practical or feasible. 21st century organizations need to establish and maintain a state of fluidity in order to adapt to operational environments.

Weick argues that the organizations are in the process of constant change through organizing. Enactment theory talks about organizations and enactment takes place because of people becoming conscious of their relationships. The organization's members cannot totally separate themselves from the organization; this is because they work as one organism and the way they think or act is influenced by the people around them, as well as their environment.

A metaphor can be defined as a specific structure of a mental system. Similarities as such influence the way we perceive the world or classify events, and they are naturally responsible for the composition of mental schema, while their use plays a key cognitive role, as it supports mental processes and stimulates creativity. They allow organization members or consultants to apply improvised thinking and to use original ideas in their managerial or advisory practice. The business practice provides us with a number of examples in this field. Casakin suggested that allegories are able to grasp the outline of an idea, and to characterise goals and necessities. In a different analysis, the order to create unusual mental configurations turned out to be more productive during the initial stage of the process of idea specification, called the reason-related configuration. The use of similarities during the following stages of the specification process produces less predictable results and requires greater specialist skills.

Apart from information and naturally specialist skills, the process of problem specification requires also a healthy dose of imagination. Creativity encourages to look at a problem from an unusual and imagined point of view. In order to foster innovation, one can apply all kinds of standards, tools, and heuristics,

such as illustration techniques. Despite the significance of a number of these
techniques, no one has ever conducted any research in this respect: the ultimate
goal here is focus on the possibilities of applying illustration techniques in the
planned innovation development.

Innovation is an exceptional and empowering strength hidden in human rea-
soning. It is characterised by the ability to transform conventional thoughts in
order to implement specific organizational improvements. Imaginative deduc-
tion is also connected with the ability to examine reality from different creative
perspectives and to consider unpredictable possibilities, which in the mod-
ern business reality is the essence of the operation of enterprises. Development
is something natural, while innovativeness attempts to grasp mental processes
responsible for creative and critical thinking. A large variety of applications of
creative and critical thinking is characteristic of the modern era.

Ingenuity is a key element of critical thinking, and thus of management. A
significant reason for this is the fact that specifying is a disorganized movement
of thoughts, during which solutions to problems cannot be reached through
calculation or management. The need for the subjectivity of the information
experienced and the creation of new, slightly unstable sets and clarifications of
this information require the development of notional abilities. Ingenuity offers
a given person or group the ability to go beyond the conventional informa-
tion space in order to find new ways of thinking and creative combinations of
ideas.

A significant aspect of research into innovation is an attempt at determining
how one can estimate notional abilities. In his research, Guildford described
innovation in operational terms, indicating four main aspects within which indi-
vidual acts of ingenuity are transformed into longer-lasting practice. These four
aspects are:

- Sophistication (the number of subtle elements in answers),
- Innovation (a statistical view of answers),
- Fluidity (the number of appropriate responses),
- Flexibility (a diversity of classifications of appropriate responses).
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Guildford’s four aspects prove highly useful when assessing ingenuity on different planes identified with the process of critical thinking.

Metaphors deepen the understanding of new circumstances with reference to the already known circumstances\(^{543}\). According to Lakoff\(^{544}\), metaphors can be used to refer to similar facts that are comprehensible in order to depict the shape of the unknown problem. In their essence, mental representations are phenomenological juxtapositions of the known and the unknown. They revise the collection of ingenious ideas that broaden the human ability to interpret organizational phenomena. Metaphors are valuable tools helping to solve difficult to characterize problems arising in an organization.

The significance of the category of similarity in the process of critical thinking refers to the so-called central steps\(^ {545}\). The first step consists in getting unknown ideas from distant mental space, where the organization of thoughts is still unclear. The second step is based on mapping deeper relationships linking the problem with the presented metaphor. The correspondence between the two ideas is a result of a consensus and speculation. Secondary relationships are excluded, while the basic references between the ideas analyzed are left in the centre of attention. The last step is based on the exchange and application of these secondary relationships between the figure and the problem examined, and so new understanding is acquired as part of a new mental configuration. (quotation)

11. Metaphor in executive coaching

Development of knowledge-based economy entails the necessity of searching for new methods and tools of strengthening and verifying organizational learning processes. In this context, numerous researches indicate the significance of executive coaching as an instrument supporting both individual and organizational learning processes\(^ {546}\). Because of the competitive global marketplace, people

---

management is gaining in importance. People management strongly influences all other sources of competitive advantage, such as technology, manufacturing processes, structure, and business strategy⁵⁴⁷.

It is strongly believed that the most important asset of any business is its employees. People and management of people are increasingly seen as key elements of competitive advantage⁵⁴⁸. Traditional views on competitive advantage emphasize such barriers to entry as access to capital, economies of scale, and regulated competition. Recent views have highlighted the organization’s strategic management of its human resources as being a source of competitive advantage, which cannot easily be acquired or imitated⁵⁴⁹.

Efficient organization management has always been a domain of persons employed in the organization and constituting its capital. People have always been a special organization resource in the sense that their competences in the form of knowledge, experience, skills and abilities are the organization’s strategic resources allowing the organization to develop and gain a competitive advantage. They create organizational culture⁵⁵⁰. Investment in human resources in the form of, e.g. a coach’s support, can lead to obtaining benefits of added value for the enterprise⁵⁵¹. This is because a number of factors determining efficient organization functioning depend on persons employed in the organization. Taking care of employees’ intellectual and professional development has become a strategic task for numerous managers. In order to retain employees and maintain their involvement, the organization needs to take care of their development. Numerous publications emphasize that human capital:

---


has a major impact on innovation of economies and societies,
has a serious influence on institutional transformations,
favors promotion and popularization of modern models of
consumption and quality of life,
shapes modern technical and organizational, information technology, as
well as social infrastructure. Human capital underinvestment results
in the emergence of civilization and education gap, economic stagnation,
etc.

Human resources development is defined as any actions taken in the organi-
zation aimed at supporting and implementing the process of enhancing skills
and motivation of employees. This process is intended to “equip their pro-
fessional potential with features necessary for performing current and future
tasks. As a result, it contributes to the pursuit of the organization’s objectives
and individual goals of the employee.” Development of work resources is
realized through:
- “various forms of training broadening knowledge and skills and shaping em-
ployees’ behavior;
- individual professional carrier planning and pursuit.”

Coaching is becoming an increasingly common way of human resources de-
velopment. This is confirmed by the growing number of coaches themselves, cen-
ters and programmes educating coaches. Numerous publications concerning
coaching have been released over the last few years. However, this field requires
research.
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There is a large terminological chaos at the current stage of development of coaching. It often happens that something that has nothing to do with coaching is called coaching. A few groups involved in defining coaching can be distinguished:

– coaching recipients (direct customers),
– principals (indirect customers – HR department employees, HR managers),
– managers,
– theoreticians (scientists),
– professional coach practitioners,
– non-professional coach practitioners.

When defining coaching and the coach, it seems the safest to use records of professional associations and organizations dealing with coaching.

It can be claimed that:

• coaching is professional assistance provided by a suitably qualified coach for the benefit of the customer’s (e.g. manager’s) development,
• coaching is a process based on cooperation between the coach and the customer. Its essence is the customer’s development in the direction which will be suitable for the customer in their view and using measures which will help the customer,
• coaching constitutes a relation between the coach and the customer and the relation space enables the customer to raise awareness, make changes and enhance professional skills,
• coaching is a dynamic process, in which the customer changes in the direction valuable for them.


Researchers indicate that coaching is a key element of efficient management and improvements in productivity and business results are benefits of implementing a coaching culture.\textsuperscript{560}

Executive coaching, whose beginnings date back to the 1940s\textsuperscript{561}, has become popular only in the 21st century. In a broad sense “executive coaching” is a specific type of training aimed at enhancing high-level managers’ leadership skills and efficiency\textsuperscript{562}. “Executive coaching” is increasingly regarded as an exceptionally effective approach to the enterprise development. “Executive coaching” has become popular partly because, above all, it helps the management team to change deeply rooted leadership behaviors. Furthermore, “executive coaching” is a development method ensuring privacy, which is appreciated by high-level managers. Kokesch & Anderson\textsuperscript{563}, Kilburg\textsuperscript{564} and Orenstein\textsuperscript{565} noticed that coaching as a profession has to this day been the subject of very few publications. Grant\textsuperscript{566}, Kilburg\textsuperscript{567} and

\begin{itemize}
\item Orenstein R.L., \textit{Measuring executive coaching efficacy? The answer was right here all the time}, “Consulting Psychology Journal: Practise and Research”, 2006.
\end{itemize}
Passmore\textsuperscript{568} claim that there is no competence model for the coach, which is particularly important, taking the ongoing terminological chaos into account.

Executive coaching needs to deal with expectations of the parties concerned in accordance with its nature. In order to meet customers’ expectations, the executive coach needs to have wide knowledge with respect to broadly understood management. According to Kampa – Kokesch\textsuperscript{569}, the executive coach must be well acquainted with such disciplines as: business, psychology, organizational sciences and emotional intelligence. Executive coaching is characterized by a multidisciplinary approach\textsuperscript{570}.

The role of coaches is to skillfully choose words, so as to reach their interlocutors. They are leaders who manage their coachees in a specific way, in order to achieve the best possible results. Such leadership coaching is associated with the following initiatives of the leader\textsuperscript{571}:

– Supporting subordinates in the moments of uncertainty,
– Fostering continuous learning through experience,
– Building an atmosphere of trust,
– Supporting the creation of tight and integrated work teams,
– Appreciating experience and competencies,
– Improving skills and listening to others,
– Orienting subordinates towards the acquisition of knowledge.

More specifically speaking, coaching is nothing else than detailed management of the subordinate’s development thanks to in-depth analyzes and reflections, leading to greater achievements. Coaching is “a comprehensive approach, the aim of which is to support development through using a number of different techniques, increasing the effectiveness of the use of the potential of skills,


supporting the acquisition of new knowledge, and improving activities”\(^{572}\). An effective coach uses appropriate metaphors in order to present situations to the coachee in a comprehensible way. Motivating listeners with the use of stories effectively arouses their imagination and activates a sense of association, thanks to which one can uncover the hidden truth. The better coaches understand their coachees’ line of thought, skillfully involving them in cooperation, the more they increase the efficiency of the tasks performed.

Metaphors and symbols used have a remarkable influence on the development of the coaching relationship. Provision of information by the coach in this form has a significant effect on the effectiveness of communication. Metaphors are more easily remembered, as their parts can be ordered based on certain schemas, and they arouse our imagination and emotions.

In the work of a coach, metaphors are very significant and can be very useful in order to understand, explain, and accept different phenomena. What matters the most is choosing the most appropriate metaphors that will produce the desired effect. Considering their profound influence on unconscious processes, they are effective thanks to the fact that they skip the filters of rational thinking. Ambiguities of metaphors can make them become alternatives when choosing new, better changes introduced into life, which can cause the elimination of old behavior. A metaphor is not only a chance journey to the world of a figurative language but a fundamental factor within the everyday cognitive process.

Metaphorical communication is a very important part of the whole communication process between a coach and a coachee or a customer. It is far more effective than direct communication, which is not always successful. All kinds of therapists, coaches, and trainers are willing to use it and they agree that it offers extraordinary advantages. A well-told story referring to the situation in life, financial situation or career of the customers helps to arouse their imagination and direct their thoughts and activities towards issues they have not considered before.

12. **Metaphor in entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship has constantly been a dominating force in the economy. It alters the way we communicate, the way we live and the way we work. It breeds Innovation and improves the quality of services and goods.

---

It is also one of the most studied areas in business research and economics. Ever since the early 1980s, entrepreneurship has been a topic of mounting interest amongst many management scholars and social scientists.\(^{573}\)

The literature on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs stems from 3 major sources:

- Economic authors, who emphasize the entrepreneur’s role in the development of the economy.
- Business and social writers, who emphasize the impact of the business and social atmosphere on entrepreneurship.
- Psychologists, who concentrate on entrepreneurs’ personality traits.\(^{574}\)

Entrepreneurial initiative is the concept of creating, taking risks, renewing or innovating within or outside an organization. The entrepreneurial spirit also places an emphasis on innovation, search and exploration. This explains why entrepreneurship is defined in many different ways.

Entrepreneurship is an important component of economic development and demonstrates its fundamental significance in diverse ways:

- By identifying, evaluating and taking advantage of business opportunities.
- By building new firms or making existing firms more dynamic.
- By using competences, job creation and innovation to drive the economy.
- By largely improving society’s wellbeing.

Entrepreneurship is at the core of the dynamics of the economy, and has continued gaining momentum as a relevant and significant field of research. In various countries, policy makers are in a rush to encourage entrepreneurship and company owners are searching for entrepreneurial employees.\(^{575}\) The attention now placed on entrepreneurship is spurred on by the massive popularity of high technology start-up firms, the growth of venture capital funding, triumphs of regional clusters, (Silicon Valley) and crowd funding possibilities. Social scientists and management scholars interested in entrepreneurship often concentrate on studying its metaphors.

Companies all over the world are finding it hard to identify new ways to achieve competitiveness, profitability and growth. This has turned into a hard

---

objective taking into consideration the pressures of global economy. Common ways to accomplish growth in a firm are joint ventures, acquisitions and mergers. However, generating growth from within a firm is still a challenging goal.

Entrepreneurship has an effect on all organizations, regardless of age or size, whether they are public or private bodies, and independent of their goals. Its significance in the economy is revealed in its noticeable growth as a subject matter of interest for both academic literature and the economic press. For this reason, it is a matter of interest to academics, businessmen and governments the world over.

Most industries across the globe operate in a competitive landscape. This landscape is rife with powerful competition amongst existing players and the rise of many competitors that target particular sectors of the market. Transformations in modern business emphasize that as a necessity, more companies need to be more entrepreneurial and organizations all over the world are trying to promote intrepreneurship so that business prospects can be recognized and exploited.

Corporate venturing, according to Narayanan et al.\textsuperscript{576} focuses on the laying down of processes and steps in building new businesses and incorporating them into the organization’s general business portfolio. Chrisman and Sharma\textsuperscript{577} affirm that corporate venturing can be separated into the external and internal. The internal entails the formation of new businesses that usually reside within the organization. Kuratko\textsuperscript{578} states that pre-existing internal organizational structures could accommodate these new endeavors or that new organizational entities could be formed within the organization. However, the external involves organizations investing in early growth stages and young businesses formed by external parties; this includes joint ventures, acquisitions, licensing, and CVC (Corporate Venture Capital).

Secondly, as mentioned earlier, corporate entrepreneurship can perhaps embody a revitalization of activities that can improve a corporation’s capacity to take risks and compete, which might or might not entail adding new businesses to an organization. This facet of corporate entrepreneurship is defined as strategic

\textsuperscript{576} Narayanan V., Yang Y., Zahra S., Corporate venturing and value creation: a review and proposed framework, Research Policy, forthcoming, 2009.
entrepreneurship by Audretsch and Kuratko, and Morris et al. Also, it has been described as involving the exploitation and identification of opportunities whilst simultaneously sustaining and creating a competitive advantage. It can entail organizational rejuvenation, business model reconstruction, sustained regeneration, domain redefinition, and strategic renewal. In their review, however, only focused on the last 4 of these. Activities in corporate entrepreneurship can occur at the project, corporate, functional, business, or spin-off venture levels. Previous corporate venture research mostly focused its attention on the parent corporation, rather than the spin-offs or venture levels.

“Intrapreneurship” is entrepreneurship that occurs within a large corporation. The term was coined by Pinchot & Pinchot and these entrepreneurs were referred to as “intra-corporate entrepreneurs” or “intrapreneurs”. Large corporations soon recognized the advantages of exploiting the entrepreneurial spirit inside their organization, and embarked on maximizing the potential of their human capital. Pinchot described “intrapreneurs” as creative thinkers who are directly responsible for the creation of innovation within a corporation. Initiatives by an organization’s employees to take on new business activities are referred to as “intrapreneurship”. Even though intrapreneurship is similar to corporate entrepreneurship, these are different concepts. Corporate entrepreneurship is

585 Narayanan V., Yang Y., Zahra S., Corporate venturing and value creation: a review and proposed framework, Research Policy, forthcoming 2009.
typically classified at organizational levels and is a top-down process (a strategy by management to cultivate initiatives by the workforce and their effort to develop innovative new businesses). Intrapreneurship on the other hand, is about the proactive, bottom-up work-related initiatives of employees (individuals), at the individual level.

Consistent human resources management (HRM) practices reinforce one another, so that their sum has a synergistic influence upon desired employee behaviors. Hornsby, Kuratko, and Montagno identified five success factors linking HR practices to corporate entrepreneurship (CE). These include:

- The appropriate use of rewards,
- The provision of management support for innovation,
- The availability of resources for innovation,
- An organizational structure conducive to learning and cooperation,
- Individual risk-taking.

Research has confirmed the empirical significance of these five dimensions of organizational environments in promoting corporate entrepreneurship. In another study, Morris and Jones identified five sets of HRM practices associated with corporate entrepreneurship:

1. Performance appraisals – It is worth stressing that performance appraisals are oriented towards ends rather than means. They measure both individual and group performance. They reflect a tolerance for failure, their content includes innovation and risk-taking behavior.


2. Compensation – In entrepreneurial firms, base pay is lower and there is a greater amount of pay at risk. Entrepreneurial companies balance both long and short-term performance and individual and group performance.

3. Orientation and training – Entrepreneurial firms invest more time and effort in orienting their new employees, and there is more group-oriented training.

4. Recruitment and career development – Entrepreneurial firms emphasize the external labor market and offer a variety of career paths.

5. Job design – Job designs tend to be less structured and more complex, offering more discretionary authority and freedom.

Evidence of a correlation between certain HR practices such as selection, training, performance management, rewards and career development that encourage entrepreneurial behaviors and corporate entrepreneurship was presented by Twomey and Harris. There is one common thread in studies of human resources management practices and corporate entrepreneurship. This states that there is a need for human resources systems to support informal employee contributions, encourage cooperation and avoid unnecessary bureaucratic constraints on behavior.

Idea generation, opportunity perception, recombination of resources, designing of new products, persuading management, internal coalition building, planning and organizing, and resource acquisition are major activities in entrepreneurship. Risk-taking, taking charge, personal initiative, out-of-the-box thinking, active information search, championing, voicing and finding a way are key behavioral aspects of entrepreneurship.

Research on metaphors is well recognized in the field of entrepreneurship. Charteris-Black (2004) stresses that metaphor comprises meanings of transfer. The use of metaphors allows individuals to map out a schema that is familiar to them but in a fresh domain, and evaluate the suitability of the relationships

---


amongst variables\textsuperscript{597}. This facilitates the understanding of abstract and complex ideas\textsuperscript{598}, like entrepreneurship. Metaphors are famous for capturing emotions and experience more than literal discourse\textsuperscript{599}.

Scholars have researched on the metaphors used by entrepreneurs and (non-entrepreneurs\textsuperscript{600}) for entrepreneurship\textsuperscript{601}. Numerous scholars have studied the metaphors used by the media to portray entrepreneurs\textsuperscript{602}. Also, the application of metaphors for sense giving and sense making amongst entrepreneurs is another research subject\textsuperscript{603}.

Where an entrepreneur’s past experiences is limited to entrenched words or references to certain isolated features of an industry and not the entire industry, the entrepreneur can project these features but should ensure that they are aligned with the provisional representation of the industry, before any inferences can be made or derived\textsuperscript{604}. In cases like this, analogical inferences arise in the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{603} Hill R.C., Levenhagen M., Metaphors and mental models: sensemaking and sensegiving in innovative and entrepreneurial activities,”Journal of Management”, Vol. 21, No. 6, 1995, pp. 1057–1074.
discursive elaboration of comparison where features of the source and the target source are first aligned before any inferences are made from the source to the target. This analogical reasoning is known as the alignment-first model, as entrepreneurs will discursively project and align features of the source (ventures in the known industry) and target (a novel venture in a novel industry), and because the results can be used to project and elaborate on additional features of the source. This can lead to inferences, when features are discursively blended with the target, or can make additional features salient.

When entrepreneurs lack proper analogies to give because of a lack of experience in that industry, they face a clear sense-making imperative and can therefore be forced to draw meaning from entrenched idiomatic words or expressions that they will metaphorically extend to the new venture situation, as a way of creating understanding. Lacking directly related experiences and

---


observations, entrepreneurs will reduce use of metaphors due to their liking of language, and due to the pressure of adapting to a limited inventory of conversational units and ever-changing situations that require idiomatic expression\(^{609}\).

Therefore, depending on the entrepreneur’s past experience in the field, they can use specific analogies or metaphors in their communications to give a structure some understanding, and thus increase predictability. Linking their communication to past experiences with the same venture can be analogically thought of as a way of strengthening trust in a venture in a novel industry, hence creating predictability.

Zott and Huy\(^{610}\), and Martens et al.\(^{611}\), all report on how entrepreneurs communicate their analogical links between novel ventures and their past achievements. Entrepreneurs can also draw analogical links with other organizations and industries to predict issues and how they might affect certain situations.

But when there is a lack of direct links and direct parallels which can be drawn, the entrepreneur is likely to use metaphors to make others understand the venture and therefore enhance predictability. Weber et al.\(^{612}\) analyzed how entrepreneurs in a ‘grass-fed’ environment (agricultural and food products) mainly create new markets through their use of idioms such as ‘living soil’ and ‘heritage breed’ cattle. This resonates well with the broader value-orientations of the stakeholders. There are no common analogical parallels to draw on the production side, as opposed to established commitments around local, sustainable and slow food consumption. The entrepreneurs therefore resorted to use of idiomatic expressions which resonated with the familiar cultural understandings of the people involved in sustainability and the natural environment. In turn, this created a solid rationale for the venture.


\(^{611}\) Martens M.L., Jennings J.E., Jennings P.D., *Do the stories they tell get them the money they need? The role of entrepreneurial narratives in resource acquisition*, “Academy of Management Journal”, No. 50, 2007, pp. 1107–1132.

13. Summary

To better understand organizational complexity and how to navigate it requires that managers make it more comprehensible. It requires that they be able to explain and understand complex problems, so that their organizations can better recognize and control their resources.

From the time George Lakoff and Mark Johnson published their famous book, metaphors have been published and have since taken the place of research into cognition and human language. Metaphors have become the perfect tool for defining the role of Cognitive Linguistics and discovering how language reflects our perception of the world. Even though metaphors go unnoticed by most language users, they claim that the language they speak is literal. To most it comes as a surprise that metaphorical speech is in fact part of everyday language and will always be there, whether we know it or not, when we speak about our experiences, emotions, etc. Metaphors do not belong only in the realm of language. Important researchers such as Andrew Goatly, Zoltan Kövecses, George Lakoff and others have argued that Cognitive Linguistics underline how we perceive the world. Metaphors are used to make us understand abstract domains such as time, social institutions, and emotions. The use of metaphors can be a useful tool for reading, understanding and managing organizations.

In everyday language, metaphors comprise essential elements at a practical level\textsuperscript{613}, so why shouldn’t they in management or management consulting? We strongly believe that a metaphoric approach toward management can be applied both in academia as well as in managerial and consulting practice all over the world.

\textsuperscript{613} Cook-Sather A., Movements of mind: the “Matrix,” metaphors and re-imagining education, “Teachers College Record”, No. 105(6), 2003, pp. 946–977.
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