

CHAPTER 1

Meaning of Discourse Analysis in Methodology of Management Sciences

Jolanta Bujak-Lechowicz¹, Paweł Kocoń²

¹University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland; ORCID 0009-0009-5265-6208

²University of Economics in Katowice, Poland; ORCID 0000-0002-2792-2406

Summary. Discourse analysis is a research method well rooted in linguistics and in such sciences as sociology and cultural studies. Meanwhile, in management sciences, discourse analysis seems to be ignored and marginalized. At first glance, the answer to the question whether discourse analysis supports the research process in the field of management sciences may seem obvious. On the other hand, discourse analysis is relatively rarely used in scientific research and business practice. To understand the possible applications of discourse analysis, the definition of the term was first reviewed. Secondly, phenomena are discussed, the nature of which makes it possible to understand discourse analysis; special attention was paid to public relations. The article ends with a recommendation to improve the synergy effect between management and discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a difficult and non-obvious research method derived from the humanities, but necessary when it is necessary to study what is hidden in the organization, inaccessible directly to the researcher.

Keywords: discourse, organisational culture, public relations, brand

1. Introduction

*Success in business is like riding a bike.
Either you go forward or you fall.*

Jackson Brown

It is not without reason that we begin our reflections with a thought which is both meaningful and metaphorical. Its message is simple, success is an incredible skill that helps you keep your balance, is a chance to move and follow a well-thought-out direction and stay on the market. It's a kind of way to be someone and strive to be on top (success is top) (Pycka, 1994), to be down (failure is down). The metaphorical message, which is known to cognitive

scientists (Tabakowska, 2001), allows us to take a close look at management, which has more than one name.

The first associations coming with a concept, refer to the management of something, someone. You can manage your company, human resources, time, emotions (Tabakowska, 2001). This management is not only planned, but also targeted for a specific purpose. It strives to create together with methods and techniques a management concept that will lead to the expected, intended effect. It is possible when a wider context and research methods are taken into account, which give us the field to show off and to describe the issue that interests us.

Social sciences, including management sciences, strive – as every area of life – for a kind of autonomy. This autonomy is obtained on institutional grounds, opening in higher education institutions appropriate fields of study, specialties or creating a whole – endowed with an adjective pointing to a specific discipline – the university.

Autonomy manifests itself in the search for unique research fields (cognitive, holistic) and – above all – characteristic for a given field of methods and research techniques well-established and thought-out for the needs of selected topics. Obtaining such methods is quite rarely done by developing from scratch, it is often a continuation of what someone started, but it did not develop in its entirety, to give a place to those who will return to the problem. More often we are dealing with the adaptation of methods and techniques taken from other sciences, therefore interdisciplinary in this area turns out to be useful and important because it offers many possibilities together with interesting research conclusions. An example of such adaptation is the use of observations in sociology or an experiment in psychology. Thanks to them, we can see a given phenomenon in two ways and find out that this approach is better because it facilitates the description of a problem which we analyze and evaluate.

It is no different in the management sciences, which broadly adapt the methods from the above-mentioned teachings. There is no obstacle for management science to adopt a discourse analysis derived from linguistics and widely used in sociology. All the more so because “Discourse is a key factor in the construction of social life and has a driving force in it”¹ (Duszak, Fairclough, 2008, p. 23). It means that it fits into communication and works on its course depending on the situation of the communication event. We can achieve a lot through discourse.

In connection with the above, several important questions are asked: What is discourse analysis? What do we call discourse and is it a phenomenon other than what has been studied so far? What for does the manager need discourse? (Szeluga-Romańska, 2016). What functions does the analysis of discourse in the process of managing the organization perform? What is it researching? What effects do the results of such research give to you? What management phenomena does the discourse analysis look at? What results can be obtained using this research method? Are there discourse analysis techniques that are only used in management.

On the margins of the above considerations, one should ask another question whether the analysis of discourse fits into the management sciences so much that the researcher who uses it keeps his identity as a scientist in this field, and does not become e.g. a sociologist for a moment. This is not strictly a question in the field of management methodology, but the answer to it is important due to the current scientific promotion in Poland.

¹ Authors' own translation.

In order to answer such questions, we analyzed the selected discourse literature referring to the methodology of management sciences in order to draw conclusions, which will allow us to undertake research on communicating the organization with the environment both internal and external.

2. Discourse and discourse analysis – definitions and demarcations

According to *Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych z almanachem* [Dictionary of foreign words and foreign phrases with almanach] by Władysław Kopaliński, the term ‘discourse’ comes from the Latin ‘discursus’, meaning ‘to discuss’ and means conversation, discussion, and speech (Kopaliński, 2000, p. 136).

Paul Ricoeur defined discourse as an event and meaning (Ricoeur, 1989, p. 85), so understanding discourse is the interpretation of the text, the implication of its meaning (Malewska-Szałygin, 2004, p. 85). It can be said that discourse is a series of language behaviours (Grabias, 1994, p. 231). Lech Nijakowski writes that “discourse is, in brief, a text in context, and therefore not only a fixed system of signs, but also the social context of its creation, dissemination and reception” (Nijakowski, 2006).

This definition seems to be clue to understanding what discourse is and, in particular, how it differs from text or conversation.

According to Michael Foucault, “history constantly proves that discourse is only something that explains the struggles or systems of domination, but also why and what for we fight – it is the power we are trying to gain” (Foucault, 2002, p. 8). So we have an indirect reference to various organizations as systems of power. The power in itself cannot do without communication, and thus without a variety of types of messages. According to the authors of the book *Rytualny chaos. Studium dyskursu publicznego* [Ritual chaos. A study of public discourse] as a discourse we can analyze: “the entirety of messages in the social circulation, so both the area of communication in everyday life [...] and the area of the mass media” (Czyżewski et al., 1997, pp. 10–11).

After defining the discourse one should present what it is and what its analysis consists in. Tim Rapley writes that “discourse analysis is not a unified, mummified approach to studying language in use. It can be treated as a research stream flowing from many sources, a set of loosely related practices and associated theories used to analyze speech and text” (Rapley, 2010, p. 25).

Nevertheless, such a wide-ranging team of research practices has a specific goal. It is, as Lech Nijakowski writes: “reconstructing the structure of discourse. The meaning of a particular message can be fully read only when we look at it from the perspective of its place in the structure of a given discourse” (Nijakowski, 2006).

“This structure of the discourse covers all messages related to a given organization or problem. Therefore, discourse analysis deals not only with the discussion of e.g. newspaper articles, but also pictures, comic books or radio and television programs. It allows you to reconstruct broadcast meanings in all dimensions, because, e.g. receiving the content of a newspaper means not only reading the article, but also viewing graphics and photos, paying attention to titles, subtitles and bolds of text, etc.” (Nijakowski, 2006).

Two examples of how to analyze discourse can be given:

- quantitative content analysis focused on the number of occurrences of words and phrases in the speech, e.g.:
 - number of occurrences of a word category, surface of text – how much space in a newspaper is allocated to text,
 - the placement of the text, whether there is a reference to the text on the cover of the newspaper,
 - arrangement of photos,
 - airtime, font size of the title;
- qualitative content analysis that draws attention to argumentation strategies. It focuses not so much on the concepts themselves as on the relationship between them (networks of concepts) (Grzymała-Kazłowska, 2004, p. 13; Jabłońska, 2006)

These two ways are ones of many, that can be used in analyzing organizational texts. Attention should be paid to their number and variety. These are both formal internal documents, such as: regulations and ordinances, as well as informal texts of employees on internet forums (Rostek, 2010) in addition to advertisements, press texts and many more. All this shows the richness of the organizational phenomenon in humanistic research (Kostera, Nierenberg, 2016)

3. Phenomena explored by discourse analysis

Discourse is an indicator of the nature of organizational culture. If we understand the organizational culture as

Czesław Sikorski defines it as a system of patterns of thinking and acting that are fixed in the social environment of the organization and are important for the implementation of its formal goals (Sikorski, 2002, p. 4).

It can be said that discourse analysis is such a method of understanding the organization by outsiders. One can also risk the wording that employees also carry out pseudoanalysis of organizational discourse for themselves, trying to interpret it in the best way possible to achieve success. It is possible when you believe in the words that are interesting illustrated by Rhonda Byrne in the book *Sekret*. Reading it, you can feel that everything that we want to do, what is in our dreams, is possible and real in achieving what we are interested in at the moment, because: “the gravity law gives you what you think – the end, dot” (Byrne, 2007, p. 15). Undoubtedly, this is also related to how communication takes place between yourself and others in a fragmented world (Banaszek, Florkowski, 2005). It is worth taking advantage of new forms of organizational communication, namely employer branding (Kantowicz-Gdańska, 2010), once and company image management, or public relation (Adamus-Matuszyńska, 2010). Special attention should be paid to the study by Arlie Russell Hochschild titled *Zarządzanie emocjami. Komercjalizacja ludzkich uczuć* (Russel Hochschild, 2009) in which we clearly can find the connection between action and emotions, as well as life success in every field of life.

Both researchers and stakeholders of the organization (clients, contractors, etc.) try to interpret and understand all messages that flow out of the organization to obtain profit, gain a competitive advantage or strengthen alliances.

William J. McIver argues that “organizational culture is a set of social norms and value systems that stimulate the behavior of members of the institution, important from the point of view of relations meaningful for the realization of a specific purpose, and occurring in time and space between people and between people and the elements of the organisation” (Pietkiewicz, Kałużny, 1993, p. 47).

Therefore, if it is known that norms and values can be declared and actually implemented (or both), discourse analysis will show us the assignment of norms and values to one of the above-mentioned collections. The difference between these norms and values, which are only declared, and not respected, or implemented in reality, will be manifested by the difference between formal and informal messages and the activities of the organization. Attention should be paid not only to the content, but also to such elements of the message as: its context, which together with the text can create irony, as well as the ambiguities included in it.

4. Anthropology and ethnography of organizational culture

Organizational members responded to four open-ended questions about the organization’s culture at two times, six years apart. Results of a content analysis of the responses indicated that organizational values remained stable, despite extensive changes in the top leadership of the organization coupled with environmental forces that were pushing for change in the organization’s culture (Campbell, 2004, p. 47).

Mariusz Bratnicki, Roman Kryś and Jan Stachowicz are followers of the anthropological approach to organizational culture, in the name of which organizational culture is recognized as sharing meanings and symbols, rituals and cognitive schemes, constantly formed and transformed as the organization tries to balance the requirements of internal cohesion with the needs of reactions detected in the environment (Bratnicki et al., 1988, p. 67).

While the majority of organizational rituals are available at least for employees, their meaning can only be known through their in-depth analysis.

The identification of standards and values guiding the organization leads to the identification of types of organizational culture. If we consider the proposal of Charls Handy quoted by Nogalski, who distinguishes four cultural orientations (rarely existing in a pure form), which are in fact types of organizational culture:

- 1) power orientation,
- 2) orientation on the role,
- 3) task orientation,
- 4) orientation per person (Nogalski, 1998, p. 124).

It turns out that the nature of the company’s documentation – ordinances, regulations, etc. – influences not only on the focus on the role or power, also on the formal language, as well as informal – similar to the private office décor or the content of advertisements on information boards. It should be remembered that the message is not just a document, film, e-mail or voice recording. Design and spatial attributes of places are also very important – they carry information for the crew and people from outside. Here, too, discourse analysis gives a decrypt of meanings contained in the above-mentioned elements.

The components of organizational culture can be also considered in relation to the discourse, especially those elements that are hidden or ostensible. According to Edgar Schein quoted by Kostera, there are three levels of organizational culture:

- 1) visible, conscious – artefacts and cultural creations, visible patterns of behavior, symbols, ceremonies,
- 2) partially visible and conscious – norms and values, bans and ideologies, behavioral guidelines,
- 3) invisible, usually unconscious – attitude to the environment and reality, human nature and interpersonal relations, activity (Kostera, 1996, p. 75).

The artifacts, the rituals and the symbols read properly and not only through the content they communicate, but also through the organizational context, point to norms and values actually realized, not just declared. The proper deciphering of norms and values and reading them from behind the curtain of the organizational elites declarations allows to read the “organizational paradigm”, the above-mentioned unconscious level of the organizational culture. This reading has important consequences – cognitive, because it allows to know the essence of organizational and practical culture, because it enables its real change. The knowledge of the strategy of interpersonal communication (Filipiak, 2004, pp. 144–150), which avoids silence and selective expression, also helps to replace it with a holistic, cognitive view of a given topic. Magdalena Stefańska (2002), Piotr Kwiatek, Marek Zieliński (2002) and Jacek Trębecki (2002) write about this in an interesting way.

In turn, the institutional ethnography (IE), is a social ontology, pioneered by Dorothy Smith, a Canadian feminist-sociologist. Conceptualizing the discourse as social relations, which are organized by human activities and are empirically examined, IE was increasingly used by non-sociological scientists in areas such as education and health (Peacock, 2017).

Also learning about the organizational climate is simpler by analyzing discourse, especially discourse changes in the context of the changing environment. Here again, the transformation of the so-called personal documents texts (diaries, blogs, letters, e-mails) do not say everything without an organizational context – e.g., the situation of the organization on the market.

5. Brand of organization

One of the most important objects studied by management science is the organization's brand. Notes that the role of brand as more than just a marketing communications icon is increasingly obvious to leading businesses. Brand drives nearly two-thirds of customer purchases and impacts nearly every function area of the business. It stands to reason, then, that extending the equity of the brand will fuel growth while allowing the business to outpace competitors (Davis, Halligan, 2002). The concept of a brand is ambiguous and has blurred boundaries. A brand is a “trademark or brand is a name, a term, a symbol, an inscription, a pattern or combination thereof, color composition, melody or combination of all these elements used to distinguish a given product from competing products” (Altkorn, 2005, p. 128).

The brand defined in this way is a combination of symbols and signs. That is way the brand is a specific language creation and an ideal object of discourse analysis. These emotions

are so strong that Martin Lindstrom claims that brands are “perceived by man as sacrum” (Lindstrom, 2009, pp. 105–123).

Leslie de Chernatony distinguishes the following approaches to the brand concept (de Chernatony 2003, p. 45):

- As a work, the brand is a part of culture, often a symbolic product. Analyzing artistic discourse, or rather the discourse of art, gives an answer to what the brand is in the process of managing the organization. As a logo subjected to the reading in a certain context, it is the language symbol of the organization. As an institution, in this case the brand covers the whole organization that creates it. In this case, the product or service is the same as the organization. As a value, a brand can be considered as a group of values (de Chernatony, 2003, p. 45), for example conservatism, elitism and wisdom, embodying the Rotschild Investment Bank. The advantage of such a brand’s understanding is timelessness – wisdom or individuality, they will never grow old. The disadvantage – the problem of determining the value and matching them with the values of the staff (Ollins, 2004, p. 93).
- A brand can be understood as a stenographic record – a certain number of information about a product or service (de Chernatony, 2003, pp. 38, i.e. a brand is defined as a bundle of information. We can accept seven bits of information at the same time (de Chernatony, 2003, p. 38).
- As a vision – another approach to interpreting a brand used by managers is to treat it as a kind of a lighthouse whose light shows the travelers the right direction of the road. Metaphorically it means, that a lighthouse looks like a journey to success. The role of the brand in this approach can therefore be defined as a consequence of the vision (de Chernatony, 2003, p. 38).
- As a risk limiting factor – in this approach the point is that the brand gives the consumer confidence in the usability of the product, also regarding the profitability of investments in the city.

In addition, we deal with the recognition of a brand as a: legal instrument, a company, positioning, a personality, identity and relationship (de Chernatony, 2003, p. 48). It also involves with the Bank for the Services Exchange, which takes place in interpersonal contacts. It is often the manipulation leading to the destruction of relationships and all activities². Therefore, it seems important to shape one’s own personality and create a strong embedded identity in itself, that image, promotion, self-promotion and self-presentation will be effective and will bring success. It could also help to have a holistic view of the issue by appealing to the senses, which can strengthen being yourself. It depends on the strength of the given sense and its activation at a given moment without weakening the other receptors.

Similarly, an advertising is subject to discourse analysis. A lot of space is devoted to it and an advertising appears in various aspects. Attention is drawn to what it expresses, what kind of the information carrier it is, what it is for and what it is its message. This last is not always legible, it is often conditioned by an individual approach and understanding of the image or advertising text. Looking at the advertisement in the context of discourse

² Three parts of the Helen Fielding novel referring to the history of the Bridget Jones Journal can be used as literary examples (movie).

is an interesting mental experience and allows to extract this, what constitutes the sense and the essence of the discussed phenomenon. Expressing this through language, indicating the messages that characterize them and situating them in context is a research adventure worth launching, digging into it and ending it with descriptions and conclusions. According to Barbara Jabłońska, who writes: “[...] common features for sociologically and critical oriented analysis of discourse, which distinguishes them from the linguistic approach, is the understanding of discourse both as statements and text, attaching importance in the research process to the context in which it works and paying attention to its processuality. However, the difference in these approaches is that in critical studies, in addition to the descriptive and explanatory plane, the normative plane is added” (Jabłońska, 2006, p. 57).

The statement shows that during the discourse analysis we focus on statements, text, context and consider them, taking into account three possible approaches: description, explanation and normativity. They are closely related to the communication event and processuality (Gajda, 2010), which occupy an important place when discussing management in the area of research.

The employer brand can also be subject to discourse analysis as P. Raj Devasagayam, Cheryl L. Buff, Timothy W. Aurand, Kimberly M. Judson write: “External branding initiatives and communications can be used internally, among employees, to build positive brand associations and brand affinity. Further, implementing an internal brand community can lead to increases in the emotional buy-in of employees and ultimately could help companies increase the proportion of »champion« employees” (Devasagayam et al., 2010, p. 210).

6. Standardization of discourse tests

Management is an extremely grateful and bearable topic. A registration, a picture and a recording can be the research material. Definitely an interesting reference are memes or images that are presented on such portals as Demotywatory. On their basis, one can show the discursive and axiological side of a given issue. Discourse tests are also conducted to check how they function and what they characterize. Such considerations are undertaken by the authors of the Qualitative analysis of discourse in social sciences (Wodak, Krzyżanowski, 2011), who propose solutions in various possible discursive paths. Certainly these are preliminary descriptions that give researchers the chance to develop in different directions, depending on the methodology adopted and the research slope, which is not always uniform, often mixed, because it uses material that requires interdisciplinary analysis. Do not be afraid of such analyzes, because they are an interesting view of management in both narrow and broader sense.

7. Conclusion

The presented point of view encourages deeper research on the example of specific references that clearly show that the discursive form of management is not only interesting, but especially the description is important for science, because it gives holistic, cognitive and pragmatic opportunities to look at what has so far been overlooked, and which, in our opinion, needs to be emphasized.

This is a type of managerial profiling, i.e. searching for a prototype, stereotype, metaphor, metonymy, cognitive models, which in terms of cognitive linguistics are the image of the discussed concept and problem and indicate the experience of the user (Lakoff, Johnson, 2010), who uses and processes, gives sense what he says creates the conceptual reality and its scope. Discourse analysis allows you to find different variables affecting events and identify their mutual influences. So far, there are no discourse analysis techniques specific to management and quality sciences, but the pre-paradigmatic nature of this scientific discipline allows the use of methods and techniques from other scientific disciplines.

References

- Adamus-Matuszyńska A., 2010. *Współczesne wyzwania organizacji w obszarze public relations*. [In:] D. Majka-Rostek (red. nauk.), *Komunikacja społeczna a wyzwania współczesności*. Difin, Warszawa, pp. 155–181.
- Altkorn J., 2005. *Produkt*. [In:] J. Altcorn (red.), *Podstawy marketingu*. Instytut Marketingu, Kraków, pp. 114–164.
- Banaszek E., Florkowski R., 2010. *Kompartmentalizacja. O byciu i komunikowaniu w „pokawalkowym” świecie*. [In:] D. Majka-Rostek (red. nauk.), *Komunikacja społeczna a wyzwania współczesności*. Difin, Warszawa, pp. 40–55.
- Bratnicki M., Kryś M., Stachowicz J., 1988. *Kultura organizacyjna przedsiębiorstw. Studium kształtowania procesu zmian zarządzania*. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław.
- Byrne R., 2007. *Sekret*. Wydawnictwo Nowa Proza, Warszawa.
- Campbell C.R., 2004. *A longitudinal study of one organization's culture: Do values endure?* “American Journal of Business”, vol. 19(2), pp. 41–52, <https://doi.org/10.1108/19355181200400011>.
- Chernatony L., de, 2003. *Marka. Wizja i tworzenie marki* [przekł. A. Kania]. Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk.
- Czyżewski M., Kowalski S., Piotrowski A. (red. nauk.), 1997. *Rytualny chaos. Studium dyskursu publicznego*. Wydawnictwo Aureus, Kraków.
- Davis S., Halligan C., 2002. *Extending your brand by optimizing your customer relationship*. “Journal of Consumer Marketing”, vol. 19(1), pp. 7–11, <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760210414916>.
- Devasagayam R.C., Buff C., Aurand T.W., Judson K.M., 2010. *Building brand community membership within organizations: A viable internal branding alternative?* “Journal of Product & Brand Management”, vol. 19(3), pp. 210–217, <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610421011046184>.
- Duszek A., Fairclough N. (red.), 2008. *Krytyczna analiza dyskursu. Interdyscyplinarne podejście do komunikacji społecznej*. Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych “Universitas”, Kraków.
- Filipiak M., 2004. *Homo communicans. Wprowadzenie do teorii masowego komunikowania się*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin.
- Foucault M., 2002. *Porządek dyskursu: wykład inauguracyjny wygłoszony w Collège de France, 2 grudnia 1970* [przekł. M. Kozłowski]. Słowo/Obraz Terytoria, Gdańsk.

- Gajda J., 2010. *Analiza dyskursu i jej zastosowanie w badaniach politologicznych*. [In:] D. Mikućka-Wójtowicz (red.), *Przeszłość – Teraźniejszość – Przyszłość. Problemy badawcze młodych politologów*. Wydawnictwo Libron – Filip Lohner, Kraków, pp. 253–261.
- Grabias S., 1994. *Język w zachowaniach społecznych*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin.
- Grzymała-Kazłowska A., 2004. *Socjologicznie zorientowana analiza dyskursu na tle współczesnych badań nad dyskursem*. “Kultura i Społeczeństwo”, vol. 48(1), pp. 13–34.
- Jabłońska B., 2006. *Krytyczna analiza dyskursu: refleksje teoretyczno-metodologiczne*. “Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej”, vol. 2(1), pp. 53–67.
- Kantowicz-Gdańska B., 2010. *Employer branding jako nowa forma komunikowania organizacyjnego rozwinięta w odpowiedzi na wyzwania współczesnego rynku pracy*. [In:] D. Majka-Rostek (red. nauk.), *Komunikacja społeczna a wyzwania współczesności*. Difin, Warszawa, pp. 136–154.
- Kopaliński W., 2000. *Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych z almanachem*. Świat Książki, Warszawa.
- Kostera M., 1996. *Postmodernizm w zarządzaniu*. Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa.
- Kostera M., Nierenberg B., 2016. *Wstęp. Komunikacja społeczna a zarządzanie humanistyczne*. [In:] M. Kostera, B. Nierenberg, *Komunikacja społeczna w zarządzaniu humanistycznym*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków.
- Kwiatek P., Zieliński M., 2002. *Targi jako narzędzie komunikacji*. [In:] H. Mruk (red. nauk.), *Komunikowanie się w biznesie*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej, Poznań, pp. 109–118.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M., 2010. *Metafory w naszym życiu* [przekł. T.P. Krzeszowski]. Aletheia, Warszawa.
- Lindstrom M., 2009. *Zakupoologia. Prawdy i kłamstwa o tym, dlaczego kupujemy* [tłum. M. Zielińska]. Znak, Kraków.
- Malewska-Szałygin A., 2004. *Tradycja stosowania pojęcia „dyskurs” i jego przydatność w antropologii współczesności*. “Etnografia Polska”, vol. 48(1–2), pp. 81–97.
- Nijakowski L., 2006. *Analiza dyskursu na temat mniejszości narodowych i etnicznych w polskich mediach*, <http://www.racjonalista.pl/kk.php/s,4820/q> [12.12.2010].
- Nogalski B., 1998. *Kultura organizacyjna. Duch organizacji*. Oficyna Wydawnicza Ośrodka Postępu Organizacyjnego, Bydgoszcz.
- Ollins W., 2004. *O marce* [tłum. M. Hereźniak, G. Skonieczko]. Fundacja Promocja Polska. Instytut Marki Polskiej, Warszawa 2004.
- Peacock D., 2017. *Institutional Ethnography, Critical Discourse Analysis, and the Discursive Coordination of Organizational Activity*. [In:] J. Reid, L. Russell, *Perspectives on and from Institutional Ethnography*. “Studies in Qualitative Methodology”, vol. 15, pp. 91–106.
- Pietkiewicz E., Kałużny S., 1993. *Bankowcy i dobre obyczaje. Kultura, etyka, etykieta*. Centrum Kreowania Liderów S.A., Warszawa.
- Pycka W., 1994. *Zarys filozofii sukcesu*. Wydział Filozofii i Socjologii Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin.
- Rapley T., 2010. *Analiza konwersacji, dyskursu i dokumentów* [tłum. A. Gąsior-Niemiec]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

- Ricoeur P., 1989. *Język. Tekst. Interpretacja. Wybór pism* [przekł. fr. P. Graff, przekł. ang. K. Rosner]. Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warszawa.
- Rostek R., 2010. *Internetowe fora pracowników jako zagrożenia dla wizerunku firm*. [In:] D. Majka-Rostek (red. nauk.), *Komunikacja społeczna a wyzwania współczesności*. Difin, Warszawa, pp. 115–135.
- Russell Hochschild A., 2009. *Zarządzanie emocjami. Komercjalizacja ludzkich uczuć* [tłum. J. Konieczny]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Sikorski C., 2002. *Kultura organizacyjna*. C.H. Beck, Warszawa.
- Stefańska M., 2002. *Komunikowanie wizerunku przedsiębiorstwa*. [In:] H. Mruk (red. nauk.), *Komunikowanie się w biznesie*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej, Poznań, pp. 97–109.
- Szeluga-Romańska M., 2016, *Rola menadżera w procesie komunikacji*. [In:] M. Kostera, B. Nierenberg, *Komunikacja społeczna w zarządzaniu humanistycznym*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków, pp. 21–36.
- Tabakowska E. (red.), 2001. *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa*. Polskie Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych “Universitas”, Kraków.
- Trębecki J., 2002. *Narzędzia komunikowania się przedsiębiorstw z mediami*. [In:] H. Mruk (red. nauk.), *Komunikowanie się w biznesie*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej, Poznań, pp. 128–137.
- Wodak R., Krzyżanowski M. (red. nauk.), 2011. *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu w naukach społecznych* [tłum. D. Przepiórkowska]. Oficyna Wydawnicza Łośgraf, Warszawa.