Tuomo Takala

RESEARCH PARADIGMS OF
MANAGERIAL WORK AND
BUSINESS SOCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY -
A TRIAL TO DEVELOPE
NEW PERSPECTIVE

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Economics
and Management

Tuomo Takala

RESEARCH PARADIGMS OF MANAGERIAL
WORK AND BUSINESS SOCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY -
A TRIAL TO DEVELOPE NEW
PERSPECTIVE

N:o 100/1990

Research Paradigms of Managerial Work and Business Social Responsibility - a trial to develope new perspective

INTRODUCTION

Idea of corporate social responsibility has been evolving for decades. As early as the 1930's, for example, Wendel Wilkie,"helped educate businessman to a new sense of social responsibility" (Cheit, 1964). The modern era of social responsibility, however, may be marked by Howard R Bowen's (1953) publication of Social Responsibilities of Business Man, considered by many to be the first definite book on the subject. Following Bowen's book a number of works have been published (see Takala, 1989a; Kettunen,1984; Schreyögg and Steinmann, 1986). However, when one makes a review about the issue one can find out that business social responsibility is quite abstract subject in most of the studies. Even the most recent studies present quite unbelievable conclusions (see for example Piha 1988, p.213) about social responsiveness of Finnish business managers.

These claims seem to be unfounded for many reasons, especially when none empirical evidence is presented. In those studies the idea of firm's social responsibility is not fixed up in any areas of managerial work. So, one purpose of this article is to offer a trial to more concrete examination. Business social responsibility issues are defined and studied through the research approaches of managerial work.

In this study these approaches are called "paradigms". A trial is made in this article to sketch out new kind of approach to study managerial work, especially related with business social responsibility issues. This approach is called speech or discourse paradigm.

The structure of this article is following. First, the paradigms describing managerial work are presented, evaluated and criticised. These paradims are interpretitive paradigm, behavioural paradigm and paradigm of managerial work processes. Second, studies made about organizational talk are reviewed. After this, a trial is made to sketch out a new way to study social responsility issues. This "aspect"is called discourse or speech paradigm, the point from which actors can be thematized as language using discoursive actors. Ontological assumptions arising are considered and new research proposals are made.

1. Interpretitive or action paradigm

With the action or interpretitive approach, the focus is on a subjectivistic view of the world, which argues that the social structure is created at the meaningful human action. This alternative is derived from Germanic philosophical interests which emphasize the role of language, interpretation and understanding in social science. The well known German philosopher Schutz (1967) has been perhaps the most influential proponent of this alternative. As a general scientific paradigm this approach relies on following basic assumptions (see Wai Fong Chua, 1986):

a. Scientific explanations of human intention are sought. Their adequacy is assessed via the criteria of logical consistency, subjective interpretation, and agreement with actors' common-sense interpretation.

b. Social reality is emergent, subjectively created, and objectified through human interaction. All actions have meaning and intention that are grounded in social and historical practices. Social order assumed. Conflict mediated through common schemes of social meanings.

c. Theory try to understand how social order is produced and reproduced, and in some amount also to explain how this process happens.

As Berger and Luckmann (1967) put it, reality is socially constructed through an infinitude of individual, meaning-conferring and meaning-guided actions. Thus when studying managerial work, the focus would be on how managers create "meaningful definitions of situation". These definitions and their revision would relate to the way company acted, or decided not to act, in any particular instant; they amount to the creation of "the rules of organizational game". If one want to study managerial work from this perspective it would be interesting to see whether those rules were activated according to a shared set of conventional symbols or whether they were actually being negotiated in an overtly political way. The main questions should be how meaning is given, constructed and negotiated in organisations (see Harvey et al.). As Fay (1975) points out, interpretitive knowledge reveals to people what they and others are doing when they act and speak as they do. It does so by highlighting the symbolic structures and taken for-granted themes which pattern the world in distinct ways. Interpretive science does not seek to control empirical phenomena; it has no technical application. Instead, the aim of the interpretive scientist is to enrich people's understanding of the meanings of their actions, thus increasing the possibility of mutual communication and influnce. By showing what people are doing, it makes it possible for us to apprehend a new language and form of life.

Another essential feature is the idea of human actor. From this point of view the character of managerial agency is that managers, as creative subjects, may have high discretion to

determine how their firm qua organization will function and thus
how social responsibility issues are carried out.

2. Behavioural paradigm

This paradigm is based on the presumption of consensus and
is provided by the position called functionalism. Social groups
and institutions are seen as interdependent always tending
to equilibrium and stability. The conception is
'functionalist' because each of the parts of organization is
seen function for the others. It is a system of mutual
interdepence (see Harvey et al 1984). For the managerial work
this means that, from this unitary standpoint (see Willmott,
1987), the structure of social organizations within
organizations is seen to embody rational efforts to develop
the most efficient and effective means of achieving common
interests and objectives. When studied in this light,
managerial work is regarded primarily as an expression of
the technical division of labour required to realize
organizational goals. This point of view is most clearly evident
in classical and human relations accounts of the role of
management (also expressed in present studies of managerial work,
e.g.Mintzberg, 1973).

Some critique against "the behavioural paradigm":
Hales (1988) states that in abstracting the activities
of individual managers from their institutional context, the
studies fail to show how power as a structural feature and
capital accumulation as a process and both condition are

reproduced by these activities. By emphasizing superficial differences in managers' behaviour and conceptualizing managerial politics purely in terms of informal, individualistic manoevre, the studies remain blind to the common raison d'etre of all managers, namely control, and to the broader sense in which managers act "politically", namely in employing their access to structurally situated power resources to promote, in the face of potential contestation, a particular class interest.

Willmott (1987) argues that prominent and influential studies of managerial work have been guided by frameworks of interpretation that have disregarded or trivialized its institutional reality and significance. By separating work from its social context, these "behavioural" studies have largely disregarded the "political aspect" of managerial work: or they have identified it exclusively with the skills and strategies of devised and applied by individual managers to perform their formally defined roles and/or to advance their career interest. Overlooked and obscured are the institutional grounds of managerial work as an expression of politico-economic relations of power.

Second, from a pluralist standpoint the unitary perspective is unconvincing because, in large modern organizations, the complexity of the technical division of labour is such that individuals are conditioned by specialized training and motivated by self-interest to form coalitions for the pursuit of sectional objectives. Managerial work is understood to involve a continuous effort to gain consent and/or

contain conflicts of interests in ways which, in the long run, allow at least minimal fulfilment of all members' sectional objectives (see e.g. the studies worked out by Kotter, 1982). More critical points, based mainly on the same standpoints, can be found in Lilja et al. (1986).

In functionalist analyses of organisations the environment is often supposed to dictate what the firm will do. This ideal-typical model reappearing in answer to questions of corporate social responsiveness. Corporations, it is argued, must act responsibly and responsively or face several long-run difficulties of legitimation or profitability or growth. Corporations are essentially responsible to social criticism and if they fail to respond to the changing consensus, then their future legitimacy, and even commercial success will become problematic. But in the effort to accommondate to environmental change, the internal adjustments so necessitated must also satisfy the organisation's internal and other constituencies as far as is possible. Thus internal and external interests should reach acceptable compromise.

The third standpoint, which try to avoid the failures above,is called by Willmot (1987) "radical paradigm" and it includes the position what can be called the paradigm of managerial work processes.

3. The paradigm of managerial work processes

The examination which follows is a brief sketch, more covering presentations can be found from many other sources see especially Teulings, 1983; Tainio et al., 1984; Tainio, 1986;

Lilja, 1986; Räsänen, 1986), only the most important points, from the point of view of this study, are presented.

Recent developments on explanations of managerial work by Teulings (1986) and Tainio et al. (1984), although not directly focusing on social responsibility or business ethics issues, are useful as analytical distinctions and "sensitive framework" when studying ideologies of social responsibility, issues on business ethics and styles of speech on them (see Takala; 1989b).

Teulings (1983) conceptualizes management in modern corporations as collective work processes that have formed around some spesific functions and tasks. He distinguishes four different work processes and characteristics as follows:

Operational management focuses on direct control and coordination of production and distribution

- Business management focuses on developing new products and markets, combining the factors of production, and regulating transactions in the marketplace

- Strategic management focuses on determining the objectives of the corporation, and obtaining and allocating capital in order to reach the set objectives.

Institutional management focuses on legitimating the objectives and activities of the corporation towards its various stakeholders

The key idea is that the managerial work processes concentrate on different substances of the firm production, product market relations, capital market relations, ownership relations), are carried out in different managerial arenas and have contradictory rationales and different influence on firm performance. The work processes form a hierarchy in that those carried out at deeper levels (ownership and capital market relations) precondition firm performance at more immediate levels (production and product market relations). This idea of hierarchy and contradicting means and objectives at different levels are the major

differences between this conceptualization and other frameworks of managerial work mentioned earlier (e.g., Mintzberg, 1973; Kotter, 1982; Donaldson & Lorsch, 1983), (see Woichestyn, 1988). The work process paradigm blames the three studies above their failure to recognize the politico- economic nature of the technical division of labour. From a radical perspective, the horizontal and vertical differentiation of tasks between individuals and groups cannot adequately be explained by references to functional imperatives. Instead, it is understood to reflect and sustain the structure of power relations in society. Managers are seen to play specialist, technical roles in the division of labour. But these roles are perceived to be primarily conditioned by the political economy of work processes in capitalist society.

These roles of managers can be conceptualized in the different managerial arenas (Tainio et al., 1983). The arenas of managerial work define sets of games within which managerial labour processes can be involved in. The arenas are the work

place, business markets, the ground for extensive competition, and the nation-state (Tainio et al., 1984; see also Woiceshyn, 1988)

The games at each of the arenas have their own rationalities in the sense that there are certain "rules of the game" which define what winning is and what means are available for pursuing these goals. Managerial labour processes have their own rationalities which are embedded in the division of labour, definition of jobs, techniques used, and expectations of good work performance. Occupational specialisms have their own conceptions of rational action in spesific crafts and situations. Finally, each individual manager has certain interests and capacities for pursuing them. Personality, broader life-situation, and career-ambitions, for instance, give reason to act in a certain way, even if it does not fit occupational,labour-process, or arena spesific rationalities (Lilja et al.,
1986, p. 13). And further,".. Attention should be focused to determining the conditions in time, space, and material strength - where the management can be an active agency or passive object. This might result in identification of different forms and strengths of the managerial agency in concrete situations" (Tainio et al., 1983, p.26). Thus, what is important from my point of view, this paradigm does not nihilate the agency of individual manager and does not neglect the possibility for a manager to act, to some extent, "freely" within the different kind of structuralities.

What about social responsibility in respect to the levels

of management, the managerial arenas and different rationalities ? Several presumptions are assumed:

- organization and corporation (company, firm) are consisted of many battlefields, i.e. organization is a "contested terrain"

- several conflicting rationalities rule the action in the firm

- an individual (top) manager has to act simultaneously in several arenas, and the arenas have interconnections that are beyond manager's control

- social responsibility issues are dominated by the profit making rationale and manager's own ethical rationale, on the other hand

According to this paradigm (and from a cynical point of view) one can state that, a company's internal and external relations would be seen as being cast within a "contested terrain" over the priority to "accumulation", in which is determined the nature and extent of corporate responsibility, for example, to create jobs but not to cure unemployment; to limit the environmental impact "within reason"; to create healthy working conditions but within the limits of profitability; to enchance quality of working life, but not to divest control into the hands of operatives (Harvey et al., 1984). On the other hand it can be assume on the basis of some studies see Takala, 1988; Miettinen, 1982; Pääkkönen and Repo, 1984) that the individual manager have

different conflicting responsibilities, duties and stresses
dueing to different rationalities governing his professional
practice and private morality. In this study it is assumed
that as a one result of these problems is "managerial talk".
I suggest that this talk or discourse reveals something very
essential on the managerial work and social responsibility
issues. So, the paradigm to study managerial work as speech
must be defined.

4. On organizational and managerial talk - toward the discourse paradigm

The ontological presuppositions of this paradigm are quite the
same as in the so called interpretitive paradigm. Now, the point
is that some elements of the interpretitive paradigm are tried
to combine with the work process paradigm so that the result is
the speech paradigm.

Many influential students of organizations have emphasized the
importance of language, speech and symbolic order in the process
of socialization and also in the work of management (e.g. Meyer
and Rowan, 1977; Pondy, 1978; Pfeffer, 1981; March and Olsen,
1976). Jointly shared symbolic expressions which are articulated
through language are the means of socialization and create
a social bond between individuals and groups since the roles
and social relations are transmitted and internalized
through language. Also in political science the importance of
the ideas above are confessed, for example Edelman states that

talk, on the other hand, involve a competitive exchange of symbols, referential and evocative, through which values are shared and assigned and coexistence is attained (Edelman, 1964). This implies, when one study managerial work from "speech"-paradigm, that language can be understood as cultural and political guidance system into which values handed down from the past are deposited. It is also worth noticing that this function of language often realizes itself unconsciously; language is part of our unconscious (see Pekonen, 1987). The concept of symbol is another important matter. This concept can be defined as the crystallization of linquistic or image - like description. Due to existence of different symbols, reality is not only described but also valued. The symbol is not only a reflection of reality,it also "refracts" and structures; symbolization is always more than just a process of naming.

The importance of the verbal communication has been lately accentuated as an central element of the managerial decision making process (e.g. Brunsson, 1986; Czarniawska-Joerges, 1988; Takala, 1989b). One can differ several approaches in the studies concerning organizational or managerial talk. First, it is analyzed in evaluative terms: people in organizations talk instead of acting, which should be their main occupation. Consequently, talk has perceived as covering or reflecting the "actual" reality. As alternative approach is that of talk as work. Within this approach people perform their jobs by talking. This can be also said of managers, if we wanted to describe them as profession. Third, talk can be seen as device for control. Thus organizational talk was treated as a crucial type

of organizational action. Talk is a part of organizational consciousness, what people know and ask about, confirm and doubt. Talk is meta-action in the sense that it control physical action and also other talk. He who decides what is talked about and how is talked about has power (see Czarniawska-Joerges, 1988).

As it is noticed above there have been published recently several studies on managerial work and talk. Czarniawska-Joerges (1988) has studied the proto-typical devices used to build shared meanings in organizations. In that process the following subjects have a central position. **Talk, rhetoric, language, speech, and discourse** are terms often used in this context. According to her definition the meanings of these terms are quite different. Talk can be seen as special kind of social action, it is an intentional human act taking place between actors within given social order. Rhetoric stresses mainly formal aspects of talk and even that of discourse . The term important for this thesis is discourse. Discourse can be seen as a repository for talk, a storage of legitimate talk elements. This repository is then used in speech acts, actual occurrences of use of language. Talk is then all speech acts and their rhetorics as characteristics for a given social setting, and is either a synonym for discourse or else includes it as potential talk.

Organizational talk is action taken within the social order of an organization. It can be an action by itself, for example as opening the meeting or in decision making, or it can be a meta-action, giving a meaningful structure to other

actions. This last function consists of forming linkages between culture and organizational symbols; among various organizational symbols: and between organizational symbols and organizational reality. Talk joins together the practical and expressive orders or the orders of "work" and "desire" of organizational life, therefore providing various organizational events with shared meaning. Based on these axioms Czarniawska-Joerges (1988) found three proto-typical devices, which were labels, metaphors and platitudes. Labels tell us what things are, they classify; metaphors say how things are, they relate, imagize, give life; platitudes establish what is normal, they conventionalize.

Also Brunsson (1986) concentrate his attention on the organizational talk produced by different kinds of organizations. He states that talk is a way to handle and act out inconsistent norms in their environment. For example, companies are required, by powerful counterparts, not only to make high profits, but also to provide many jobs, good employment conditions and little pollution. So, the organizational actions are often prepared, initiated and propelled by talk - the spoken word - within the organizations. Talk and decisions are used for mobilizing and coordinating internal actions. In order to serve as action initiators they should be consistent - the talk and decisions should describe the action that they propose. But the instruments of talk and decisions can also be used for external purposes for reflecting the norms of organizational environment, i.e. they are then used as ideological outputs. By talking about themselves and others to external audiences, organizations are able to describe who they are and what their

environment looks like, what and whom they like or dislike, what they try to do, what they actually do, why succeed or fail. Sometimes this talk is presented in formal documents, committee reports or annual reports. Sometimes via public debates, in mass media interviews, in advertisements for individual products or in discussions with individual clients. Different talk may be produced by different organization members, for instance, in public debates. It may be sometimes be possible to produce different talk for different parts of the environment (see Brunsson, 1986, p.171). In her study also Czarniawska-Joerges (1988) found same kind of functions of talk as Brunsson. She makes the observation that when contrasting action to talk in discussing the public sector's attitudes, one can say that different kinds of talk, using different rhetorics and differently coupled to material action are involved. One kind is an "idle talk", meant as substitute for action, and the other is "performative talk" which either is action by itself, or triggers the material action.

When we speak about managerial talk the important term often used is "Management of meaning". It can be understood at least two ways: as managing the meaning for others and managing the meaning of others.

In the former interpretation the members of organization must be able to make some sense to chaotic world outside, in order to be able to carry out their collective action. Managers reduce uncertainty - for themselves as well as for others - by saying what is there, what it is like, what is

normal and what is strange. Usually, however, the sense making of the non-managers can be very different from that of managers and because of that the second meaning comes in. Managers try to manage subordinates' meaning by convincing them that action-norms given by managers are more valid or offer a better basis for a collective action. This can also be called persuasion. The third model is also presented by Czarniawska-Joerges (1988); she calls that as "negotiating of meaning", which involves partially both the two other interpretations. In this process superiors and subordinates both participate in enactment process and mutually use persuasion.

What kind of devices can be used in the second variant of management by meaning (the abdiction of meaning) presented above. I shall propose that these kinds of devices are, for example, as follows:
- different strategies to use talk (to hide or reveal information)
- to talk different ways to different audiences
- to modify the reasoning process behind the decisions
  to use different types of moral reasoning
- to use several rhetorical strategies and figures
However, the validity of these presumptions can be verified only by the empirical research process.

Cheney and Vibbert (1987) studied "talk" produced by several large corporations in USA. They called this talk as "corporate discourse". The perspective adopted was rhetorical and terminological; that is they assume that the terms of corporate

discourse are powerfully persuasive in themselves, and should be analyzed as such. So, one can say that it is in question management of meaning at the most abstract level, in the public arena and device for that is something called "Public Relations." Today, one can find large organizations of many kinds redefining, refining and expanding their roles in the public arena. These evolving practices, many of which have corresponded to significant cultural transformations, represent a noteworthy shift in the "corporate" communication's posture. Cheney and Vibbers'analysis shows that through public relations communication, corporate actors attempt - admittely with varying degrees of success - to control the ways internal and external environments discuss such key concepts as values, issues, images, and identities.

Authors above define the values as those things treated as important and basic by individuals or groups..".as revealed primarily in the ongoing discourse of individual or collective". Values are appealed to when two or more parties discuss, debate, or come into conflict over an issue. An issue is created when two or more human agents attach significance to an situation or perceived "problem". Issues are focal points in public discourse. For my point of view corporate social responsibility persists as an issue because individuals and groups can always raise questions about what corporations ought to be doing for people. To manage issues and promote values is also to affect images and identities. In everyday discourse, identity conjunctures up an idea of something individual or group
has or possesses, something indicating continuity and

distinctiveness. Image usually indicates something projected by an individual or group, something perceived or interpreted by others. Image and identity can be treated together. Issues point to values, values often become issues, the discussion of issues affects images, such changes are liked to identities and so forth. These connections are possible because of the power of words. An issue is not an issue until it is talked about and labeled as such; an identity becomes "what it is" through symbolic means, though it is grounded in physical things.

According to Cheney and Vibbert contemporary corporate public discourse serves three functions which are the rhetorical function, the management-identity function and the political function. The first is the **Rhetorical Function**; organizational campaigns are designed to influence both internal and external publics (or audiences), and therefore function as multifaced rhetorical acts. The rhetorical aspect of corporate communication campaigns can be illustrated as treating "image building"-advocacy as epideictic discourse - that which reinforces and sometimes "establishes" values. This genre is central to discourse for several reasons.

A related manifestation of the rhetorical nature of corporate campaigns is the attempt to use these efforts to establish key symbolic linkages or identifications that "locate" the corporation in the domain of public discourse. Such symbolic linkages are profoundly symbolic in nature. They are fundamental efforts at adjusting the relationships between the organization and its publics, its environments. Rhetorically these symbolic linkages are important because they represent or encapsulate the

activities of larger campaign, and encourage identification. Corporate persuasive campaigns, then, are viewed as multifaced rhetorical artifacts with strategic structures (p.186). The second is the **Identity - Management Function;** to manage one's audience in discourse is also to manage one's identity in discourse, whether "one" be an individual or group. The most profound challenge to advocacy by on any organization is to develop a distinct identity while at the same time being recognised as part of the cultural "crowd".

The third function is the **Political Function;** this means that numerous large organizations nowadays explicitly act in a political manner and "see" themselves as doing so. In entering the political arena, however these organizations, are confronted with the dilemma of achieving direct political influence without being identified as political groups. They must proclaim political messages without at the same time being represented as political bodies in the discourse of other corporate and individual rhetors, for example Cheney and Vibbert found many corporate bodies who proclaim political messages, but who shy away from the implication that they are political factors. Finally they make three general conclusions of the analysis above. First, public opinion is perceived as a valuable corporate ally. Second, the
stance of public relations is moving increasingly away from reactive accomdation and toward proactive formation. Third, corporate actors have become vitally concerned with controlling the terms of their presentation to various publics, both "inside" and "out there." Corporate public persuasion, drawing from vast

symbolic and materials resources, incorporates key terms of the larger social order, even as it advocates some of its own.

The discourses or talk produced by managers are analyzed very seldom by using pure rhetorical analysis. Perhaps the reason is the fact that reserch findings provide us with relatively little information concerning business rhetoric. According to Knapp (1970) it has been scattered information available from a sample of large business corporations concerning their speakers, speeches and audiences, it exists a one major attempt to analyze the rhetorical nature of speeches of top management, and it exists only a few scattered analyses of selected business leaders. The knowledge obtained from these studies can be summarized in the categories of speech content, speech preparation, and measures of audience responses.

Studies concerning business rhetoric are usually made to give some normative advices to business men for writing letters, notes etc. (e.g. Roundy & Thralls, 1983). However, some more "value free" or scientific attempts are also made to analyze the business texts. These kinds of studies are, for example, Shelby (1986), Kallendorf & Kallendorf (1984, 1985), Limaye (1983).

Based on the article of Kallendorf & Kallendorf (1985) Takala made the rhetorical analysis of selected articles of Finnish Employers' Journals (see Takala, 1989a). The results of this study show that in the texts there does not exist very rich rhetorical figures and strategies compared with the results found by Kallendorf & Kallendorf and Burke (1982) in the arena of

political rhetoric. One reason for this might be the nature of the audience. In this case the character of audience is homogenous and one-dimensional, it consists of many same-sided interest groups of Finnish industry. That might cause the situation where very rich wordly expressions are not needed by the speakers to persuade the audience to approve the principles of business social responsibility, i.e. the wordly instruments of legitimation are not necessary because the speakers and the audience are on the same side of the "front". The legitimation happens mainly through the factual content of the articles. Secondly, notable differences of figures of speech used between the two timeperiods do not exist. In the thirties the figures of speech used were metaphor, simile and hyberbole and in the seventies hyberbole, rhetorical questions and metaphor. However, the number of the figures used was small in the both decades . Thus, one can make the conlusion that the figures of legitimizing talk are not connected with the dimension of time, in this respect e.g. following research topics can be listed:

- to study problems felt by business managers connected with the social responsibility of business
- to study the managerial talk, and styles of speech (corporate public discourse) concerning with social responsibility issues of business

5. Conclusions

On the basis of the previous studies it is difficult to formulate any strict hypothes for the basis of a research agenda because the number and the results of these studies do not exist in the

form of coherent totality. However, "the discourse perspective" to managerial work and social responsibility of business seems to be interesting, as can also be seen from the studies presented above. Although it is not possible to formulate hypotheses, some presumptions can be suggested. The presumptions which will be tested and search could be as follows:

- Different types of business organizations produce or create different kinds of discourses and one of these is "corporate public discourse"

- The accentuation of several components of discourses (which define as ethical component, social component and economic component) is different within different types of business organizations and levels of management

- The representatives of different types of business organizations speak in a different way and on different issues of social responsibility

So, in this context I want to emphasize the point that speech and language are essential tools for modern business management. I also suggest that this kind of managerial speech has several different functions, for example:
- to give "honest" information
- to create creditability toward business life
- to hide or reveal some issues
- to create legitimacy toward business
In order to do these tasks management has to use many arguable terms. This process may also contain different styles of speech

depending on the communication media and strategy used. This means that hypothetically one can presuppose that different levels of managerial work processes may use different "speeches". In addition, it can be assumed that different kinds of firms, situations and audiences require several styles and strategies of managerial speech.

Within the discourse paradigm such a view can be taken which considers the modern management as a meeting place for several rationalities (see Teulings 1986; Tainio 1986). Thus very central question is:"When and how different principles and interests become part of our life or how different rationalities form our reality." In this process managerial talk has very important place. For example the institutional management is the social force, which create justifications and means of corporate business activities and to the preconditions of capital accumulation (Lilja et al. 1986). In other words, institutional management takes care of the legitimation problem of business. One way to get the legitimation is to create the legitimacy by the means of managerial talk. One can hypothesize that action of this kind is very necessary in such a situation when something new are happening in society. In these kinds of situations institutional management has to govern the new situation and this will happen by defining situations and facts. That is much more than defining facts which would be same to everyone; the question one is naming those facts. This meaning-giving is symbolizing, and, of course the symbol is not any direct representation of the object; the terms used structure the reality.

When one studies the social responsibility of business this means
that it would be interesting to find out the ways by which
different firms, corporations, and managers try to define the
social responsibility and thus to rule the situation. It can be
presupposed that different groups with different interests in
society try to define what the social responsibility of
business really is and this happens through meaning-giving.
This process of naming can also be seen as the symbolical
battling of the possibilities to govern the field inherent to
business life.

As I have earlier mentioned the defining social responsibility
issues in the most covering arena (nation state and politics)
belongs to tasks of the so called institutional management. This
is very true in the large corporations where the work processes
are clearly differentiated. However, there exist many kinds of
firms, for example in the integrated firm, or in the "in one man
show" as Räsänen (1986) puts it, it can be found a team of
managers who divided work among themselves so that operational
management in production and distribution is the responsibility
of functionally specialized managers, and the managing director
is, together with the functional chefs, responsible for business
management, and alone for strategic and institutional management
as necessary (Räsänen 1986, p.67). This means that the tasks of
institutional level exist in all kinds of firms and also the
"talk" produced by that level of management can be founded, the
talk in which the central issue is the social responsibility of
the firm.

In the end of this article some comments about the managerial

agency and the ontological standpoints of the discourse paradigm
will be presented. I shall agree with Harvey et al. (1986) when
they stated that the existing empirical research work in the area
of corporate responsibilities is characterised by an atheoretical
approach, in that it does not discuss alternative theoretical
bases for studying these issues (this can also be seen from
the quotation of Piha's study in the introductory chapter). The
main approaches are, perhaps unconsciously
posititivist/functionalist. Corporations are treated as if
they simply "adapt" to their environments, and writers
try to relate corporate social responsibility mechanisms
and responses to organizational characteristics and
effectiveness with the apparent lack of appreciation of
"structural" conflicts of interest.

An alternative method is employed by Ackerman (1975). He,
instead of relying on remote questionnaire surveys, utilises the
case-study approach, and by going inside the firm can make
observations about the managerial processes involved in dealing
with environmental pressures. However, he also shares the
orthodox functionalist approach to corporations, in that he sees
firms as logically adjusting to external imperatives, and the
role of manager becomes the neutral "arbiter of the public
good". I shall propose that the point of departure must be
different. Rather than displaying associations between
organizational and environmental variables, and seeing managers
 as the mere facilitators of these abstract
relationships, I want to explore the exercising of managerial
work within definite social contexts. I also suggest that
different relevant actors may have different values and

intra-organizational political processes are important.

The discourse or speech paradigm offers an complementary view to other paradigms presented in this article. This view offers to us two opposite standpoints which one can choose . First, the view where individuals can be seen and perceived as a victims of discursive practices which they themselves reproduces and maintain and which bind them to acceptance to dominant modes of languages and knowledge. These modes, in turn, dictate how individuals relate to each other and shape each others' experiences and destinies (see Daudi, 1984). Second, one can also alter this original pessimistic concept of micropolitics e.g. by emphasizing the autonomy and creative role of individual actor in producing language and knowledge and in reproducing discursive practicies (Giddens, 1979; see also Hänninen, 1983). Whichever alternative one will choose, the pessimistic or optimistic, the discourse approach opens new possibilities to conceptualize micropolitics in organizations, inter-individual relations, human experience, and business social responsibility issues.

REFERENCES

Ackerman,R., The social challenge to business (Cambridge: Harvard, University Press, 1975).

Berger,M and Luckmann,T., The social construction of reality (London: Penquin, 1967).

Burke,K., Politics as rhetorics, Ethics (1982), pp.45-55.

Bowen,H.R., Social responsibilities of the businessman (New York: Harper & Row, 1953).

Brunsson,N., Organizing for inconsistencies: on organizational conflict and hypocricy as substitutes for action, Scandinavian Journal of Management Studies (1986), pp. 165-185.

Cheit,E.F, The business establishment (New York: Wiley, 1964).

Cheney,G. and Vibbert,S: Corporate discourse: public relations and issue management. In Handbook of organizational communication (California: SAGE, 1987).

Chua, Wai Fong., Radical developments in accounting thought, The Accounting Review (1988), pp. 601-630.

Czarniawska-Joerges,B., To Coin a phrase. (Stockholm,1988).

Donaldson,G. and Lorsch,J., Decision making at the top: the shaping of strategic direction (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

Daudi,P., Makt, diskurs och handling (Lund, 1984).

Edelman,M., The Symbolic uses of politics (Illinois: Urbana University Press, 1964).

Fay,B., Social Theory and Political Practice (London: Allen & Unwin, 1975)

Giddens,A., Central problems in social theory (London, 1979).

Hales,C., What do managers do ? A critical review of evidence, Journal of Management Studies (1986), pp. 88-115.

Harvey,B. & Smith,S. & Wilkinson,B., Managers and corporate social policy (London: Mac Millan Press, 1984).

Hänninen,S., Towards a textual situation analysis of politics. In Heiskanen,I. and Hänninen,S., (eds.), Exploring the basis of politics (Tampere: ILMO, 1983).

Kallendorf,C. & Kallendorf,C., A new topical system for corporate speechwriting, The Journal of Business Communication (1984), pp.3-14.

Kallendorf,C. & Kallendorf,C., The figures of speech; ethos and Aristotle: notes toward a rhetoric of business communication, The Journal of Business Communication (1985), pp. 35-50.

Kettunen,P., The stages of moral responsibility of the firm, Scandinavian Journal of Management Studies (1984), pp.137-151.

Knapp,M., Business rhetoric: opportunity for research in speech, Southern Speech Journal (1970),pp. 244-255.

Kotter,J: The general managers (New York: The Free Press, 1982).

Lilja,K., Tuotteen elinkaari selluteolisuudessa ja liikkeenjohdon työprosessit, Hallinnon tutkimus (1986), pp.46-61.

Lilja,K. & Räsänen,K. & Tainio,R., Towards period spesific theories of management, Working Paper, F-144 (Helsinki School of Economics, 1986).

Limaye,M., The syntax of persuasion: Two business letters of request, Journal of Business Communication (1983), pp.17-30.

March,J. and Olsen,J., Ambiguity and choice in organizations (Bergen, 1976).

Meyer,J and Rowan,B., Institutionalised organizations:formal structure as myth and ceremony, American Journal of Sociology (1983), pp.340-363.

Miettinen,A., Liikkeenjohdon eettiset ongelmat (Helsinki: LIFIM, 1982).

Minzberg,H., The nature of managerial work (New York: Harper and Row,1973).

Pekonen,K., Symbols and politics as culture in the modern situation, Publication, No. 53 (University of Jyväskylä, Department of Political Science, 1987).

Pfeffer,J., Power in organizations (Marchfield: Pitman, 1981).

Piha,K., Business ethics and business philosophy, The Finnish Journal of Business Economics (1988), pp.212-224.

Pondy,L., Leadership as a language game. In McCall,M.V. and Lombardo M.M.,(eds.), Leadership (Duke: Duhe University Press, 1978).

Pääkkönen,M and Repo,H., Yrityksen yhteiskunnallinen vastuu - miten se ymmärretään suomalaisissa yrityksissä, Unpublished research paper (University of Jyväskylä, 1984).

Roundy,N and Thralls,C., Modeling the communication context: a procedure for revision and evaluation in business writing, Journal of Business Communication (1983), pp.27-46.

Räsänen,K., Tensions in management (Helsinki: Kyriiri, 1986).

Schreyögg,G. and Steinmann,H., Moral issues in business: the case of Cabora Bassa, Scandinavian Journal of Management Studies (1986), pp.213-227.

Shelby,A., The theoretical bases of persuasion: a critical introduction, Journal of Business Communication (1986), pp.5-29.

Shutz,A., The Phenomenology of the social world (London: University Press, 1967).

Tainio,R. & Lilja,K. & Räsänen,K., Managerial arenas of the firm (unpublished seminar paper,Helsinki Schoool of Economics, 1983).

Tainio,R. & Lilja,K. & Räsänen,K., Management and modern corporation in society: how are they interrelated ?, Working Paper F-98 (Helsinki School of Economics, 1984).

Tainio,R., Firms and management in the theories of of the firm: towards a description of the firm as multi-layered battlefields. In Proceedings of the international symposium on recent developments of in business management research (Helsinki School of Economics, 1986).

Takala,T., Yrityksen yhteiskunallinen vastuu, sitä koskevat yritysjohdon professioeettiset ongelmat sekä yhteiskunnallisen vastuun legitimaatiostrategiat, Working Paper, No 83 (University of Jyväskylä, Department of Economics and Management, 1988).

Takala,T., Discourse on the social responsibility of the firm in Finland, 1930-1940 and 1972: theoretical framework and empirical findings, Scandinavian Journal of Management (1989), pp.5-19.

Takala,T., Liikkeenjohdon työn tutkiminen "puhe"-näkökulmasta - hahmotelma viitekehykseksi ja tutkimusehdotuksia, Hallinnon tutkimus (1989), pp. 69-72.

Teulings,A., Managerial labor process in organized capitalism. In Knights,D & Willmot;H.(eds.), Managing the labour process (Cambridge, 1986).

Willmot,H., Studying managerial work: a critique and a proposal, Journal of Management Studies (1987), pp. 250-270.

Woiceshyn,J., Technological change in the context and dynamics of the firm (Helsinki: VAPK, 1988).