

Personalistic Human Capital Management: Basic Conditions

Małgorzata Adamska-Chudzińska*

Submitted: 21.09.17 | Accepted: 21.11.18

The article discusses the issue of personalistic human capital management. The argument is based on a new approach to the employee within an organisation, as well as the role of the subjective determinants of employee activity in the effective attainment of strategic goals. The essence of the personalistic approach to human capital within an organisation is presented through the prism of personalism, mainly the personalistic concept developed by K. Wojtyła (later John Paul II), emphasising the autonomous value of human being as a person. Against such a backdrop, it is shown that the application of the personalistic approach to human capital requires resolving dilemmas associated with the recognition of both subjective and economic dimensions of actions. The outlined bi-directionality in the approach to a human being in the modern organisation greatly complicates the discussion about the personalistic perspective of the human being within an organisation. However, the author points to basic conditions of the personalistic human capital management in an organisation. Pro-social strengthening of organisational culture and the introduction of pro-social orientation into strategic activities, as well as axiological targeting of managers' attitudes are necessary. These factors condition the presence of a personalistic norm in the long-term achievement of economic efficiency based on a fully subjective management of the organisation's human capital.

Keywords: management, personalism, human capital, human being in organization.

Personalistyczne zarządzanie kapitałem ludzkim – podstawowe uwarunkowania

Nadesłany: 21.09.17 | Zaakceptowany do druku: 21.11.18

W artykule rozważana jest kwestia personalistycznego zarządzania kapitałem ludzkim. Tok wyводу oparty jest na nowym podejściu do pracownika w organizacji oraz roli podmiotowych wyznaczników jego aktywności w efektywnym realizowaniu celów strategicznych. Istota prezentowanego ujmowania kapitału ludzkiego w organizacji przedstawiona została przy uwzględnieniu filozofii typu personalistycznego, głównie personalistycznej koncepcji K. Wojtyły, późniejszego papieża Jana Pawła II akcentującej autonomiczną wartość człowieka jako osoby. Na tym tle wykazano, że aplikacja personalistycznego podejścia do kapitału ludzkiego wymaga rozwiązywania dylematów związanych z równoczesnym ujmowaniem pod-

* **Małgorzata Adamska-Chudzińska** – Professor, Cracow University of Economics, Faculty of Economics and International Relations, Department of Psychology and Didactics.

Correspondence address: Cracow University of Economics, Faculty of Economics and International Relations, ul. Rakowicka 27, 31-510 Kraków, Poland; e-mail: achm@uek.krakow.pl.



miotowego i ekonomicznego wymiaru działania. Zarysowana dwukierunkowość w podejściu do człowieka we współczesnej organizacji znacznie komplikuje dyskusję nad personalistyczną perspektywą człowieka w organizacji. Autorka wskazuje jednak podstawowe warunki personalistycznego zarządzania kapitałem ludzkim w organizacji. Niezbędne jest prospołeczne wzmocnienie kultury organizacyjnej i wprowadzenie orientacji prospołecznej w działalność strategiczną oraz aksjologiczne ukierunkowanie postaw menedżerów. Czynniki te warunkują obecność normy personalistycznej w długotrwałym osiąganiu efektywności ekonomicznej opartej na w pełni podmiotowym zarządzaniu potencjałem kapitału ludzkiego organizacji.

Słowa kluczowe: zarządzanie, personalizm, kapitał ludzki, człowiek w organizacji.

JEL: J24, J53, M14.

1. Introduction

In the course of economic and social changes, the professional capacity of those who make up the human capital of an organisation gains significance and takes on a new light. It is increasingly perceived in the context of limited availability, increased acquisition and maintenance costs and, above all, unique opportunities to use the financial and material resources of an organisation to create value and significance among other managing subjects. A new approach to humans in organisations involves no longer treating them as cost-generating factors, but rather as owners of specific potential that is a source of strategic opportunities for the organisation. This puts managers in a particular position: they need to shape such professional relationships with employees – as subjects deciding on the use of their abilities – as to induce them to make full use of their abilities in the course of actions performed within the organisation.

This issue is reflected in both theoretical considerations and in research aimed at finding effective solutions to new problems emerging in the area of human capital management in an organisation. They are based on the conceptual framework that provides a wide range of views on professional capabilities of a person and on conditions that affect them. Against the backdrop of significant achievements in the identification of human capital management issues and the formulation of accurate theses relevant to the efficient implementation of the personnel function, dilemmas are presented regarding the linking of specific economic determinants of action to their subjective determinants. The hard-to-quantify subjectivity of an employee eludes market measures and mechanisms, which hinders an efficient management of human capital of an organisation.

Difficulties in correlation perspective and analysis of the two dimensions of human capital – i.e. subjective and economic – reveal the need for philosophical concepts that place an individual at the centre of the world of values, accentuating human subjectivity and the capacity of self-determination. Therefore, successful human capital management in an organisation requires

action based on a personalistic approach to the employees who make up this capital. Respecting their subjectivity and reckoning with personality conditioning then become important factors responsible for the course of action and its outcome.

We shall argue in the article that personalistic philosophy enables one to appreciate the regulatory role of personality traits and prosocial conditions of their activation, which is reflected in the quality and level of human capital use. Assuming that the personality determinants influence the level of use of other components affecting human performance, it becomes important to recognise that an individual has the opportunity to assert him/herself as a person, and that his/her personality could become reality in action. The prosocial environment characterised by unconditional respect for the subjectivity of an individual and the manifestations of his/her personality is indispensable here.

Greater consideration of these issues in the process of valuation and efficient use of human capital in an organisation can reduce the 'inconsistency' between the economic and subjective dimensions of an activity and intensify the involvement of human capital in the process of gaining competitive advantage in the market. The essence of the personalistic approach to human capital have been presented, the problem of the application of the personalistic approach to human capital and the fundamental conditions of personalistic human capital management that determine the practical application of the presented concept. It has been pointed out that fully subjective human capital management requires the introduction of pro-social orientation and axiological orientation of managers' attitudes in the organisation's activity. It then becomes possible to shape the pro-social dimension of organisational culture, in which the affirmation of an employee and his/her personal development are important aspects of effective professional relationships.

2. The Essence of the Personalistic Approach to Human Capital

Personalistic philosophy places the human person at the heart of the world; the well-being and development of a human being are the supreme principle which governs everything that a person does as a result of his/her freedom (Chudy, 2005–2006, p. 233). A review of literature on personalism does not, however, indicated any unified vision of the philosophy of a person. The very concept itself poses problems, as it is difficult to classify it into traditional philosophical categories. Despite their great variety, certain basic aspects common to various trends in the personalistic philosophy can be identified. First of all, personalism postulates the affirmation of a human being as a person, emphasising his/her dignity, autonomy and the ability for self-determination. Pointing to the superior value of a human being in relation to all economic and social structures means opposing all forms of

‘reification’ of humans. This means that a human being has the opportunity to transcend and express him/herself through his/her own deeds and work; that is, to effectuate his/her personality into the results of his/her activities.

The second basic aspect is related to the self-consciousness of the human person and his/her ability to develop spiritually. In this development, all particular values, including economic values, are to be subordinated to personal values that build the subjectivity of the acting human being. Personalists assume that a person should never be treated as a means to an end, as by his/her very nature, he/she are always the target of an action. The space in which a person can develop most fully is the space of relationships with other people (Żardecka, 1997, p. 422).

Fundamental aspects of personalism outlined here are in line with the approach represented by E. Mounier, who claims that personalism is not a systematic trend, but rather a certain perspective of recognising a human being, the method of his/her development and, at the same time, an obligation towards him/her (Andrzejuk, 2018). In broader terms, the whole of reality is personal and the world of things as created by people is based on the understanding of reality by mind and human perception (Barth, 2009).

There is a large variety of detailed approaches in the personalistic literature, organised on the basis of specific criteria. The national criterion is used as the basis for distinguishing between American, German, French and Polish personalism. In turn, if we apply the criterion of the concept of a person and philosophical assumptions, several personalistic trends can be distinguished (including idealistic, metaphysical, phenomenological, ethical, pragmatic, relativistic, religious, theological etc.). This wide range has been divided by I. Dec (2007, p. 123) into three types: 1. horizontal personalism (atheistic), 2. vertical personalism (theistic) – non-Thomistic, and 3. classical personalism – Thomistic. The various forms of personalism presented in this classification are characterised by the primacy of the person, taking into account the accepted concept of society, culture, worldview and the tenets of a given philosophy. Considerations contained in this article – with some precaution – can be associated with Polish personalism of Lublin classical school; it refers, in particular, to the vision developed by K. Wojtyła. His position, especially the approach to the phenomenon of *human person* and *human act*, seems to correspond most closely to the concept of practicisism outlined in this article, which is an attempt to transfer certain elements of personalism to human capital management.

The personalistic concept of K. Wojtyła (1996) emphasises the individuality of the human person, his/her irreducibility to the natural world, and his/her uniqueness. It refers to the complexity of the human person who is both the subject and the object of action. Thus, K. Wojtyła opposes absolutisation, i.e. treating a human solely as a material being or a spiritual being. Human identity determines the unity of his/her soul

and body, and is possible through his/her transcendence. The essence of subjectivity of the human being lies in the fact that he/she cannot be reduced neither to material phenomena (the object of influence of others), nor to a set of emotional phenomena (devoid of self-consciousness). On the other hand, he/she is both an actor and a subject of his/her actions. A person makes him/herself present through conscious and voluntary acts. An act is a special moment of insight into a person. The analysis of K. Wojtyła (1996, pp. 290–291) focuses on performing the act and finding fulfilment in action. A person realises him/herself through self-determined actions in which the structure of self-governance and self-possession is expressed. Through self-determination, each human being exercises a specific power in relation to him/herself, that he/she possesses him/herself and is possessed by him/herself, he/she rules over him/herself and that he/she is subordinate to him/herself; therefore, no one else can exercise this power (Wojtyła, 1996, pp. 132–133).

In the characterisation of self-determination – that is, the conscious and free performance of acts – the author of the presented concept points out to the self-agency and intentionality of the human person. Self-agency, originating from freedom, is expressed in the feeling of ownership of action fulfilled by an individual and his/her responsibility for it. Intentionality, as a simultaneous striving to reveal oneself as one's causal agent points to the aspect of exploration of the experience of 'a person in action'. The person is the agent of an action, at the same time being the agent of his/her personal growth and improvement (or deformation). The action is the result of the person's agency and it is 'objectifies' in the person (Chudy, 2005–2006, pp. 235–236), as it shapes and changes him/her. A human understood through his/her action is referred to as 'agential subjectivity'. Being a person, that is, an individual capable of planned and purposeful action, of self-determination and aiming to fulfil him/herself, means being the subject of one's actions. Undertaken actions, regardless of their nature, are to serve the fulfilment of humanity, the fulfilment of a personal vocation, which is quintessential of humanity itself (*Laborem exercens*, Encyclical by John Paul II, pp. 8–10).

Consciousness is a property of the human being as a person, which means that he/she is a self-aware and, at the same time, a self-realising person, fulfilled in conscious action. The possibility of conscious self-fulfilment (having influence, self-determination, etc.) or lack thereof is reflected in the nature of acts and their results. The impossibility of self-realisation in action in the above sense transforms action into a form of coercion, dampens subjectivity and any effects of subjective action.

In his personalistic concept, K. Wojtyła argues also that a person in action not only learns his/her capabilities, but also reveals his/her relational (social) dimension known as 'participation' among others. Personal participation means that a human being exists and works with others in such a way

that he/she preserves his/her identity, does not cease to be him/herself and his/her freedom remains intact (Pełka, 2018). Through acting consciously among others, he/she discovers him/herself in the act of serving them. Responsibility for actions taken depends on the social environment in which he/she operates and experiences his/her own subjectivity (he/she has a sense of importance, competence, influence and agency). K. Wojtyła therefore emphasises the subjectivity of the human being, which manifests itself through conscious action within the environment that strengthens the sense of subjectivity; in turn, this conditions the process of human development and discovery. Consequently, human beings can develop and realise socially important goals. What the individual is like and what he/she can accomplish is reflected in external manifestations of action, if it is possible for him/her to function in an environment respecting and strengthening his/her inner sense of subjectivity.

In the above context, the personalistic approach to the human being in an organisation consists in shifting away from treating the employee as a cost-generating factor of production in favour of recognising his/her subjective role as a manager of specific opportunities of strategic value. In this case, the subjective treatment of an employee is linked to the quality and effectiveness of his/her actions. Experiencing subjectivity in the work environment can significantly stimulate the quality and scope of genuine engagement of employees and their unique use of material and financial resources of an organisation. The response to such transformations of the human function in organisations is the concept of human capital and its evolution towards improving the approach to the employee and shaping the configuration of elements for the purpose of managing his/her resources (Pocztowski, 2008). Through linking human capital with the uniqueness of the employee's experience, it is difficult to develop appropriate human management methods independently and to define the structure of human capital in this concept. It requires taking into account the subjectivity of the human being and, at the same time, valuing the capital of his/her abilities.

The outlined bi-directionality in the approach to a human being in modern organisation greatly complicates the discussion about the personalistic perspective on the human being organisations. The key issue is to distinguish the employee from other resources of an organisation and to recognise the personal value of human capital (Harasim, 2008, p. 10). As a result, the employee (human capital) will gain an exceptional position in relation to other resources of the organisation, both in material and financial terms. In the hierarchy of organisational resources, the human being should occupy the highest, privileged place. All other types of resources can be used as a means to achieve organisational goals; according to the personalistic concept of K. Wojtyła, human beings (human capital) should not. This requires perceiving an employee as a value in itself, as a individual with certain qualities, capable of self-determination and using his/her strengths,

as reflected in the so-called 'personalistic norm' (Truskolaska, 2010, p. 183). This norm requires that subjectivity be taken into account and the value of the human being, in the diversity of his/her behaviour and activities, be recognised. It refers both to the acting subject and to all participants in his/her environment, which is expressed in the subjective nature of mutual relations. It conditions the duality of human activity in the organisation: self-realisation of the person in connection with acting responsibly for the sake of others (Chudy, 2005–2006, p. 244). Respecting the personalistic norm in an organisation is, therefore, a prerequisite for a proper exploration and development of employee's values. The effects of his/her performance for the organisation are thus optimised.

3. Problems with Applying the Personalistic Norm to Human Capital

The difficulty of applying the personalistic norm to forming attitudes toward an employee and relationships within an organisation is related to the employee evaluating his/her abilities in terms of capital (financial resources). The value of this capital depends on the suitability of the employee's ability to implement the organisation's strategy and the ability to multiply its resources. Developing the economic dimension of the employee's behaviour requires knowledge of patterns governing the market while, at the same time, taking into account the fact that a person decides upon the extent and timing of making him/herself (his/her capital) available to an organisation. The subjective and market aspects combined here are not conducive to unambiguous decision-making.

H. Król (Król & Ludwicyński, 2010, p. 118) proposes that the concept of human capital be treated as a metaphor. It becomes possible to adopt new meanings of words which are different in terms of significance, but remain syntactically related. A metaphor is indispensable in this case, because it is necessary to imagine the specificity of the phenomenon of a human being-human capital. It enables 'one piece of reality to be understood in terms of another', which is the specific role of the subject in the course of economic processes. However, one should not forget the nature of the metaphor, neither treat it literally, as the author observes. Otherwise, it loses most of its cognitive value. One forgets then about the proper understanding of human subjectivity and any attempts to evaluate his/her strengths fail.

In the process of identifying the value of human capital within an organisation, it is necessary to adopt such metaphorical reference. When we focus on the value of human capital within an organisation, we should not overlook the subjective nature of the holder of the capital, but rather extract essential elements of his/her personality. This approach finds confirmation in a thesis of John Paul II, who argues that human work should not be limited to economics, but also and, above all, we need to recognise its

spiritual value. The economic system itself benefits from the fact that these personal values are fully respected (Encyclical of John Paul II *Laborem exercens*, 2017, pp. 12–15). Then, if we espouse the notion of ‘capital’ in its original meaning, as a financial resource of things and, at the same time, recognize the primacy of a person over things, we can create a dual vision of an employee – a person as ‘human capital’, who is a subject of work.

The opportunity to capture the subjective correlates of employee activity and their role in the multiplication of organisational values is the concept of human professional efficiency (Adamska-Chudzińska, 2012). The essence of human professional efficiency includes a specific combination of subjective and economic approach to the activity of an entity that holds the capital of professional opportunities. The subjective origin of professional efficiency points to the essential role of personality conditions in shaping it. The economic aspect is related to an area in which efficiency is revealed and applicable. The complex and unique personality of a person exposes itself in a given job or in a specific role within an organisation.

Human professional efficiency is one’s internal disposition (ability and willingness) to perform competently. It represents the system of physical, mental and social predispositions of a person and the source of his/her knowledge, skills and motivation necessary for a particular action. The properties of the psyche involve all spheres of human personality¹, including cognitive processes, intellectual and emotional development, temperament and character. By setting a unique dimension of the employee’s personality, these properties determine his/her ability to learn, evaluate and prioritise individual elements of an activity. They significantly model employee behaviour, each time giving it a personal dimension. Consequently, they play a regulatory role in relation to other parameters of professional efficiency, determining their use and the final dimension of human activity.

The importance of personal (psychological) predispositions in self-realisation and the experience of subjectivity is, therefore, remarkable. This attitude refers to the role of the act of reflection and decision indicated by K. Wojtyła as the basic element of human action (act). It cannot be reduced to an intentional act, but requires special cooperation of the [entire] system that a human person is. This factor is based on the specific organisation of the human personality. Although it has its own rational structure, it is not limited to it but, on the contrary, it originates from human personality (Póltawski, 1981, pp. 135–136). To show this complex dependency, the aforementioned concept of human professional efficiency strongly emphasises personality aspects and the role of individual treatment of each employee.

Therefore, an analysis of human professional efficiency includes two types of behavioural characteristics of an employee: a behavioural description of actions in certain external dimensions of a situation, and a subjective explanation of the fact of a given action through reference to complex

personality structures. In behavioural terms, behaviour is relativized to external demands. They are met to a certain extent by the employee. To adopt only this approach is to ignore the impact of subjective dynamics on self-realisation in the course and outcome of action. The notion of professional efficiency requires that we delve deeper into personality; it is necessary to explain why an individual's own sense of subjectivity, which determines self-fulfilment in action, is responsible for the quality of this action and, thus, for the optimal use of material and financial resources of an organisation. Only knowledge from this area gradually enables one to recognise the most important determinants of the personalistic perception of the human being in an organisation.

The personalistic perspective of the human being in an organisation entails taking into account his/her personality predispositions, strengthening these personal determinants of action. This conditions one's ability to act according to what one is like – i.e. to realise one's own personality (intelligence, temperament, character, etc.) – by revealing and developing it in specific action. Through self-fulfilment in a given activity, it is possible to feel subjectivity and a high level of professional efficiency. In personalistic terms, an employee cannot be treated as equivalent to other organisational resources. Hence, he/she cannot be reduced to results alone. Attention should be paid to the internal contradiction of development limited only to economic results, one that easily assigns the person and his/her rights to profit requirements, which prevents employees from regarding each other as human beings and the creation of an organisational community based on the principle of responsibility (Encyclical of John Paul II *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, 2017, pp. 33–39).

The personalistic approach reveals a personal relationship between an employee and the results of his/her actions, which leaves a human footprint, or traces of his/her personality, on the created product (Kapias & Polok, 2014, p. 162). By creating the reality of an organisation, the employee leaves him/herself in what he/she creates, which leads to potentially outstanding results for the functioning of an organisation as a community. Therefore, human capital reaches its highest value only if its owner has an authentic experience of his/her subjectivity. Without recognizing the unique value of an employee, it is not possible to properly solve any economic problems. Thus, the employee as a subject of work comes to the fore in relation to the fundamental values of decent organisational reality (Encyclical of John Paul II *Centesimus annus*, 2017, p. 11). A conscious approach to experiencing oneself in the organisational reality is associated by D. Melé (2006, p. 8) with a specific understanding of the situation of acting as such, which cannot be changed without a change in the person. The position of the author, presented on the basis of the views of M.R. Follett, thus draws attention to the interdependence between the development of the organisation and the development of its employees acting as individuals.

4. Conditions of Personalistic Human Capital Management

Personalistic human capital management depends on different aspects of functioning of an organisation and certain characteristics of the organisational culture. Focus on the impact of organisational culture on management remains linked to the dual approach to the human being within the organisation. It is necessary to cease the instrumental treatment of employees, typical of mainstream economics, in favour of recognising the personal and relational dimension of his/her value for the organisation. It is important to show that the ultimate goal of economic systems is not the advantage, but integrated human development in personal and social terms (O'Boyle, 2016, pp. 52–82).

The prosocial dimension of organisational culture shaped on the basis of a personalistic norm seems the most desirable. Introducing a personalistic norm into patterns of organisational culture means recognising the special role of an employee as a person, his/her affirmation for him/herself and the possibility of personal fulfilment in the process of attaining goals for others. Such organisational reality requires a deeper orientation towards the needs and expectations of individuals within the organisation and incorporating it into strategic thinking about economic results. Prosocial strengthening of the organisational culture based on the personalistic norm is determined by the following conditions:

- acknowledging the existence of social interdependence in the work environment,
- subjective interpretation of the situation of action within an organisation.

The first condition can be defined as a primary factor of social motivation in the organisational culture. It stems from the natural human pursuit to be with others and expect their approval. The perception of interdependence in satisfying the need for affiliation and self-determination shapes the personalistic attitude of people towards each other. The realisation of this condition consists in developing awareness of mutual interactions among members of an organisation and the ability to identify the internal states of individuals within their reach. Respect for other person's dignity in the work environment defines the basis of subjective self-expression and, at the same time, forms the foundation of a personalistic approach to human capital.

The second condition is based on the premise that pro-social behaviour is a consequence of the activation of the so-called personalistic norm, i.e. a sense of duty to affirm a person and take into account his/her social needs and expectations (Reykowski, 1979, pp. 295–329). Its implementation lies in appropriate recognition and interpretation of the situation of action in an organisation. First of all, it is important to meet the needs of individuals who make up the human capital of an organisation and to accept information about the actual or possible failure to meet these needs. Then, it is necessary to recognise that these needs can be met in the work environment. In this

respect, the result depends on the presence of fundamental social values (e.g. reliability, honesty, truthfulness, justice) in managers' attitudes.

According to O'Boyle, Solari & Marangoni (2011, pp. 64–76), the maximisation of these features (virtues) in managers and in mutual relations increases the profitability of the organisation, as righteous individuals work more efficiently. Assigning an axiological context to a strategic activity and adopting a subjective perspective of an employee means that the organisation's managers are in a position to recognise their opportunities in the personalistic creation of the work situation, and also to take into account the needs of their employees. Employees' expectations are not neglected, nor are their needs manipulated. Reaching for the axiological basis of human action makes it possible, at the same time, to assess which of these needs ought to be given priority and which are not justifiable.

Paramount in giving the human capital management a personalistic dimension is managers' understanding of the relationship between taking into account the subjectivity of employees, pro-social activities promoting their self-determination in implemented actions and results of strategic activities performed by the organisation. Creating conditions in which the expectations and needs of employees are addressed activates personal determinants of effective action. As they are expressed at the level of activation and internal processes responsible for a sense of dignity and the effects of self-determination, one should notice their significant influence on the level of professional efficiency activation. Thus, respect for employee's dignity and human rights, as well as sensitivity to social values contained in strategic activities as a manifestation of highest organised forms of human behaviour are, at the same time, important aspects of optimising his/her professional efficiency, making full use of human capital in the organisation. Coherence of leadership and personalism is a synergistic success of strategic human capital management in the form of organisation development and employee development (Szandurski, 2010, pp. 754–763).

The extent to which prosocial orientation of organisation's activities can be implemented depends on introducing social aspects as follows (Adamska-Chudzińska, 2009):

- recognising the goals of an activity,
- using expert knowledge and skills,
- accepting responsibility for the consequences of an action.

The recognition of organisational goals specific to the developed social orientation involves two dimensions of these goals: striving for the economic maximisation of profits and, simultaneously, recognising the superior value of a human person and his/her development. The deeper social context of economic objectives must be, therefore, taken into account. This approach is determined by the perception of coherence between the economic and social areas of functioning of an organisation (Woźniak, 2007, pp. 19–21). Economic goals are treated in this case instrumentally in relation to

broader social requirements and the obligation to ensure a sustainable development of mankind. At the same time, it is assumed that sensitivity to and respect for social needs and expectations determine moral legitimacy of any business activity (Melé, 2016, pp. 33–55). Taking into account social needs and expectations in an organisation makes stakeholder engagement more closely related to its strategic tasks (Harasim, 2013, p. 11). Meanwhile, stakeholders' motivation is higher, encouraging more intensive cooperation that serves the interests of the organisation, as well as their own needs.

The second analysed characteristic of the prosocial orientation of an organisation is expressed in the use of professional knowledge and professional skills deepened by axiological reflection. Integrating sensitivity to social values and honesty in perceiving them is an important aspect of the dual approach to human activity in the organisation and the recognition of the subjective conditioning of effective professional behaviour. When offering one's actions to others, it is not enough to have and operate knowledge. Pro-social thinking means the inclusion into axiologically-neutral knowledge of the reflection on its proper application. The wisdom of human capital management translates into the acceptance of social values as principles guiding the use of substantive knowledge (Chmielecka, 2004, p. 59).

Management decisions should be integrated; that is, they should combine economic values and social values. The conflict between them should not be solved by restrictions in any of these dimensions, but by establishing their proper order and strengthening higher motives. The latter, understood as motives of 'social service' should be a key reference to the motives of 'immediate usability' reduced to making profit (Melé, 2006, pp. 5–7). Knowledge and expertise against social values determine the personalistic way of inducing employees to work effectively in the long run. This creates a situation where the axiological action profile of managers of an organisation can translate into success and competitive advantage (Bartkowiak, 2005, p. 408).

The last characteristic of the prosocial orientation of an organisation, which determines the personalistic approach to human capital, is the acceptance of social responsibility towards those affected by economic activities. Whether or not the managers of an organisation accept responsibility is a clear expression of the importance that attach to employees and social values in their business. This may involve bearing responsibility or knowingly taking it. The seemingly insignificant difference between these concepts is revealed in the extent to which the manager is capable of taking on all the consequences of his/her actions, not only economic but also social, including consequences that are clearly undesirable. One can be responsible for something (because of the activity itself) and not take responsibility for it. As explained by R. Ingarden (2006, p. 75), bearing responsibility means '... factual circumstances borne passively by the actor'. On the other hand, taking responsibility is guided by social values, i.e. meeting higher

(social) requirements and feeling one's personal influence on the course of action. Therefore, taking social responsibility involves active, personal commitment to the task and taking into account all the consequences of one's undertakings: economic and social, desirable and undesirable, final and those that emerge in the course of action (Pratley, 2000, p. 114).

Sensitivity to social values that leads to the deepening of responsibility means taking full account of the consequences for people who are experiencing the effects of a given activity. Consequently, this sensitivity must already be present in the course of the action taken, and not only in the economic consequences that inevitably result from it. Taking responsibility in this sense can be related to the 'third-level action' indicated by O'Boyle (2012, pp. 99–101), which has a subjective dimension and covers the social needs and expectations of those who remain within the sphere of influence. Taking them into account or failure to do so in the implemented activity shapes a specific range of acting personal capital, i.e. its internal development as a human person. Through experiences associated with taking the needs of others into account, changes in the acting person occur that increase their personal capital. Based on this analysis, the author shows that the maximisation of utility or profit is an intermediate norm of economic performance, while personalist capital is the ultimate norm of economic performance.

The organisation's prosocial orientation expresses the readiness and willingness to introduce a personalistic norm in the strategies of action and to give it a specific form that responds to the specific needs and expectations of employees. Personalistic human capital management is based on categorically respected, subjective treatment of members of an organisation. Responsible and sensitive reaction to each other means not compromising human dignity, respect for personal determinants of activity and recognition for competence and professional experience (Adamska-Chudzińska, 2012, p. 127). In addition to respect for the dignity of the employee, the basic level of employee subjective treatment is expressed by respecting employees' rights and work standards and promoting their work-life balance.

On the other hand, greater recognition of the subjectivity of employees is contingent on providing them with sufficient autonomy and responsibility in the workplace. Expanding the field of action or freedom of choice means strengthening subjectivity. An employee feels his/her subjectivity when he/she can influence his/her work situation (Penc, 2007, p. 88). A similar personalistic approach to the human being in the organisation is presented by J. Domański, W. Kotarba & T. Krupa (2014, pp. 43–45) in their new management paradigm. The human being, as the supreme value, has a central and fundamental role in relation to the other three elements of this paradigm, i.e. organisation, knowledge and security. Organisational culture built on the subjectivity of employees is conducive to a permanently

high level of professional efficiency. Respect, a sense personal involvement in work and experiencing it, as well as the feeling of agency and importance of one's actions contribute to excellent results.

5. Conclusions

The possibility of accepting the personalistic perspective of the human being in an organisation and personalistic human capital management rest on the way in which managers solve dilemmas revealed between a transcendently perceived human being and a measurable employee. The above discussion proves that these issues are not easily solved with unambiguous decisions. The difficulty in correlatively analysing the personalistic and economic dimension of human behaviour is largely due to the complexity, dynamic nature and non-measurability of subjectivity structures; primarily, these are personality predispositions and pro-social conditions of action that determine its experience. In this respect, the perception of the subjectivity of the employee and the scale of his/her individual needs is important. Indeed, philosophical reflection reaches the immanent grounds of human subjectivity. On the one hand, it shows how the possibility of its manifestation unifies the inner harmony of the human being (Bartnik, 2001, p. 520) while, on the other hand, deciding about cognitive abilities, self-reflection, concentration and the range of creative action. Meanwhile, economic activity, based on market mechanisms, requires a more measurable approach. It reduces the subjectivity of the employee to the possible benefits of his/her actions for the organisation. The shortcomings or limitations of this approach are often reflected in undesirable effects or difficulties in maintaining good long-term results.

According to Mounier (1960, p. 223), one should take into account the 'dynamic dialectic' between internal resources of humans and their external manifestations; that is, 'the inner person is sustained thanks to the outer person, who, in turn, relies on the strength of the inner person'. Therefore, the application of the personalistic dimension of human capital management should be embedded in the in-depth consideration of the subjectivity of the employee, i.e. taking into account the internal potential of the possibilities of action and the conditions of their externalisation in the form of achieved results. The activation and development of human potential are, therefore, closely linked to the influence of the social environment. Professional environment that expects great results from employees must build pro-social working conditions and foster cooperation. Experiencing positive relationships, acceptance, recognition and, consequently, the possibility of manifesting the values of one's own identity in a constant reference group, triggers personal determinants of efficient action, which are reflected in the level of activation and use of the potential of employee productivity. Thus, entrusting employees with tasks is tantamount to respecting their

subjectivity, the needs and expectations of work, while applying fundamental social values as organisational and job evaluation criteria.

The deepened perception of the subjectivity of those employed in the organisation will not be possible without an axiologically-oriented attitude of managers. Attitudes, as relatively persistent personality components, are activated in the evaluation processes and reveal themselves in the motivation to act in a certain manner. It is important that this internal instruction directing the managers of an organisation towards actions is not only measurable economically, but also socially desirable and respectful of the uniqueness of each employee. The axiological orientation of managers should be treated as the foundation of their professional activity. Knowledge and skills embedded in axiologically-oriented attitudes become tools for realising social values and observing ethical principles. They are expressed in the ways and means of managing the organisation's human capital, implementing strategic goals and building relationships with stakeholders. They condition the presence of the personalistic norm in the long-term pursuit of economic efficiency and competitiveness based on a fully subjective valuation of employees' potential.

Endnotes

- ¹ According to psychological concepts, it was assumed that predispositions/psychological traits determine a unique dimension of personality as an internal system of integration of thoughts, feelings and behaviours specifying individual characteristics of an employee.

Acknowledgments

The creation of the English-language version of publication was funded from the appropriations of the Faculty of Economics and International Relations of the Cracow University of Economics, within grants for maintaining the research potential.

References

- Adamska-Chudzińska, M. (2009). Orientacja prospołeczna a zarządzanie kapitałem ludzkim. In: J. Bieliński, R. Płoska (eds), *Prace i materiały Wydziału Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego*, Vol. 2, No. 3. Sopot: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego i Fundacji Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Adamska-Chudzińska, M. (2012). *Uwarunkowania sprawności zawodowej człowieka w organizacji. Aspekt prospołeczny*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie.
- Andrzejuk, A. (2010). *Jaki personalizm? Szerokie i wąskie rozumienie personalizmu*. Retrieved from: http://katedra.uksw.edu.pl/publikacje/artur_andrzejuk/jaki_personalizm.pdf (15.11.2018).
- Barth, G. (2009). *Pojęcie i rozwój personalizmu. Polski personalizm* (teksty/artykuły). Retrieved from: <http://hosting0800050.az.pl/personalizm/?p=142> (18.08.2017).

- Bartkowiak, G. (2005). Zarządzanie wiedzą a psychomanipulacja w przedsiębiorstwach polskich i francuskich. In: A. Poczowski (ed.), *Praca i zarządzanie kapitałem ludzkim w perspektywie europejskiej*. Kraków: Oficyna Ekonomiczna.
- Bartnik, Cz. (2001). *Historia filozofii*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Gaudium.
- Chmielecka, E. (2004). Informacja, wiedza, mądrość – co społeczeństwo wiedzy cenić powinno? In: K. Kloc, E. Chmielecka (eds), *Dobre obyczaje w kształceniu akademickim*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Fundacji Promocji i Akredytacji Kierunków Ekonomicznych.
- Chudy, W. (1998). Oblicza personalizmu i ich konsekwencje. *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny*, 26(3).
- Chudy, W. (2005/2006). Filozofia personalistyczna Jana Pawła II (Karola Wojtyły). *Teologia Polityczna*, 3.
- Dec, I. (2007). Personalizm. In: A. Maryniarczyk (ed.), *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii* (vol. 8). Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Domański, J., Kotarba, W. & Krupa, T. (2014). The Prisms of Management. *Foundations of Management*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/fman-2015-0010>.
- Encyklika Jana Pawła II z 14 września 1981r. Laborem Exercens – o pracy ludzkiej (z okazji 90. rocznicy Encykliki Rerum novarum). (2017). In: *Encykliki Ojca Świętego Jana Pawła II*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Encyklika Jana Pawła II z 30 grudnia 1987 r. Sollicitudo rei socialis – z okazji dwudziestej rocznicy ogłoszenia Populorum progressio. (2017). In: *Encykliki Ojca Świętego Jana Pawła II*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Encyklika Jana Pawła II z 15 maja 1991 r. Centesimus annus, w setną rocznicę Encykliki Rerum novarum. (2017). In: *Encykliki Ojca Świętego Jana Pawła II*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Flewelling, R.T. (2004). Studia personalizmu amerykańskiego. *Personalizm*, 6.
- Harasim, W. (ed.). (2013). Człowiek i organizacja XXI wieku. *Zeszyty Naukowe*, 3. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Promocji.
- Harasim, W. (ed.). (2008). *Najnowsze trendy i wyzwania świata w zarządzaniu zasobami ludzkimi*, II. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Promocji.
- Ingarden, R. (2006). *Książeczka o człowieku*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Kapias, M. & Polok, G. (2014). Etos pracy w perspektywie badań longitudinalnych nad preferencjami aksjologicznymi studentów UE Katowice. *Studia Ekonomiczne*, 187.
- Król, H. & Ludwicyński, A. (eds). (2010). *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi. Tworzenie kapitału ludzkiego organizacji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Melé D. (2006). Ethics in Management: Exploring the Contribution of Mary Parker Follett. *International Journal of Public Administration* 618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690601158279>.
- Melé D. (2016). Understanding Humanistic Management. *Humanistic Management Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41463-016-0011-5>.
- Mounier, E. (1960). *Co to jest personalizm?* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- O'Boyle, E.J. (2012). The Acting Person and Personalist Capital. *Journal of Markets & Morality*, 15(1).
- O'Boyle, E.J. (2016). Does culture matter in economic behavior? *HSE Social and Education History*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.17583/hse.2016.1796>.
- O'Boyle, E.J., Solari, S. & Marangoni, G.D. (2011). The good company. *Corporate Governance*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720701111108853>.
- Pełka, A. (2015). Personalizm chrześcijański w ujęciu Karola Wojtyły – Jana Pawła II. Retrieved from: <https://szkolnictwo.pl/index.php?id=PU7580> (09.11.2018).
- Penc, J. (2007). *Nowoczesne kierowanie ludźmi. Wywieranie wpływu i współdziałanie w organizacji*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Poczowski, A. (2008). *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Póttawski, A. (1981). Człowiek jako istota realizująca się w czynie (Antropologia Karola Wojtyły a Henri Eya analiza świadomości). *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, 17(2).

- Pratley, P. (2000). *Etyka w biznesie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Felberg SJA.
- Reykowski, J. (1979). *Motywacja, postawy prospołeczne a osobowość*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Szandurski, J. (2010). Przywództwo i personalizm jako źródła sukcesu w strategicznym zarządzaniu kadrami. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, 115.
- Truskolaska, J. (2010). Koncepcja rozwoju osoby w personalizmie etycznym jako podstawa wychowania. *Pedagogika Katolicka*, 6.
- Wojtyła, K. (1969). *Osoba i czyn*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo PTT.
- Woźniak, M.G. (2007). Teoretyczne problemy spójności społeczno-ekonomicznej mechanizmu rynkowego w kontekście gospodarki opartej na wiedzy. *Nierówności społeczne a wzrost gospodarczy. Gospodarka oparta na wiedzy. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego*, 10.
- Żardecka, M. (1997). Personalizm. In: J. Herbut (Ed.), *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.