

Conceptual Analysis in the Field of Management

Grzegorz Pilarski

War Studies Academy in Warsaw, Poland

Abstract

In the literature on the subject, the terms steering, management and control are often used interchangeably. However, in the course of the terminological analysis, the author indicated the dependencies between these concepts and defined the area of their application. The conducted research allowed for the identification of the concept of command and the area of its influence. The system of command, as a special (specific) form of management, allowed for the presentation of the entirety of the commander's purposeful activity as part of the command system. As a result of the terminological analysis, the author drew attention to the diversity of the analysed concepts, which will allow for their purposeful and proper use in research in the field of social sciences in the disciplines of safety science as well as management and quality science.

Keywords: management, command, directing, steering.

1. INTRODUCTION

Analysing the literature on the subject¹ in the field of management and leadership, the author came to the conclusion that terms such as control and command should

¹ The considered source definitions defining the concepts of control, management,

also be added to this catalogue. According to some scholars², the unequivocal distinction between these concepts is a complex and intricate problem that can only be solved by an arbitrary decision. However, for the uniqueness of the concepts used in the discipline of social sciences in the fields of security, as well as management and quality, it seems advisable to attempt to define the terminology of the above-mentioned concepts and the area they cover.

In the article, the author, based on many years of research including, inter alia, analysis of the literature on the subject and normative documents, synthesis, comparison and generalization, conducted a terminological analysis in the field of basic concepts in the field of management.

2. TERMINOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

In encyclopaedic and dictionary sources, one can find an interpretation related to the identical use of the concept of steering and control. According to T. Pszczółowski³, *managing in a systemic perspective can be treated as controlling or regulating one system by the second system, when the first system is human and the second system is human*. On the other hand, according to L. Piaseczny⁴, *directing can be understood as the impact of one object (the driver) on another (directed) object aiming at the fact that the directed object behaves (works or functions) towards achieving the goal set before it*.

steering and command are considered by theoreticians and practitioners, among others: Pszczółowski T., *Mała encyklopedia prakseologii i teorii organizacji*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław 1978; Piaseczny L., *Encyklopedia organizacji i zarządzania*, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa 1981; Ścibiorek Z., *Analiza możliwości wykorzystania ogólnej teorii kierowania podczas podejmowania decyzji do działań bojowych*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1999; Ścibiorek Z., *Kierownik w przedsiębiorstwie*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2000; Griffin R. W., *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001; Stoner J., *Kierowanie*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa 2001; Robbins S. P., DeCenzo D. A., *Podstawy zarządzania*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa 2002.

² Ścibiorek Z., *Analiza możliwości...* op. cit., p. 24; Michniak J., *Kierowanie mobilnymi systemami łączności wojsk lądowych*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2005, Pt. 1, p. 14.

³ Pszczółowski T., op. cit., p. 95.

⁴ Piaseczny L., op. cit., p. 205.

A similar approach is presented by Z. Ścibiorek⁵, according to whom steering and management are derived from control defined as *any deliberate influence of one system on another in order to obtain such changes in the course of the process taking place in the subject of control or the state of the controlled system at a given moment, which are considered to be desirable*. Control is influencing a certain phenomenon in order to produce a desired effect. According to its assumptions, the controlling subject is a man or a group of people, while the object can be a thing, e.g. a vehicle, an airplane.

Other terms often used interchangeably in the literature are leadership and management. According to J. Stoner⁶, *management is the process of planning, organizing, leading and controlling the activities of the members of the organization and the use of all other resources to achieve the set goals*. On the other hand, management according to SP Robbins and DADeCenzo⁷ *refers to the process of achieving certain things, efficiently and effectively, together with other people and through them, while the process in the definition of management is related to the basic activities performed by managers (planning, organizing, leading and controlling)*. Similarly, management defines RW Griffin⁸ as *a set of activities (including planning and making decisions, organizing, leading, i.e. managing people and controlling) directed at the resources of the organization (human, financial, material and information) and carried out with the intention of achieving the organization's goals in an efficient and effective manner*.

As the research results show, both concepts combine functions that are undertaken in the implementation of individual processes, that is: planning, organizing, leading and controlling. So what is the difference between leadership and management?

The analysis of the literature on the subject in this area shows that management relates to people, while the domain of management is the activity of the organization⁹.

According to the views of Z. Ścibiorek¹⁰, the concepts of directing and management are distinguished by adopting one of two dependencies:

⁵ Ścibiorek Z., *Kierownik...* op. cit., p. 26.

⁶ Stoner J., op. cit., p. 23.

⁷ Robbins S. P., DeCenzo D. A., op. cit., pp. 32-33.

⁸ Griffin R. W., op. cit., p. 38.

⁹ See: Ścibiorek Z., *Podjęmowanie decyzji*, Agencja Wydawnicza Ulmak, Warszawa 2003, pp. 47-51; *Podstawy dowodzenia*, red. Kręćkij J., Wołęjszo J., Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2007, p. 12.

¹⁰ Ścibiorek Z., *Podjęmowanie decyzji...* op. cit., pp. 50-51.

- directing is semantically broader than management;
- directing is semantically narrower than management.

The assumption of the first variant consists in specifying from directing, referring to the whole organization, some kind of directing, which is management. However, in the second variant, management is identified with the entire organization, and directing refers to human teams.

Another theory is presented by L. Piaseczny¹¹ claiming that *management is narrower than directing, which concerns people, institutions, or things not necessarily subordinate to the manager due to the ownership of the means of production. In turn, according to him, directing is a process in which one can distinguish the subject of directing (the directing object), the object of directing (the directed object), the relationship of superiority and subordination between them and the goal (or goals) to which the direction is aimed.*

A model representation of management, in which the subject of management, the object of management and the relations between them are distinguished, can be found in many sources¹².

In conclusion, based on the analysis of the literature, the following objects can be classified in the model approach to assigning a subject to a group of subjects:

- subject - refers to a person, a group of people;
- object - refers to a thing (device, vehicle, plane), a person (a group of people), and an organization.

According to the author, the form of defining the concepts of control, direction and management is also influenced by the environmental factor taking into account the area of activity of individual scientists. Due to the author's area of interest related to military issues, it is advisable to narrow down and focus on the interpretation of the concepts under consideration in relation to military activity.

¹¹ Piaseczny L., op. cit., p. 609.

¹² Kieżun W., *Sprawne zarządzanie organizacją*, Szkoła Główna Handlowa, Warszawa 1997, p. 138; Ciborowski L., *Pojęciowa interpretacja terminu „informacja” i jej pochodnych*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Obrony Narodowej”, 81 (2010), pp. 62-69; Michniak J., *Dowodzenie w teorii i praktyce wojsk*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2003, pp. 12-13; Ścibiorek Z., *Podejmowanie decyzji...* op. cit., p. 49.

By making a synthesis on the basis of the previous considerations and theories of leading military theorists and practitioners, the author adopts the following findings in relation to the aforementioned concepts: control, direction and management.

1. Steering.

Generalizing, on the basis of the assumption of subjectivity and objectivity of steering and the analysis of the literature on the concepts of steering and management, it can be assumed that:

- when analysing the area related to the steered subject, steering (managing) this subject and its environment is meant;
- considering the steered object, we will talk about direct control of this object.

The above considerations can be applied to the relations that take place on military grounds. In the literature on the subject, one can meet the phrase *steering the means of combat (destruction)* or *steering the means of destruction*. Taking into account the above findings, when the commander has at his disposal people who use the means of destruction (combat), it will be referred to as steering. On the other hand, considering the relationship between a human (operator) and a human being, the device will talk about steering the means of combat (destruction).

2. Directing.

For his considerations, the author adopted the following basic dependencies relating to the concept of management:

- relates primarily to people (staff)¹³;
- unjustified taking into account the human factor without the prism of the organization¹⁴;
- the essence of management and management, taking into account that *these are information and decision-making processes taking place primarily in the functional layer (planning, organizing, motivating and controlling) and in the resource-capital layer, which should be understood as human, material, financial, technological and information resources -organization*¹⁵.

¹³ Podstawy dowodzenia... op. cit., pp. 11-13.

¹⁴ Ibidem, p. 11.

¹⁵ Ibidem, p. 13; *planning is the process of arriving at the predictions and decisions that will be included in the plan, p. 67; organizing boils down to establishing the rules of horizontal and vertical division of labor and tasks, determining the routes of information flow and the distribution of powers to make decisions, p. 69; control is a process of continuous*

In conclusion, the author assumes that management will refer to a situation in which the subordination of human resources (personnel) and (material) resources of the organization in the form of a given or delegated authority has been clearly defined. An example would be a unit commander (manager) who has authority over subordinate resources vested in him.

3. Managing.

Taking into account the above considerations and the dependence in which management relates primarily to the organization¹⁶, the author accepts that management can be considered in a situation where there is no direct ownership of assigning power over resources. Such a situation may occur when the management of the organization and its resources is carried out within the framework of types of troops through boards, divisions, bosses or departments.

From the above terminological analysis it can be concluded that there is a dependency between the type of implementation of the management process and the type of authority conferred on it. An interesting approach in this respect was presented by L. Krzyżanowski¹⁷, who defined the relationship between the factors forming the basis of power and the title and type of management. According to his views, the type of management depends on: the type of organization, the type of authority, as well as the forms and means influencing the functioning of the organization. According to his theory, the type of management, which is management, is based on material competences, while management as a command includes formal competences. Such an approach to command as one of the types of organization management is also presented by many other authors:

- J. Cendrowski and S. Swebocki *define that commanding is a special type of directing*¹⁸;
- J. Michniak *defines commanding as the basic form of directing*¹⁹;

verification that everything is going according to plan, issued instructions and established rules, p. 69.

¹⁶ Ibidem, s. 11.

¹⁷ Krzyżanowski L., *O podstawach kierowania organizacjami inaczej: paradygmat, filozofia, dylematy*, Wydawnictwo PWN, Warszawa 1999, p. 248.

¹⁸ See: Cendrowski J., Swebocki S., *Psychologia walki i dowodzenia*, Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1973.

¹⁹ Michniak J., *Dowodzenie w teorii ... op. cit.*, p. 15.

- R. Kuriata considered *commanding to be special, due to the scope and type of directing*²⁰;
- E. Zabłocki and S. Miodek say *that commanding is a special form of directing*²¹.

The distinction between command and management was proposed by W. Mróz²², who differentiated the powers of the authorities. According to his theory, management can be treated as a form of management, with the goal of detailing the implementation of the process of command.

Summing up, management can be treated as a detailed implementation of the command process, which is the basic form of management.

Worthy of consideration in this problem area is discussed by L. Ciborowski, pointing to management as a concept broader than management. According to his views²³, *all forms of control and stimulation constitute managerial interactions influencing changes in the objects under control*.

In assessing the above considerations, the author accepts for further considerations that management is a broader concept, and the identification of the form of the causative factor (decision-information, information, physical) with the activity performed (command, management, control) allows for the explanation and definition of the area related to the typology concepts under consideration.

3. COMMANDING AS A SPECIFIC FORM OF MANAGEMENT

There are many definitions of command in the literature on the subject. Many factors influence the terminological diversity of this concept. One of them are the periods of time in which the content of this concept was formed depending on the needs of interested entities. The next factors, according to J. Michniak²⁴, depend on

²⁰ Kuriata R. (kier. zesp.), *Dowodzenie siłami powietrznymi*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2004, p. 18.

²¹ Zabłocki E., Miodek S., *Dowodzenie w wymiarze powietrznym*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2006, p. 43.

²² Mróz W., *Zarys kierowania i organizacji pracy dowódczej i sztabowej*, Wydawnictwo Sztabu Generalnego Wojska Polskiego, Warszawa 1978, p. 12.

²³ Ciborowski L., op. cit., p. 72.

²⁴ Michniak J., *Zarządzanie w sztabach wojskowych*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2009, p. 40.

the preferences of the authors who expressed their arguments in various aspects: psycho-social, technological or praxeological.

The terminological discrepancy in the concept of proving can also be observed in normative documents, where the basic concepts should be identical with each other. In documents such as: *Regulations of Land Forces Operations*²⁵ and instruction *Planning Activities at the Tactical Level in Land Forces DD / 3.2.5*²⁶, the definition of command is consistent with the definition proposed by J. Michniak²⁷, where *command is a process by which the commander imposes his will and intentions of subordinates and within the framework of which, assisted by his staff, plans, organizes, coordinates and directs the activities of subordinate troops through the use of standard operating procedures and all available means of information transfer.*

Nevertheless, there are differences: in the regulations, command is defined as the commander's activity, while in the manual it is a decision-making and information process. In addition, in these documents, depending on the powers granted and the related responsibility, the command²⁸ was divided into:

- full command - FULLCOM;
- operational command – OPCOM;
- tactical command - TACOM.

In addition, one of the control functions (as part of command) was differentiated, which is control on:

- operational control - OPCON;
- tactical control - TACON.

These divisions were taken from the allied doctrinal documents in order to clarify the scope of power that is conferred on the commander.

When analysing the above provisions it can be concluded that in the first case (considering the command) the activities carried out by the commander concern the subordinate organization, while in the second (management - control) they

²⁵ *Regulations of the Land Forces activities of 2008, ref. Command of the Land Forces 115/2008, p. 272.*

²⁶ *Planning activities at the tactical level in land forces DD / 3.2.5. from 2007, ref. Command of the Land Forces 96/2007, p. 7.*

²⁷ J. Michniak, *Dowodzenie i łączność*, AON, Warszawa 2005, s. 19.

²⁸ See: Kaczmarek W., *Kierunki ewolucji wojsk lądowych pk. „EWOLA”*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2008, pp. 29-30.

concern the organization assigned (normally not under his command) in order to perform the task. In the author's opinion, this approach shows the discrepancy in terms of the terminology of the allied and national approaches. The reason for this may be the direct translation of allied documents without taking into account national circumstances. According to the author, it is not advisable to translate allied documents directly without taking into account national circumstances, as this may lead to misinterpretation by the reader.

Another example of terminological discrepancy is *the Doctrine of the Command System of the Polish Armed Forces DD / 6.1.*²⁹, which does not coincide with previous documents.

The author, while analysing subsequent normative documents, concludes that the legislator, while developing the conceptual content in *DD / 6.1.* was suggested by the provisions from the previous item³⁰ covering the area of communication organization and cooperation in multinational operations for the purposes of the command system. In this document, the definition of command was taken from *the NATO document ATP-35 (B)*³¹, where a distinction between *command and control* was made. As you can see, the phrase control has been replaced with directing by taking a direct translation of the original concept. In interpreting the provisions in *DD / 6.1.*, Command is considered to be the authority entrusted to a specific person to direct, while directing is the authority exercised by the commander. The analysis of these records allows the reader to interpret in which proving is a concept broader than directing, which, according to the previous analysis of the literature on the subject, is not true.

On the basis of the terminological analysis to date, it should be emphasized that proving (as previously assumed) is a specific form of management. This specificity consists in the absolute implementation of the decisions made, through the commander's managerial activity and the information process consisting in transferring decision-making information to subordinates.

A likely source of error, as the author has already pointed out, may be the legislator's direct suggestion to provisions in the normative documents of NATO member

²⁹ Due to the clauses in this document, the full content is not provided, only the author's interpretation.

³⁰ *Zasady organizacji łączności współdziałania w operacjach wielonarodowych*, Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1999, sygn. Łączn. 1003/99, p. 12.

³¹ *ATP 35 Land Force Tactical Doctrine*; newer version ATP 3.2 Land Operations.

states. Considering the content of the collected definitions of proof, the author concludes that, despite striving to standardize the basic concepts and terms, terminological diversity is also visible here.

When analysing the given definitions, it can be noticed³² that the concept of *command* is divided into two parts: "command" and "control", which covers two basic areas:

- "*command*" is interpreted as authority - the right to issue orders and bear responsibility for them, varied in terms of the situation, e.g. full command, operational control;
- "*control*" is represented as a process whose domain is governance; in this process, the commander, supported by his staff, carries out planning, organizing, setting tasks and coordinating the activities of the forces subordinate to him.

The study of the content of both areas indicates the identification of the concept of command from the national perspective. An example of this can be the definition presented by J. Michniak³³, which covers both areas within one concept.

Based on the above analysis of the literature, it can be concluded that the term which covers the subject area of the Polish concept of command is "*Command and Control C2*" and not only "*command*" as it is presented in the normative documents quoted above.

Accepting after J. Kręcikije³⁴, the author agrees with the thesis that the term "*control*" cannot be translated as directing and, consequently, as "C2" as command and management. "C2" should be translated and understood as command, and the Polish term command should be treated as "*Command and Control*" in the allied translation.

The above interpretation was accepted as correct for further analysis. The above-mentioned example suggests that it is not advisable to introduce direct translation of allied documents without a terminological analysis in the national aspect, as this may lead to misinterpretation by the reader.

Command is a very broad concept and abstract from the point of view of action. Therefore, in the literature, command is described in a systemic form³⁵ as a command

³² *Podstawy dowodzenia...* op. cit., p. 16.

³³ See: Michniak J., *Zarządzanie w sztabach ...* op. cit., p. 41.

³⁴ Kręcikij J., *Ustalenia standaryzacyjne sojuszu północnoatlantyckiego w wybranych obszarach dowodzenia*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2001, p. 16.

³⁵ System - (def.) Is a concept designating a certain whole created by a

system, presenting the entirety of the purposeful activity of the commander and his command organ.

For the purposes of the discipline of security sciences, the author recommends the use of the following definition of the command system - *it is a set of elements organized in the form of command bodies, means of command and an information and decision-making process linked by command relations with the entire combat and logistic security infrastructure, cooperating with each other according to the adopted and agreed advance rules and requirements*³⁶.

Based on the analysis of the above definition and terms available in the literature on the subject, it can be assumed that the command is carried out in the information and decision-making process between the commander and subordinates. This process is carried out with the use of three basic elements (personal, technical, procedural), which are mutually interconnected by defined relations.

In the Polish literature on the theory and practice of command, the following division of the basic components of the command system can be found:

- organization of command;
- command process;
- means of command.

Due to the illustrative nature of the article, the author will not cite the definitions of scientists available in the literature, but will present selected definitions for the purposes of further considerations.

According to J. Michniak, the command organization is *a set of undertakings concerning the selection of material, temporal and spatial components* rationalizing the functioning of the command system in given environmental conditions. However, according to the concept of J. Posobc³⁷, the organization of command consists of the following elements:

specific set of objects (elements) and connections (relations) between them, considered from a specific point of view (aspect of research); Sienkiewicz P., *Podstawy teorii systemów*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1993, p. 45.

³⁶ *Podstawy dowodzenia...* op. cit., p. 61.

³⁷ Posobiec J., *Organizacja dowodzenia w środowisku sieciocentrycznym*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2008, pp. 103-104.

- general principles of operation of individual elements of the command system (including the deployment and relocation of command posts);
- division of commands into particular command positions;
- organizational and functional structure of commands;
- relations of command posts (external and internal ties);
- scopes of powers and responsibilities of commands.

The second element of the command system is the command process³⁸, defined as *the information and decision-making process carried out in decision-making cycles by the commands located in the network of command posts at their organizational level, consisting in cyclical collection and processing of information, and then processing it into decision-making information, which is led in the form of a task. to contractors.*

Means of command are another component of the command system. In the literature on the subject, you can find many similar definitions. One of them is the definition presented by J. Posobiec stating that *the means of command include material and technical resources, systems, devices and technical procedures, information technologies (applications, computer programs, etc.) organized into the infrastructure of command posts, tele-informatic, postal and signalling networks, command support. Means of command are used in command to obtain, process, verify, distribute, collect and display information.*

However, according to the author, this definition does not contain essential elements imposed by technological progress, and which definitely have an impact on the area scope of the means of command.

When finalizing the presented terminological arguments related to the concept of *the command system (command)*, it should be emphasized that such an approach indicates that the following basic conditions should be ensured in the army:

- viability of facilities and means of command;
- ability to cooperate (synchronize) and coordinate activities with other types of armed forces or components of the armed forces of allied countries, with the administration in the country or in the host country;
- ability to react and adapt to command needs depending on the type of activities performed.

³⁸ *Podstawy dowodzenia...* op. cit., p. 62.

4. SUMMARY

On the basis of the research carried out in the field of terminological analysis, the author indicated the differences between the concepts of command, management and control and the area of their application. This allowed for the identification of the concept of command as a specific form of management in a hierarchical organization of a military nature. In the research process, the author showed that translating English-language or allied documents without interpreting national conditions may lead to misinterpretation. The author hopes that the presented terminological analysis will allow for proper and purposeful use of concepts related to rational impact on processes taking place in organizations, taking into account their specificity.

REFERENCES

- [1] ATP 3.2 Land Operations.
- [2] ATP 35 Land Force Tactical Doctrine.
- [3] Cendrowski J., Swebocki S., *Psychologia walki i dowodzenia*, Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1973.
- [4] Ciborowski L., *Pojęciowa interpretacja terminu „informacja” i jej pochodnych*, “Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Obrony Narodowej”, 81 (2010), pp. 58-108.
- [5] Griffin R. W., *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2001.
- [6] Kaczmarek W., *Kierunki ewolucji wojsk lądowych pk. „EWOLA”*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2008
- [7] Kieżun W., *Sprawne zarządzanie organizacją*, Szkoła Główna Handlowa, Warszawa 1997.
- [8] Kręcikij J., *Ustalenia standaryzacyjne sojuszu północnoatlantyckiego w wybranych obszarach dowodzenia*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2001.
- [9] Krzyżanowski L., *O podstawach kierowania organizacjami inaczej: paradygmat, filozofia, dylematy*, Wydawnictwo PWN, Warszawa 1999.
- [10] Kuriata R., (kier. zesp.) *Dowodzenie siłami powietrznymi*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2004.
- [11] Michniak J., *Dowodzenie i łączność*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2005.
- [12] Michniak J., *Dowodzenie w teorii i praktyce wojsk*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2003.
- [13] Michniak J., *Kierowanie mobilnymi systemami łączności wojsk lądowych*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2005, Pt. 1.

- [14] Michniak J., *Zarządzanie w sztabach wojskowych*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2009.
- [15] Mróz W., *Zarys kierowania i organizacji pracy dowódczej i sztabowej*, Wydawnictwo Sztabu Generalnego Wojska Polskiego, Warszawa 1978.
- [16] Piaseczny L., *Encyklopedia organizacji i zarządzania*, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa 1981.
- [17] *Planowanie działań na szczeblu taktycznym w wojskach lądowych DD/3.2.5. z 2007 r. sygn. DWLąd wewn. 96/2007.*
- [18] *Podstawy dowodzenia*, red. Kręcikij J., Wołęjszo J., Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2007.
- [19] Posobiec J., *Organizacja dowodzenia w środowisku sieciocentrycznym*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2008.
- [20] Pszczółkowski T., *Mała encyklopedia prakseologii i teorii organizacji*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław 1978.
- [21] *Regulamin działań Wojsk Lądowych z 2008 r. sygn. DWLąd wewn. 115/2008.*
- [22] Robbins S. P., DeCenzo D. A., *Podstawy zarządzania*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa 2002.
- [23] Sienkiewicz P., *Podstawy teorii systemów*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1993.
- [24] Stoner J., *Kierowanie*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa 2001.
- [25] Ścibiorek Z., *Analiza możliwości wykorzystania ogólnej teorii kierowania podczas podejmowania decyzji do działań bojowych*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1999.
- [26] Ścibiorek Z., *Kierownik w przedsiębiorstwie*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2000.
- [27] Ścibiorek Z., *Podejmowanie decyzji*, Agencja Wydawnicza Ulmak, Warszawa 2003.
- [28] Zabłocki E., Miodek S., *Dowodzenie w wymiarze powietrznym*, Akademia Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 2006.
- [29] *Zasady organizacji łączności współdziałania w operacjach wielonarodowych*, Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa 1999, sygn. Łączn. 1003/99.

Grzegorz Pilarski
War Studies Academy in Warsaw, Poland
g.pilarski@akademia.mil.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-9728-2611