

Aleksy KOWALSKI¹

ORCID: 0009-0000-7245-3373

Ethical Dilemmas in Strategic Human Resource Management

Dylematy etyczne w strategicznym zarządzaniu zasobami ludzkimi

Introduction

Moral questions belong to the knowledge, practice, and experience of human tradition. Ancient and modern thinkers analyse human life in the *pastpolis* and today's metropolis. Ethical roles organize not only family life, but also social existence, and implement them among citizens, to formulate States. Moral and lawful regulations were known among Olympic dignitaries, philosophers, orators, politicians, warriors, merchants, farmers, and free and slave people.

The Pythagorean society, Plato's Academy, the Aristotelian Lyceum, the Stoic school, and the mysterious religion propagate their beliefs through a unified moral code. For instance, Pythagorean ethics depend on Orphism and Socratic intellectual ethics, and Plato's eudemonistic ethics, teleological –

¹ Aleksy Kowalski, PhD, Prof., The Korczak University – Academy of Applied Science in Katowice, Poland, email: aleksy.kowalski@gmail.com

golden means Aristotelian ethics, and aretaic ethics united with the nature and hegemonic ethics of Epicureanism.

Modern times are interesting in ethical issues. For instance, Immanuel Kant proposes deontological ethics, discursive ethics of Jurgen Habermas, Waldo Emerson's egoism ethics, and Max Scheler and Roman Ingarden's value ethics (Copleston, 1993; Joos, 2009; Bagginian and Fosl, 2010; Taylor, 2017; Galewicz, 2020; Kuderowicz and others, 2002; Reale, 2010; Ślipko, 2021).

Contemporary researchers analysing the question of management also pay attention to ethical issues, especially strategic human resource management. There is a dynamic relationship between employers and employees. Therefore, aretology, aretaic philosophy, axiology, and value ethics propose values that organize social business life, in which personal value, according to Ingarden, is a human person's existence as the most important value.

Ethical Doctrine in Antiquity

Ethics has been integral to human civilization from antiquity to the digital age. Ancient thinkers sought answers to questions about moral behaviour that lead to *eudaimonia* (happiness and well-being). Aristotle of Stagira (346–322 B.C.) was among the most influential philosophers of antiquity. Drawing on theoretical and practical knowledge, he categorized several philosophical ideas he analysed. The second group includes ethics and moral philosophy. According to Aristotle, moral principles are grounded in logic and in the distinction between good and bad choices (Copleston, 1993, 332–350; Taylor, 2017, 135; Reale, 2010, 265–283). Aristotle wrote two treatises, *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Eudemian Ethics*, which focus on human arete (goodness and excellence). The concept of virtue can be viewed in both horizontal-ontological and vertical-axiological dimensions. His description of the ontological dimension involves *mesotes* (a middle or central position), and the axiological dimension emphasizes *arete* (excellence or an extreme). Aretology, also known as Aretaic Ethics, is the philosophical study of virtue that examines ways to achieve a fulfilled life (Abbagnano, 1995, 55; Taylor, 2017, 119; Ślipko, 1982, 33; Leśniak, 1989, 81–87).

The structure of the human psyche (*anima*) was analysed by Plato's pupil, who identified three types of *psyche*. Two types of souls are irrational: the nutritive or vegetative (*threptikon*) soul, which represents the lowest form of psyche.

The higher form known as “sensitive” (*aisthetikon*) is associated with animals. The highest soul that is rational (*logistikon*) is only found in humans due to their intellect (*nous*) that functions both in scientific thought (*epistemonikon*) and deliberation (*dianoia practice*). According to Aristotle (2012, I, 1102b, the human soul is the connection between the lower vegetative and sensitive parts of the psyche (Reale, 2010, 258–263; Copleston, 1993, 327–330).

Aristotle posited two types of virtues at the beginning of the Nicomachean Ethics, one ethical and the other intellectual (Aristotle, 2012, II, 1103a–1103b). Describing the ethical virtues (*aretai ethikai*) that govern the desiderative part of the psyche, he identifies the golden mean between deficiency and excess, citing courage, temperance, liberality, magnificence, self-respect, unnamed gentleness, truthfulness, witness, friendliness, modesty, and righteous indignation (Aristotle, 2012, V, 1129a–1138b; Copleston, 1993, 341; Taylor, 2017, 121).

The Stagirite emphasizes that the rational part of the soul can be perfected through teaching (*didaskalia*) and practicing (*praxis*) by analysing the intellectual virtues (*aretai dianoetikai*). He distinguishes five principles of dianoetic: intellect (*nous*), scientific knowledge (*episteme*), productive knowledge (*techné*), practical wisdom (*phronesis*), and theoretical wisdom (*sophia*). The world of ethical virtues is organized by wisdom, which represents the highest theoretical excellence, in collaboration with practical wisdom. Aristotle asserts that ethical and intellectual virtues are interdependent (Aristotle, 2012, VI, 1139a–1145a, Reale, 2010, 270–271).

Happiness (*eudaimonia*) is the goal of human beings, and it can be achieved by acting in accordance with virtue. *Eudaimonia* is not contingent on human emotions but rather embodies the genuine state of living well. By working together with the intellect (*nous*), the soul can achieve it through a very good activity. Intellectual virtues are organized by intellect, while practical wisdom (*phronesis*) guides moral virtues. According to the philosopher, the first and second forms of *aretai* do not work separately but rather work together in harmony.

The act of contemplation (*theoria*) is the only way to find the highest happiness, as stated by the Nicomachean Ethics’ tenth book, because the intellect, the highest faculty of man, is involved in it. This activity can be sustained longer than any other activity, such as exercising the body. Philosophical contemplation describes pleasure as the most pleasant activity, and it is one of the elements of well-being. Therefore, the philosopher is

more dedicated to self-sufficiency than any other human being. Copleston, explaining the Aristotelian point of view, declares: "Philosophy is loved for its own sake and not for the sake of any results that accrue from it. In the field of practical activity, it is not the action itself that is desirable, but some results to be attained by means of the activity. Philosophy is no mere means to a further end" (Copleston, 1993, 349). The act of contemplation brings happiness to the soul, as well as the vegetative, sensitive, and rational forms of the human soul.

Arius Didymus (c. 80–1 B.C.), the philosophical writer and Stoic of Alexandria, was mentioned, among others, by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*) and Diogenes Laertius (*Lives of the Philosophers*). He wrote the philosophical treatise that is known to modern readers, entitled *Epitome of Stoic Ethics* (Arius Didymus, 1999). Ioannes Stobanus included the book in his Anthology (*Słownik pisarzy antycznych*, 1982, 646).

The Alexandrian philosopher, at the start of his *Epitome*, refers to Zeno of Citium (336–264 B.C.), the founder of the Stoa, and explores the ethical aspects of that philosophical doctrine. The Stoic concept of virtue forms the core of aretaic teaching. Stoicism divides things into three categories: good, bad, and indifferent. Every virtue is considered good and sufficient for well-being and a state of perfected rationality. Stoics emphasize the unity of virtue and conformity to nature. They categorize: a) things that align with nature and have value; b) things that oppose nature and are valueless; c) things that possess neither value nor disvalue. Managing strategic human resources, future generations will have to develop a set of values, which is the origin of Stoicism (Copleston 1993, 397).

Arius Didymus, like other Stoics, preserves the traditional four cardinal virtues: practical wisdom (*phronesis*), moderation (*sophrosyne*), courage (*andreia*), and justice (*dikaiosune*) (Arius Didymus, 1999, 5b2; Copleston, 1993, 397). Stoic practical wisdom differs from Aristotle's point of view. *Phronesis* is united with theoretical wisdom and distinguishes good and evil activity. Moderation governs modesty, property, and self-control. Courage demonstrates knowledge about false fears and the epistemic possibility of correcting them. Justice ensures that the relationships within a rational human community are properly organized. Arius Didymus declares that *dikaiosune* is grounded in rational cosmopolitanism. That virtue shows not only the legal fairness said in the first place in relation to the universal intellect. He synthesized the importance of four cardinal virtues in Stoic philosophy writing: "Intelligence

deals with appropriate acts, self-restraint deals with man's impulses, bravery deals with acts of endurance, and justice deals with the apportioning of what is due" (Arius Didymus, 1999, 5b2).

The Stoic philosophers do not continue the Aristotelian distinction between the moral and intellectual virtues; nevertheless, they identify their specific cognitive excellences. Arius Didymus, analysing the virtue of knowledge (*epistle*), defines it as a stable and systematic understanding of the divine and the human. A wise man (*sophos*) acts in accord with all the virtues; his every action is concurring with logical consistency and free from contradiction. (Arius Didymus, 1999, 5b8). Right reason (*orthos logos*) governs all virtuous actions; in consequence, intellectual error produces moral ones. The Alexandrian philosopher declares that a wise man possessing one virtue owns all of them. Virtues are united and create rational perfection.

The Aristotelian and Stoic ethics create philosophical principles of a) aretology – science about moral virtue, b) eudaimonology – science of goal and sense of human existence, and c) axiology – science of moral good and moral value.

Theoretical and practical usage of ethics in human resource management

Modern thinkers presenting the division of philosophy show three branches of ethics: metaethics that demonstrates a) cognitivism, b) non-cognitivism, c) subjectivism, and d) objectivism. Normative ethics deals with utilitarianism, egoism, deontology, virtue theory, natural law theory, and divine command theory. Applied ethics explains a person's responsibilities and permissibilities, particularly in challenging situations that require moral evaluation (Taylor, 2017, 13–16).

Any moral decision presents *pro* and *contra* arguments that justify a subjective or objective point of view. For instance, a strategic human resources manager faces a dilemma that presents two realities: a true dilemma and a false dilemma. The true dilemma shows a real situation in which a difficult choice must be made between only two alternatives. A scenario with more than two options can be shown through the false dilemma (Taylor, 2017, 299).

The book *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (2014) is written by authors who also look at ethical dimensions-

related questions. In the first part of that book, in chapter eight, titled *The Ethical Dimension of HRM*, they describe moral questions in human resource management. First, the authors introduce that branch of philosophy. Then, the meaning of ethics, the nature of moral decisions and judgements, the ethical subjects of deontology, utilitarianism, stakeholder theory, and discourse theory; the meaning of equity, justice, and fair dealing; the ethical guidelines of human resource management; who settles ethical dilemmas? And the ethical significance of human resources.

Authors distinguish between ethics and morality and provide definitions for both concepts. Some thinkers consider them synonymous. Petrick and Quinn (1997, 42) state that moral philosophy “is a study of individual and collective moral awareness, judgment, character, and conduct.” Hamlin and others (2001, 98) emphasize that ethics concern statements and moral values that help differentiate right from wrong. Beauchamp and Bowie (1983, 1–2) clearly differentiate between ethics and morality. Moral values are described as part of social institutions with a history and teachings that promote learnable statements. The study of moral philosophy is about describing the nature of ethical rules and related issues and decisions. Armstrong and Taylor (2014, 96) conclude that the question affirms, “Ethics is concerned with making decisions and judgments about what is the right course of action to take. It can be described in terms of a framework that sets out different approaches and can be extended to include concepts that influence and guide ethical behaviour, namely equity, justice, and fair dealing.”

Jones (1991, 367) proposes the concept of an ethical decision (*sententia ethica*), which is a morally acceptable judgment to a larger group of people. “A moral issue is present where a person’s action, when freely performed, may harm or benefit others [...] the action or decision must have consequences for others and must involve choice, or volition, on the part of the actor or decision maker” (Jones, 1991, 267).

Winstanley and Woodall (2000a, 8–9) call moral philosophy a tool (*instrument*) that contains human criticism and challenges. There is no universal code of ethical frameworks. Any ethical situation requires moral reflection, decision, and judgment. Usually, there is a choice between two alternatives, a true dilemma (*vera dilemma*), and seldom is it the rational choice between valuable right and unvaluable wrong. Summarizing Clegg and others (2007, 12), they declare that *sententiae ethicae* “emerge out of dilemmas that cannot be managed in advance through rules.”

Armstrong and Taylor, presenting the ethical framework (*compares ethical*), do not mention the Aristotelian and Stoic archaeology. They begin their reflection from Kant's conception of deontological theory, which belongs to normative ethics, to explain the etymology of the Greek word "*deon*" that signifies something binding, needful, and right (Armstrong and Taylor, 2014, 97; McKim, 1996, 74). The founder of the ethics of duty is Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), the German philosopher who proposed, among other things, that the categorical imperative differs from the hypothetical imperative. The philosopher of Królewiec states that "a moral law, given in reason, that has universal and unconditional binding force [...] advocates acting in a way that one could accept as good (as a universal law) if everyone acted in that way" (McKim, 1996, 40), (Armstrong, Taylor, 2014, 97), and (Taylor, 2017, 153–157).

The next concept of the ethical framework is utilitarianism, also part of normative ethics. The lexeme "utilitarianism" comes from the Latin word "*utilitas*," meaning "*use, usefulness, and utility*" (*Elementary Latin Dictionary*, 2002, 896). Utilitarian ethics has ancient predecessors, such as the Cyrenaics and Epicurus of Samos (341–270 B.C.), the founder of the Epicurean School, in his domestic garden. Epicurus teaches logic, canonical physics, and ethics that explain *eudaimonia* (happiness) as the beginning and end of hedonistic life. F. Copleston affirms that "the ethics of Epicureans is fundamentally selfish or egoistic, in that it is based on the individual's pleasure; it was not in practice as selfish as it might sound. Thus, the Epicurean thought that it is really pleasanter to do as a kindness than to receive one, and the founder himself was commended for his contented and kind character" (Copleston, 1993, 409; Reale, 2010, 364–366; Baggin, Fosl, 2010, 100–101; Taylor, 2017, 85–91).

Concept of ethical utilitarianism, represented by Jerry Bentham (1749–1832), John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) and Peter Singer (1946–), demonstrate three fundamental statements: a) right or wrong actions will be judged after analysing their consequences; b) judging consequences they create matter to determine human being's happiness or unhappiness; c) any form of well-being is measured in the same way (Taylor, 2017, 172, Armstrong, Taylor, 2014, 87).

The stakeholder theory proposed by Freeman (1984) could be considered as one form of utilitarianism. The management of certain organizations will be done by specific groups of stakeholders, including owners, employees, customers, suppliers, and communities. Managers collaborate with the orga-

nization to manage stakeholders who prepare the operational mode to secure the success and efficiency of the entire organization. Starting ethical judgments requires specific circumstances marked by stakeholders.

The theory of stakeholders highlights communication problems among members of an organization. Therefore, the philosophical theory of discourse ethics (colloquium ethicum), founded by Habermas (1929–), the German philosopher and sociologist, is explained in the field of human resource management by Winstanley and Woodall, who state: “the role of ethics is not to provide solutions to ethical problems, but rather to offer a practical process and procedure that are both rational and based on consensus, through which issues can be debated and discourse can take place” (2000a, 14, Baggini, Fosl, 2010, 92–95).

Armstrong and Taylor present four philosophical moral theories as the ethical framework of the ethical dimension of human resource management. Begging from deontology through utilitarianism, shareholder theory, and discourse ethics, they provide not only ethical doctrines but also show the process of their development and application in the sciences of management.

Then the equity theory (*theoria equitation*) that, according to Adams (1963), a behavioural psychologist, emphasizes fairness as a core of motivation. Equity (*Aequitas*) differs from equality (*equality*). Two terms indicate different realities and are not synonymous. “Equity involves feelings and perceptions, and it is always a comparative process [...] equality [...] means treating everyone the same and would be inequitable if they deserve to be treated differently” (Armstrong, Taylor, 2014, 97).

Discipline is considered a cardinal virtue in Aristotelian and Stoic aretaic ethics, but the modern understanding of justice (*iustitia*) differs. J. Rawls (1921–2002), the American philosopher, founded and described in his book *A Theory of Justice* (1971) the concept of “justice as fairness”. Eliminating bias (*inclination*) he postulates hypothetical thinking as “original position” (*status principals*). Then J. Rawls proposes a paradigm called “veil of ignorance” (*velamen ignorantiae*) in which a human agent abstracts from social position, education, religious belief, character, race, sex, etc. *Velamen ignorantiae* frees from some human kind *inclination* (Taylor, 2017, 43). The judgment that J describes can be performed after that. Rawls has two precise requirements: “every person is to have the equal right to the most extensive basic liberty comparable with similar liberty for others, and “social and economic

inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both a) reasonably respected to be to everyone's advantage, and b) attached to positions and offers open to all" (Rawls, 1973, 60).

Adams and Rawls' theories prepare the field of human resource management to understand different forms of justice practiced in the world of organizations.

Armstrong and Taylor summarize four kinds of justice: a) procedural – fairness of the processes, b) distributive – fairness of outcomes, c) social – equality, inclusion without discrimination, and d) natural – fair hearing and impartial judgement (Armstrong, Taylor, 2014, 97–98).

Strategic human resource managers from the perspective of ethical rules and their dilemmas

Ethical guidelines are present in human resource management, just like any other theoretical and practical discipline. Elisabeth Scott, a professor of business ethics and human resource management, has written an article titled *The Ethics of Human Resource Management* published in J. A. Mello's book, *Strategic Human Resource Management* (2014), which analyses the moral philosophy issue in contemporary organizations. Introducing that question, she goes to antiquity in which employees (*operarii*) and tools (*instrumenta*) were classified as "dumb tools" (plows, shovels), "semi-speaking tools" (animals), and "speaking tools" (slaves). The modern meanings of the phrase 'human resources' convey the values and rights of workers (Scott, 2014, 86). After that, she briefly presents ethical theories, among others, J. Rawls' concept of justice that emphasizes his special place regarding the realities of fairness, stakeholders, and duty in human resource management.

Scott describes three types (*exempli*) of ethical problems (*quaestiones morales*) that accompany human resource managers. The first type affirms the need for discernment (*ars discernendi*) that involves real things as a complete image of complicated situations. The manager's decision is based not only on his authority and position in the organization, but also on his capacity to implement *this discernment*. The second type of moral problem emphasizes an existing conflict (*conflict*) between the judgement of a human resource manager and his personal responsibility as an agent representing the employer. When a human resource manager's best interests are not aligned with the employer's procurement responsibility, the third type of ethical problem is called conflict

of interest (*conflictus utilitatis*). The first *quaestio moralis* can become the second or third ones, because a human resource manager decides about the appropriate activity.

The activities of the human resource manager also realize functions (*munera*) that describe relationships between employer and employee. Analysing their specification, it is necessary to present five of them: recruitment, training, motivation, retention, and termination. The first *munus* – recruitment (*conquisitio*) begins the employment process in which the manager demonstrates practical knowledge to qualified employees who become valuable assets to the organization. The experienced employer hiring candidates implements six elements: minimum qualification, entry salary range, advertising, selection, successful applicants, and conflict of interest (Scott, 2014, 87–91; Griffin, 2022, 440–443). Training and development (*exercitatio et progressus*) are part of the second function, which contains: general training, safety training, values training, conflict of interest, and career development. J. Mello, in *Strategic Human Resource Management* (2025), emphasizes employees' learning and development. They are "a key strategic issue for the organization. Companies use this method to evaluate the profitability of their human resources. Because much of the return on investment in learning and development may be difficult to quantify, particularly in the short run, organizations should take a holistic view of learning and development (Mello, 2025, 160; Swanson, 2023, 289–304; Griffin, 2022, 443–446).

Analysing the first and second functions, given the underlying role of conflict of interest that complicates and challenges the manager's activity. The third function emphasizes the reality of motivation (probation) and is proposed to the employee. The probation stage includes compensation, performance appraisal systems, employee monitoring, climate and culture, charitable contributions, work design, team circles, and quality and improved discipline. Motivation, according to Goleman (2024), is part of emotional intelligence. It harmonizes a human being's competency. It describes the aspiration to a target, engagement in the organization, initiative, and optimism (Goleman, 2024, 49; Scott, 2014, 93–95; Griffin, 2022, 483).

Benefits, a work/life balance, compensation systems, and mechanisms for employee complaints are all important factors in retention (*retentio*). Four functions demonstrate dynamic realities that realize the manager's strategic plan from recruitment to retention. The first function prepares the following ones.

The last managerial activity of employment is called termination (*exits*), which ends the employee's working adventure. That function characterizes dismissal, layoffs, resignation, and an employee's death. Scott, concluding her article, emphasizes that five functions of the employment process determine ethical values that accompany the human resource manager from *Terminus a quo* – recruitment to *Terminus ad quem* – termination.

The moral activity of a manager involves different situations in which the employer ethically recognizes and evaluates the employee's work. He has three options for exercising his judgment as a human resources manager: moral, non-moral, and amoral. As a human being, he acts according to reason and self-determination. His decision, ethically speaking, provokes real judgment with moral consequences (Koźmiński and others, 2023, 63–64). J. Habermas proposes "discourse ethics" that, following Plato's dialectics, emphasizes rationality and impartiality between interlocutors. That postulate organizes speech that describes the moral dimension of human dialogue (Baggini, Fosl, 2007, 92–96).

The reality of ethical dilemmas accompanies managerial decisions that shape life in his organization. The Greek lexeme *dilemmaton* signifies that, in a single statement, there are two phrases (Jurewicz, 2018, 218). The dilemma, generally speaking, describes the necessity of choice between two goods. The moral philosophy also presents ethical dilemmas as a process of right and controversial decisions in ambiguous and undesirable situations. The unpleasant choice determines ethical rules and moral practice. Ethics are a significant challenge for a human resource manager. For instance, how to accept the tendency to personal limitations and underline existing difficulties; researching different causes and avoiding real ones; transferring personal responsibility to others; attributing to the present situation, lack of timeliness and appropriate activity; tendency to minimize waste or questioning the real victim. On the other hand, the manager's personal conviction is presented as lawful and ethical, declaring it has no sign of misdeed or immorality. Kind of persuasion convincing that the chosen solution is the best for the company or the employee. Employer's conviction is "safe" because it will never be discovered or published. The manager will receive forgiveness and protection from the organization due to the activity's benefits (Koźmiński and others 2023, 65).

Armstrong and Taylor devised a checklist of ten questions. They can be applied to situations dealing with ethical dilemmas. There are the following

examples: “In disciplinary cases, are there any mitigating circumstances? [...] Do the facts as established and confirmed justify the proposed action? Is the proposed action in line with both the letter and the spirit of the law? [...] Will the proposed action benefit the organization, and if so, how?” (Armstrong, Taylor, 2014, 101).

Ekuma and Akobo, in analysing the question of ethics in contemporary human resource management, confront ethical dilemmas in functioning organizations. That issue describes the following scholars: Winstanley and Woodall (2000), Wooten (2001), and others. They stress the significance of moral philosophy in recording relationships between employers and employees. According to researchers Winstanley and others (1996), four categories of problems could be identified: uncertainty and risk, monitoring and control, liberalization, and speech and imposture. Therefore, Ekuma, Smith (2012) and Wooten (2001) identify five ethical dilemmas: a) “misrepresentation and collusion”; b) “misuse of data”; c) “manipulation and coercion”; d) “value and good conflict”; and e) “technical ineptness” (Ekuma, Akobo, 2015, 53–54).

Blanchard and Peale, in their book *The Power of Ethical Management* (2014), describe the moral field of management. The authors present issues of ethical dilemmas and propose moral values that call for five keys to ethical power. First value – aim (*finis*) introduces a person as an ethical being. The next one affirms the doer’s dignity (*decorus*). The next values – patience (*patientia*) and perseverance (*perseverant*) – belong to cardinal virtues and demonstrate a person’s moral abilities. Personal satisfaction that is unified with active reflection is represented by the final value, perspective (*prospectus*) (Blanchard, Peale, 2014, 82).

Roman Ingarden (1893–1970) is known for his work on many books, including *Księżeczka o człowieku* (1972) and *Wykłady z etyki* (1989). He belongs to the phenomenological tradition initiated by Edmund Husserl. Ingarden’s ethical point of view mediates between the rational ethics of Immanuel Kant and the axiological phenomenology of Max Scheler. The philosopher differentiates three branches of ethics: theoretical, normative, and applied (ethical technology). His ethics can be called axiological, precisely material ethics of values. (Ingarden, 1989, 120 and next; Galarowicz, 2020, 55–58; Węgrzecki, 2001, 72–73). Ingarden distinguishes, among other things, moral and personal values and emphasizes the differences. The Cracow Thinker presents an ontology of values indicating a) real objects; b) ideal objects, and c) purely intentional objects. Therefore, moral values exist as objective, non-

empirical, and normatively binding. Ingarden's personal values are presented as shaped by individual experience, context-dependent, and expressions of value appropriation. In consequence, they exist as a subjective realization of objective values. The philosopher, first of all, explains two realities: the subject – moral value carrier and the world of moral values, *sensu stricto* morals, and the distinction between contestable and moral values. Personal values, as basic values, determine moral values (Ingarden, 1989, 201–202).

Ingarden mentions and describes the following positive personal values that, according to him, do not belong to moral values: consciousness (*conscientia*), freedom (*libertas*), internal power (*vis interna*), intelligence (*intelligentia*), happiness (*felicitas*), versatility (*mobilitas*), profundity (*profunditas*), man's independence (*hominis arbitrium*), internal criticism (*criticismus internis*), and individuality (*natura propria*).

Analysing consciousness or self-consciousness, Ingarden argues that this personal value is not a moral one and, at the same time, insufficient for responsible activity. Similarly, freedom exists as a positive and personal value; it creates an indispensable condition of human responsibility. Internal power of a person indicates a stable character, especially when confronting difficult situations. The thinker notes that besides so-called animal intelligence, humans possess positive or negative realizations. Happiness as a personal value describes the human act of desire that surpasses the framed reality of eudaimonism. The value of versatility transcends moral considerations. Profundity states psychological and spiritual dimensions of human beings, demonstrating emotional and intellectual capacities. Man's dependence expresses his thinking, willingness, and activity, constituting an essential part of human nature. The personal value of man's independence harmonizes with internal criticism, which shows the capacity of human judgment. Ingarden's individuality is similar to Duns Scotus' uniqueness – *socratitas* (Ingarden, 1989, 220–240). The first and original personal value, according to him, determines the reality of a person as a dimension that does not summarize personal values but exists as unique in relation to all personal values.

The human resource manager is confronted with situations. It is necessary to make decisions and settle dilemmas. Moral philosophy's special role in ancient and modern organizational life is exemplified by Aretology, Aretaic philosophy, and axiology, which were introduced by Aristotle, Max Scheler, Roman Ingarden, and John Rawls, among others.

The importance of Moral Philosophy underlines a special role in today's business activities. Human behaviour concentrates on the rules that regulate appropriate relationships between employer and employee. Future perspectives are opened by the ethics of values, particularly emotional and moral intelligence. It is leading to a new area of interaction between humans and artificial intelligence.

Abstract: The article titled Ethical dilemmas in strategic human resource management raises moral questions from antiquity to the digital era. Moral issues occupied the minds of ancient thinkers. They understood that human life needs rules that help it to exist in the family, *polis*, and State. Aristotle proposed intellectual and moral virtues, and the concept of eudaimonia, and created the concept of the golden mean. Stoic philosophers elaborated cardinal virtues in harmony with nature. Epicureans preferred moderated ethical hedonism. Modern researchers also focused on the theoretical and practical usage of ethical norms in human existence. Immanuel Kant proposes a deontological ethics, and Jürgen Habermas presents discourse ethics. John Rawls formulated the theory of justice, while Ralph Waldo Emerson presents an egoism ethic. The manager's human resources face ethical dilemmas and balance moral values, as proposed by Max Scheler and Roman Ingarden, in organizational business settings. How to introduce emotional and moral intelligence in approaching the reality of artificial intelligence?

Keywords: ethics, dilemma, value, axiology, human resources

Streszczenie: Artykuł podejmuje problematykę dylematów etycznych w zarządzaniu zasobami ludzkimi. To zagadnienie towarzyszy relacjom międzyludzkim od antyku aż do ery cyfrowej. Już starożytni myśliciele analizowali to zagadnienie i rozumieli potrzebę zasad moralnych w życiu człowieka, który egzystuje w rodzinie, *polis* państwie. Arystoteles zaproponował podział cnót na intelektualne i moralne, mając na uwadze eudajmonię (szczęście) wraz z zasadą złotego środka. Filozofowie stoicy opracowali cnoty kardynalne w harmonii z prawem natury. Epikurejczycy preferowali umiarkowany etyczny hedonizm. Współcześni myśliciele także podejmują problematykę teoretycznego i praktycznego zastosowania norm etycznych w egzystencji człowieka. Immanuel Kant proponuje etykę deontologiczną, Jürgen Habermas prezentuje etykę dyskursu, podczas gdy Ralph Waldo Emerson propaguje etykę egoizmu. Menedżer zasobów ludzkich spotyka się z etycznymi dylematami, mając na uwadze wartości moralne, o których wspominają między innymi Max Scheler i Roman Ingarden, w funkcjonowaniu biznesu organizacyjnego. W jaki sposób zaimplementować inteligencję emocjonalną i moralną w spotkaniu ze sztuczną inteligencją?

Słowa kluczowe: etyka, dylemat, wartość, aksjologia, zasoby ludzkie

References

- Abbagnano, N. (1995). *Dizionario di filosofia*. Torino: UTET.
- Arejos Didymos. (2005). *Podręcznik etyki*. M. Wojciechowski (przeł.). Kraków: Wydawnic-two WAM.
- Arius Didymus. (1999). *Epitome of Stoic Ethics*. A. J. Pomeroy (tr.). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Armstrong M., Taylor S. (2014). *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi*. D. Wasik, M. Klimowicz, M. Patkaniowski, I. Podsiadło, L. Wójcik (przeł.). Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Arystoteles. (2012). *Etyka nikomachejska*. D. Gromska (przeł.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN,
- Baggini, J., Fosl. P. S. (2007). *Przybornik etyki*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Beauchamp T. L., Bowie N. E. (1983). *Ethical Theory and Business*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Blanchard K., Peale N. V. (2014). *Etyka biznesu*. A. Trybuch (przeł.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Studio EMKA.
- Clegg S., Kornberger M., Rhodes C., *Business ethics as practice*, "British Journal of Management" 2007, 18(2), 107-122.
- Copleston, F. (1993). *History of philosophy*. New York: Doubleday.
- Diogenes Laertios. (2012). *Żywoty i poglądy słynnych filozofów*. K. Leśniak (przeł.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Ekuma K. J., Akobo L. A. *Human Resource Management Ethics and Professional Dilemmas: A Review and Research Agenda*, Human Resource Management Research 2015, 5(3), 47-59.
- Galarowicz J. (2020). *Roman Ingarden. Etyka wartości*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo PEET-RUS.
- Galewicz, W. (2020). *Studia z klasycznej etyki greckiej*. Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki.
- Goleman D. (2024). *Inteligencja emocjonalna w praktyce*. A. Jankowski (przeł.). Poznań: Nasza Rodzina.
- Griffin R. W. (2022). *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*. A. Jankowiak (przeł.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN S.A.
- Hamlin B., Keep J., Ash K. (2001). *Organizational Change and Development: A reflective guide for managers*. London: FT Pitman.
- Ingarden R. (1972). *Księżeczka o człowieku*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Ingarden R. (1989). *Wykłady z etyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PWN.
- Jones T. M., *Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model*, "Academy of Management Review" 1991, 16(2), 366-395.
- Jurewicz O. (red.). (2018). *Słownik grecko-polski*. Truskaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Sub Lupa.

- Koźmiński A. K., Jemeielniak D., Latusek-Jurczak D., Pikos A. (red.). (2023). *Zarządzanie. Nowe otwarcie*. Warszawa: Poltext.
- Kuderowicz, Z. (red.). (2002). *Filozofia XX wieku*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Lennick D., Kiel F. (2007). *Inteligencja moralna. Jak poprawić wyniki prowadzenia i skutecznie zarządzać*. I. Szuwalska (przeł.). Wrocław: Purana.
- Leśniak, K. (1989). *Arystoteles*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Lewis C. T. (2002). *Elementary Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maryniarczyk, A. (red.). (2012). *Słownik-Przewodnik Filozoficzny*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- McKim D. K. (1996). *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Mello J. A. (2025). *Strategic Human Resource Management*. Mason: Cengage.
- Nowak A. J., Sosnowski L. (red.). (2001). *Słownik pojęć filozoficznych Romana Ingarden*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Petrick, J. A., Quinn, J. F. (1997). *Management Ethics: Integrity at Work*. London: Sage.
- Rawls J. (2013). *Teoria sprawiedliwości*. S. Szymański (przeł.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Reale, G. (2010). *Myśl starożytna*. E. Iwo Zieliński (przeł.). Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Scott E. D., *The Ethics of Human Resource Management*, [w:] J. A. Mello, *Strategic Human Resource Management*, Stamford: Cengage Learning, 86–100.
- Ślipko, T. (2021). *Spacerem po etyce*. Kraków: Petrus.
- Swanson R. A. (2023). *Zarządzanie rozwojem zasobów ludzkich*. A. Paziewska (przeł.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN S.A.
- Świderkówna, A. (red.). (1982). *Słownik pisarzy antycznych*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Taylor, R. (2017). *Ethics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Winstanley D., Woodall J., *Introduction*, [w:] *Ethical Issues in Contemporary Human Resource Management*. D. Winstanley, J. Woodall (red.), Macmillan, Basingstoke 2000a, 3–22.
- Yampolskiy R. V. (red.). (2020). *Sztuczna inteligencja. Bezpieczeństwo i zabezpieczenia*. P. Fabiański (przeł.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN S.A.