

## DETERMINANTS OF SHAPING ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN NON-PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Justyna Zawadzka<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kashubian-Pomeranian University in Wejherowo,  
Faculty of Social and Natural Sciences, Poland

**Abstract:** In the context of dynamic socio-economic transformations within the higher education sector, organizational culture is increasingly recognized as a critical factor in ensuring institutional coherence and adaptability. The primary objective of this study was to diagnose the determinants of organizational culture in non-public academic universities and to assess their impact on the structure and direction of cultural change. The research was conducted in five Polish non-public academic universities using a case study approach, combining structured interviews (n = 39) and questionnaire surveys (n = 577). The findings reveal that internal determinants – particularly the institutional type and employee characteristics – exert the most significant influence on organizational culture. These factors can be actively shaped. In most of the universities analyzed, a balanced organizational culture was identified, characterized by a combination of individualism and moderate openness to change.


**Keywords:** determinants of culture, non-public universities, organizational culture

**JEL Classification:** M1, M14

### Introduction

In conditions of dynamic and unpredictable changes, both in the organization's environment and within it, the importance of intangible factors that ensure organizational coherence, stability, and adaptability is increasing. One of these factors is organizational culture, a complex system of values, norms, symbols, and behaviors that shapes the way an organization functions and determines its identity and competitive advantage (Lawler, 1992; Alvesson, 2002). Transformations in the Polish higher education sector, intensifying competition for students, demographic, legal, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Justyna Zawadzka, PhD, [j.zawadzka@kpsw.pl](mailto:j.zawadzka@kpsw.pl),  <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7481-7914>

\* Corresponding author: Justyna Zawadzka, [j.zawadzka@kpsw.pl](mailto:j.zawadzka@kpsw.pl)

economic changes, as well as processes of internationalization and digitalization – all these factors force universities to redefine existing management models and seek new sources of organizational success (Maliszewski, 2015). While for many years an organization's advantage was determined by so-called "hard factors" – infrastructure, financial resources, or technology – today it is increasingly recognized that "soft factors," including organizational culture, determine the durability and quality of management (Graham et al., 2022).

In the case of private universities, which operate under conditions of limited funding, strong market competition, and face challenges in managing broadly understood resources, culture becomes one of the most critical determinants of organizational success and plays a significant role in knowledge management (Figurska, 2018; Scaliza et al., 2022). It enables not only adaptation to a changing environment but also the creation of a lasting, unique advantage based on values and identity.

The decision to address the determinants of organizational culture in private universities stems from a noticeable gap in the literature. Analysis of national sources indicates a lack of comprehensive studies on organizational culture in this segment of higher education, even though these universities constitute an important part of the educational system and the knowledge-based economy. Their specificity – resulting from self-financing, complex organizational structures, diverse educational profiles, and a dynamically changing environment – makes them a particularly interesting field for research.

The aim of this study is to diagnose the determinants of organizational culture in private universities and to indicate their influence on the shape and direction of cultural change in the context of the challenges mentioned above. Particular emphasis is placed on internal determinants, which the university can actively shape. The study of these determinants aims at understanding the mechanisms that influence culture and to indicate the direction of its improvement.

The decision to focus the research on academic private universities was driven by both theoretical and practical considerations. On the one hand, these universities represent an important but still insufficiently explored empirical field; on the other hand, they require effective tools for managing culture, which can become a source of their long-term development and lasting market position. In this sense, the article has both a cognitive and applied character, providing university management with guidance on how to consciously develop an organizational culture that supports the university's mission under conditions of increasing uncertainty and environmental variability. Ultimately, reflection on the determinants of organizational culture fits into the broader research trend on the strategic importance of organizational culture in building the competitive advantage of knowledge organizations.

## **Organizational culture – essence and significance in higher education institutions**

Organizational culture is a holistic phenomenon that encompasses both material and immaterial elements of the functioning of an organization. It is defined from various perspectives: normative-axiological, behavioral, interpretative, and philosophical (Sułkowski, 2001; Sikorski, 2006).

Some authors (Kostera, 2003; Morgan, 2022) adopt a postmodernist perspective, according to which an organization does not simply have a culture, but *is* a culture, understood metaphorically as an organism, a machine, or a brain. Organizational culture is also perceived as the social glue that binds members of an organization together (Handy, 1996) or as an unwritten code of values and traditions passed down from generation to generation (Bolesta-Kukułka, 2003).

The diversity of definitions arises, among other things, from researchers applying different paradigms in the study of culture (Sułkowski, 2012). To this day, the most frequently cited definition, which is also adopted in this work, is the one proposed by Schein (1992), according to which: “culture is the set of learned assumptions that a group has acquired in its history, which allowed it to survive and develop. The values and norms that enabled this group to survive and manage its internal affairs constitute its culture”.

Attention should also be given to the concept of the so-called “programming of the mind” proposed by Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2011), who conceptualize culture on three levels:

- a) universal – common to all humans,
- b) collective – typical of a specific social group,
- c) individual – specific to an individual.

Particular importance for organizations lies at the collective level, which encompasses shared patterns of behavior, values, and meanings.

In a synthetic view, organizational culture is a set of material and immaterial symbols, values, and norms of behavior of people in the organization, as well as fundamental cultural assumptions. The concept adopted in this context combines two dimensions: the instrumental dimension (related to organizational effectiveness) and the socio-psychological dimension (related to employee integration, motivation, and identification). Understood in this way, culture is a dynamic and complex social system, shaped in relation to the environment and influencing both internal and external relationships (Białas, 2025).

Analysis of the literature indicates that research on the organizational culture of private universities focuses mainly on internal factors, such as: quality of education (Ziemkiewicz-Gawlik et al., 2023), internationalization (Mazur, 2020), information environment (Deja, 2021), and student engagement (Łuźniak-Piecha et al., 2023). Studies confirm that organizations that consciously shape their culture achieve better outcomes in terms of educational quality (Sułkowski et al., 2016). A strong organizational culture also promotes organizational effectiveness (Smart & John, 1996).

## **Typologies of organizational cultures**

An important tool in studies of organizational culture is the typology of organizational cultures. It should be emphasized that typologies are simplified and organizing frameworks; their purpose is not to fully represent organizational reality but to provide a reference point that facilitates analysis.

Two-dimensional typologies use two independent cultural dimensions that define four types of organizational culture. They help to describe the dominant type of culture and identify the elements that should be reinforced. In research, the concept proposed by Cameron and Quinn (2015) is most commonly used.

The operational context of universities and the literature analysis allowed the author to distinguish two primary dimensions, to which one-dimensional typologies of organizational cultures diagnosed in the studied universities can be assigned. These are:

- a) conservatism vs. flexibility – the approach to change and risk: uncertainty, operational stability, and low tolerance for change vs. openness, innovation, and high tolerance for change;
- b) participativeness vs. authoritarianism – the orientation toward the team or the individual: collaboration vs. individualism.

### Determinants of organizational culture in non-public universities

The organizational culture of a non-public university is shaped by a range of both internal (endogenous) and external (exogenous) factors. The analysis and synthesis of various perspectives allowed the author to adopt her own concept of external determinants (economic, legal-regulatory, social, and market-related) and internal determinants (type of organization, organizational characteristics, and staff characteristics).

**Table 1. External determinants of the organizational culture of a non-public university**

Determinants	Criteria characterizing determinants
Economic	the state of economic indicators (GDP growth rate, inflation rate, interest rate), economic stability, sector financing, labor market (unemployment rate)
Legal-regulatory	political system, degree of government intervention, number of regulations and legal provisions, level of legal regulation variability, level of detail in legal regulations
Social	the state of demographic indicators, the status of education in the hierarchy of societal values, the standard of living of society, the culture of society/region, the pace of technological changes, the availability of new technologies
Market-related	possibility of obtaining funds, cooperation with foreign organizations, mobility and exchange of staff, international recognition – position in European/world rankings, individualization of prospective students' expectations, changing needs of current students, number of prospective students, number of students, number of international students, contact with alumni, number of competitors, attractiveness of competitors' offerings, intensity of competition, territorial proximity of competitors' operations, cooperation with employers/employment office, cooperation with entrepreneur-practitioners, cooperation with institutions and the local community

Source: Own study based on research

The literature emphasizes that no organization operates in a vacuum (Hofstede, 2000; Siemiński, 2008). The external environment provides a significant context for shaping norms, values, and behavioral patterns.

The dynamics of economic changes affect the functioning of universities, their financing, and their innovativeness. Factors such as consumer income levels, economic conditions, and the labor market shape both the educational offer and the human resources of the university. In conditions of economic uncertainty, organizational cultures with a high tolerance to change adapt more effectively to a changing environment.

State regulations, accreditation systems, quality standards in education, and national educational policy determine the organizational culture of universities. The state creates the framework for operation and fair practice (Mączyńska, 2017). When state policy provides opportunities for development, system-legal determinants should foster participatory cultures with a high degree of tolerance for change.

The social sphere (country, region, place of origin of the employees, and location of the organization) influences culture by transferring specific values, norms, and behaviors from the local community to the organization. The structure of social and professional groups determines the status and composition of human resources, which play a fundamental role in organizational culture. Dynamics in this sphere also require the development of flexible, change-oriented, innovative, and participatory cultures.

Non-public universities operate in a context of strong competition for students and staff. The market situation demands a culture focused on educational quality, as well as flexibility and innovation in teaching. Equally important are the expectations of external stakeholders: employers, alumni, local institutions, and business partners. Market volatility, including technological changes and shifting student expectations, forces universities to quickly adapt their culture, which should exhibit a high tolerance for change.

Digital transformation, remote work, hybrid learning models, and the increasing role of artificial intelligence significantly shape work organization, communication, and consequently drive the organizational culture toward greater flexibility and participation.

The internal environment is closely related to the specific characteristics of a given university (Table 2).

The non-public nature of a university fosters a more market-oriented and flexible culture, emphasizing efficiency, quality of educational services, and stakeholder satisfaction. Building a quality culture requires changing employees' awareness about their work outcomes and their impact on creating added value for students. When services are tailored to students' needs at an optimal price, when new markets are sought, new products and services are designed, the offer is shaped by students, and innovations are pursued, flexible, innovative, and participatory cultures are developed (Fischer & Theis, 2014).

In non-public universities, the direction of development is guided by the mission, vision, and values upheld by the academic community. An ingrained tradition, established and familiar ways of organizing meetings, and organizational symbolism

encourage people to identify more readily with their workplace and to achieve set goals. Attachment to tradition and a long-standing presence in the market can, on the one hand, create difficulties in implementing organizational changes, while, on the other hand, they can foster trust in the organization from its environment.

**Table 2. Internal determinants of organizational culture in non-public universities**

Determinants	Criteria characterizing determinants
Type of organisation	attractiveness of the industry, attractiveness of the offer, offer in foreign languages, range of services provided, quality of services provided, position in rankings, brand, quality of technical equipment, method of service delivery, accessibility and location, possession of own premises and facilities, attractiveness of the facilities
Organizational characteristics	size of the organization, financial situation, effectiveness of obtaining external funds, mission, vision and values, history and tradition, management style, organizational structure, internal systems, procedures, regulations, and operational rules
Staff characteristics	employee demographic structure, values and attitudes of employees, employee personality, employee motivation level, employee knowledge and experience, stability of internal staff, staff loyalty, level of organizational integration, willingness of staff to develop, staff achievements, number of international employees

Source: Own study based on research

The organizational culture is also influenced by the leadership style, organizational structure, and the administrative system. Flexible structures promote teamwork, reduce hierarchical levels and managerial positions, and provide employees with greater freedom of action. Such structures shape participatory and innovative cultures with a high tolerance for change. Leadership style is crucial in shaping attitudes. An autocratic style reinforces values related to hierarchy, control, and discipline, while a democratic style supports a participatory culture, trust, and collective responsibility.

The characteristics of employees, both academic and administrative staff, also affect the functioning of the university. In her research, the author deliberately excluded students, as they constitute a variable and dynamic parameter compared to the relatively stable and long-term organizational culture. Individual employee attributes (age, gender, professional experience, education, value system) influence the climate and functioning of the university.

The organizational culture of a non-public university is the result of the dynamic interaction between environmental influences and the organization itself. Modern universities operating in conditions of strong competition, digitalization, and changing societal expectations should, in the author’s view, build flexible and participatory cultures, that is, cultures that support collaboration, as well as the well-being of employees and students. Together, these determinants create a unique “cultural

genotype” of the university, distinguishing it from other institutions. The diagnosis of determinants should indicate their impact on the shape and direction of cultural changes.

In summary, the basis for drawing conclusions about the organizational cultures of the universities under study lies in the frequency, nature, and dynamics of change, which require cultures that are flexible, tolerant of change, innovative, risk-oriented, and grounded in collaboration and the participation of the entire team. These are “fast-action” cultures, oriented toward immediate outcomes. In contrast, conservative and authoritarian cultures require a stable and predictable environment.

## Methodology

The aim of this study is to diagnose the determinants of organizational culture in private universities and to indicate their influence on the shape and direction of cultural change. This study focused on exceptional cases to identify recurring patterns in organizational culture. Non-public academic universities were selected due to their dual role in providing both academic and practical education, conducting research, and collaborating with industry. This positioning allows them to compete with public universities through prestige, brand reputation, and educational quality, while also facing financial, infrastructural, and demographic challenges. The cases were purposively selected from the POL-on system maintained by the Ministry of Education and Science. The selection criteria included the observability of relevant phenomena and the accessibility of the research. Invitations were sent to all identified universities and five institutions consented to participate. Each university was treated as an individual case for independent analysis, followed by comparative examination. Findings cannot be generalized to all non-public academic universities in Poland; however, they provide insights into potential patterns and inform recommendations, with caution regarding contextual limitations. The study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining literature review and empirical research. The literature review included national and international sources and various secondary materials, establishing a theoretical framework, methodological assumptions, and research instruments. Empirical research involved structured interviews and surveys. Interviews were conducted with 39 university management representatives (rectors, vice-rectors, deans, vice-deans, and heads of academic units) who assessed the strength, direction, and status of cultural determinants. Surveys were administered to 577 academic and non-academic staff. The sample was complete as all listed employees were included in the study. Academic staff completed surveys during faculty meetings, while non-academic staff participated individually. Respondents evaluated the influence of organizational culture determinants. Quantitative data were aggregated and analyzed using a custom MS Excel matrix, with results presented descriptively and in tables. Qualitative data were analyzed based on field notes and interview transcriptions. This approach allowed for the identification of patterns, the evaluation of organizational culture determinants, and the formulation of contextually informed conclusions. The statistical analyses were limited to calculating the arithmetic mean of the respondents’ ratings.

## Research results concerning determinants and their impact on the organizational culture of non-public universities

The results of the study on the strength of the determinants' impact on the culture of the examined universities are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Strength of determinants' influence on the organizational cultures of the studied universities**

University	A	B	C	D	E
<b>External determinants</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>
economic	4.1	3.2	3.9	3.2	3.7
legal and regulatory	4.3	3.2	4.3	4.0	3.8
social	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7
market-related	4.1	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.6
<b>Internal determinants</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>
type of university	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1
university characteristics	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.8
staff characteristics	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0

Source: Author's own elaboration based on interviews and surveys. In the area of determinant influence intensity, the interpretation of the scores is as follows: 1.0-2.5 – weak influence, 2.6-3.5 – moderate influence, 3.6-5.0 – significant influence

The research shows that internal determinants have a stronger influence on the culture of the studied universities (with balanced average scores across all universities), which indicates that universities can actively shape them to drive cultural change. Furthermore, internal factors (type and characteristics of staff) remain a key and significant source of influence on culture. This confirms that industry and program attractiveness, quality of services provided, brand, and infrastructure are crucial culture-shaping factors.

The second most influential factor is the characteristics of the staff, which received balanced ratings across the studied universities (4.0-4.1). This indicates that staff competencies, values, motivation, development, and demographics are significant influencing factors. The characteristics of the universities themselves (financial situation, efficiency in obtaining external funds, mission, vision and values, history, leadership style, structure, and internal systems) were rated slightly lower, with the lowest score in University E (3.8).

Greater differences are observed in external determinants. They have the strongest combined influence in Universities A (4.2) and C (4.1) and the weakest in University B (3.6). The largest range of scores between universities occurs in the system-legal environment (3.2-4.3), indicating that the impact of laws and regulations is highly variable in the studied cases. For some universities, regulations are the main "catalyst" for organizational change (especially Universities A and C), while for others, their influence is relatively smaller (Universities B and E).

The weakest influence was attributed to economic factors: the highest in University A (4.1), the lowest in Universities B and D (3.2). Universities A and C feel economic pressure more strongly, which affects their fundraising strategies and risk aversion. Universities B and D (lower scores) may be less sensitive to direct economic shocks or have alternative funding channels/response strategies.

Social factors (student demographics and expectations, new technologies) are considered significant in all cases. Market factors most strongly influence the cultures of Universities A (4.1) and C (4.2), as these universities compete intensively for students and projects.

Table 4 discusses the determinants indicating the dominant type of culture.

**Table 4. Analysis of the current state and direction of influence of determinants in the studied universities**

University	External determinants – strongest areas of influence on culture	Internal determinants – strongest areas of influence on culture	Type of culture dominant (characteristics)
<b>A</b>	lack of supportive development policies, absence of stable funding sources, limited implementation of new technologies, decline in the number of domestic students	lack of a motivational and staff development evaluation system, insufficient IT and communication infrastructure, absence of effective systems to improve the quality of education, frequent organizational restructurings	conservative (low tolerance for change, individualism, sense of responsibility for students)
<b>B</b>	variability and ambiguity of national and EU regulations, strong competition in the educational market	lack of stable financial foundations and shared financial responsibility among employees, absence of formal tools for employee development and reward, lack of coherent values and behavioral standards, and absence of integrated work tools	conservative (high individualism, student-oriented, technologically capable, but resistant to organizational changes)
<b>C</b>	strong influence of national regulations, need to independently secure funding, dependence on external grants	underdeveloped incentive systems and insufficient technological infrastructure, unstable funding sources, and inadequate technological support	balanced (moderate openness to technological changes, individualism, student-oriented, partial tolerance for change)

University	External determinants – strongest areas of influence on culture	Internal determinants – strongest areas of influence on culture	Type of culture dominant (characteristics)
D	political conditions, excessive regulations, bureaucracy, frequent changes in legislation and unfavorable state education policy, conservative regional environment, competitive pressure	insufficient diversification of offerings, lack of systemic motivational solutions and strategic approach to staff development, inefficient use of resources	balanced (moderate individualism with elements of collectivism, cautiousness, stability prioritized over innovation)
E	variable economic situation and legal pressure, as well as the necessity to report activities to multiple external institutions	infrastructure limitations and lack of innovative administrative solutions, absence of motivation systems, insufficient administrative infrastructure and processes, strong attachment to hierarchy and employment stability, ineffective internal communication	balanced (conservative attitude toward innovation, individualistic approach with openness to change, collectivism in international relations and in relations with students, low tolerance for administrative changes)

Source: Own research based on interviews and surveys

Systemic and legal determinants remain the key external factor for the analyzed universities. The organizational culture of most institutions is individualistic and hierarchical in nature, whereas in Universities D and E elements of collaboration are more noticeable. Tolerance for change varies – it is the highest in University E (innovation, internationalization) and the lowest in Universities B and D (conservatism, caution). A balanced culture appears in Universities C, D, and E, combining elements of stability with moderate openness to change.

Below, the determinants shaping the cultures of the examined universities toward greater flexibility and participation are discussed.

At University A, a slightly stronger influence of external determinants (4.2) compared to internal ones (4.1) was recorded, particularly in relation to the high sensitivity to laws and regulations. Interview results confirm that a flexible culture is driven by the attractiveness of the offer and institutional reputation. Modern teaching methods, management by objectives, financial stability, internationalization, international cooperation, technological development, and demographic changes in other countries all contribute to fostering a culture of flexibility and participation. The university is student-oriented but struggles with a lack of coherent systems of quality assurance, communication, and infrastructure.

University B shapes its culture primarily through internal resources (type of university, staff), which exert a stronger influence than legal or economic regulations. Among external determinants, the social environment (4.1) has the greatest impact, including cooperation with business and stakeholders, technological development, and internationalization. Within the internal determinants, the strongest influences on culture were assessed as university brand, attractiveness of study programs, quality of technical facilities, position in the rankings, efficiency in acquiring external funds, staff stability, and employee loyalty. The interviews confirmed the importance of reputation and a recognizable brand, modern teaching methods, employee engagement and values, as well as commitment to quality.

At University C, both legislation and the market exert a strong influence – the institution operates under significant external pressure but also possesses strong internal capabilities and management methods (type and characteristics of the university – 4.2). The research findings indicate that the culture is shaped by the individualization of student expectations, stakeholder cooperation, legislative changes, and demographic processes. Among internal determinants, the most influential were the quality of the services provided, the position of the university's ranking, the brand, the attractiveness of the facilities and the leadership style. This highlights the importance of institutional prestige and a participatory management approach.

At University D, the strongest influence is exerted by the type and characteristics of the university (4.2), while the economic sphere shows weaker sensitivity (3.9). Among external determinants, the most significant impact on culture comes from demographic and legislative changes, the number of applicants, and collaboration with the local environment. These factors have improved some cultural parameters to the level of high tolerance for change and collectivism. Internal determinants dominate (4.1), especially the university type (4.2), as well as tradition and staff experience. Culture benefits from a strong brand, history, effective communication, community rituals, material resources, and employee knowledge and experience. The culture of participation is further reinforced by efficient communication, a positive atmosphere, staff integration, high loyalty, and student orientation.

At University E, the influence of the determinants was assessed as moderate to significant. The internal determinants (4.0) are stronger, particularly the type of university (4.1). The brand, leadership style, and employee competencies are the areas most strongly determining organizational culture. University E effectively utilizes its technological potential and international recognition. An attractive offer, dynamic relations with stakeholders, internationalization, and a participatory management style contribute to shaping collectivist attitudes and openness to change.

## Conclusions

Ultimately, the state of the examined internal and external determinants shapes a balanced culture characterized by a predominance of individualism, yet including elements of collectivism and openness to international cooperation. Internal determinants, over which universities have direct influence, should be actively shaped toward developmental, pro-innovative, and collaborative orientations.

Despite increasing awareness of the need for change, a conservative attitude toward innovation persists, accompanied by deficiencies in communication among employees and in knowledge sharing. Overcoming this behavioral conservatism could significantly increase tolerance for change and shift the organizational culture toward greater flexibility and participation. For universities strongly affected by external determinants, it is recommended to build internal adaptive capacities, implement quality management systems, and establish regulatory monitoring procedures. For universities with a dominant influence of internal factors, the creation of a coherent and comprehensive motivation system, modernization of procedures and infrastructure, as well as the implementation of mechanisms linking internal strength with responsiveness to the environment (strategic analyses, competence development programs) are advised.

For University A, the recommendations include strengthening internal adaptation mechanisms. It is proposed to enhance internal communication that fosters collaboration and knowledge sharing, increase flexibility in change management, and further develop the quality management system. The direction of change should lead toward shaping a pro-innovative and collective culture based on dialogue, teamwork, and a high tolerance for change.

For University B, it is recommended to enhance employee engagement in fundraising, expand internationalization efforts, align staff evaluation and development systems, implement quality management procedures, and introduce strategic planning. These changes should support the development of an organizational culture founded on trust and shared responsibility.

For University C, the proposed actions include implementing transparent reward and development mechanisms for academic staff, advancing the digital transformation of the institution, and strengthening change management systems. Building a collective culture should be supported by integration initiatives and training in innovation and communication.

For University D, it is recommended to actively acquire external funding, broaden the educational offer, develop international cooperation in teaching and research, implement staff development and training policies, and optimize infrastructure use. Progress toward an innovation-oriented culture will be possible through the promotion of bottom-up initiatives and the use of local partnerships and funds as levers of change.

For University E, it is advised to develop internal collaboration networks to reduce individualism and strengthen a culture of shared responsibility, design and implement an internal communication strategy, standardize staff evaluation principles, define and promote academic career paths, and introduce project management systems along with modern administrative tools. The recommended direction of development is the creation of a culture of trust, cooperation, and innovation based on shared values and knowledge transfer.

## References

- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding organizational culture*. Sage Publications.  
DOI: 10.4135/9781446280072
- Białas, S. (2025). Istota kultury organizacji i jej uwarunkowania. In H. Czubasiewicz, P. Wróbel (Red.), *Kultura organizacji. Uwarunkowania zewnętrzne i wewnętrzne oraz zmiana kulturowa* (pp. 20-39). Centrum Myśli Strategicznych.
- Bolesta-Kukułka, K. (2003). *Decyzje menedżerskie*. Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn R. E. (2015). *Kultura organizacyjna – diagnoza i zmiana. Model wartości konkurujących*. Oficyna Ekonomiczna.
- Deja, M. (2021). *Model diagnostyczny kultury informacyjnej instytucji szkolnictwa wyższego*. Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie. DOI: 10.26106/qsckf-9137
- Figurska, I. (2018). Kultura organizacyjna a zarządzanie wiedzą w praktyce funkcjonowania organizacji. *Studies & Proceedings of Polish Association for Knowledge Management*, 88, 18-29.  
<https://bazekon.uek.krakow.pl/gospodarka/171535451>
- Graham, J. R., Grennan, J., Harvey, C. R., & Rajgopal, S. (2022). Corporate culture: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 146(2), 552-593. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfineco.2022.07.008
- Handy, Ch. (1996). *Wiek paradoksu. W poszukiwaniu sensu przyszłości*. Dom Wydawniczy ABC.
- Hofstede, G. (2000). *Kultury i organizacje. Zaprogramowanie umysłu*. Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2011). *Kultury i organizacje. Zaprogramowanie umysłu*. Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Kostera, M. (2003). *Antropologia organizacji. Metodologia badań terenowych*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Lawler, E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating the high-involvement organization*. Jossey-Bass.  
DOI: 10.5465/ame.1993.9409142063
- Łuźniak-Piecha, M., Golińska, A., Żukowska, K., Brdulak, J., Rogiński, M., & Nieznańska-Cwynar, A. (2023). Studenci jako współtwórcy procesu edukacji – ocena wpływu wybranych czynników na kształtowanie kultury dzielenia się wiedzą na uczelniach wyższych. *E-mentor*, 1(98), 64-74.  
DOI: 10.15219/em97.1596
- Maliszewski, T. (2015). *Jak wykreować sukces uczelni. Budowanie przewagi konkurencyjnej na rynku edukacyjnym*. Oficyna Wolters Kluwer Business.
- Mazur, M. T. (2020). Wpływ umiędzynarodowienia na kulturę organizacyjną uczelni niepublicznych w Polsce (na przykładzie Wyższej Szkoły Przedsiębiorczości i Administracji w Lublinie). In M. Smolira (Red.), *Współczesne trendy w zarządzaniu* (pp. 341-357). Wydawnictwo AEH.
- Morgan, G. (2022). *Obrazy organizacji*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Scaliza, J. A., Jugend, D., Jabbour, C. J., Latan, H., Armellini, F., Twigg, D., & Andrade, D. A. (2022). Relationships among organizational culture, open innovation, innovative ecosystems, and performance of firms: Evidence from an emerging economy context. *Journal of Business Research*, 140, 264-279. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.10.065
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Siemiński, M. (2008). *Kształtowanie kultury organizacyjnej przedsiębiorstw przemysłowych*. TNOiK.
- Sikorski, Cz. (2006). *Kultura organizacyjna*. C.H. Beck.
- Smart, J. C., & St. John, E. P. (1996). Organizational culture and effectiveness in higher education: A Test of the “Culture Type” and “Strong Culture” Hypotheses. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(3), 219-241. DOI: 10.2307/1164261
- Sułkowski, Ł. (2001). Czy jest możliwe kształtowanie kultury organizacyjnej?. *Organizacja i Kierowanie*, 4, 99-110.
- Sułkowski, Ł. (2012). *Epistemologia i metodologia zarządzania*. Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Sułkowski, Ł., Seliga, R., & Woźniak, A. (2016). Rezultaty badań kultur jakości uczelni wyższych w Polsce. *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie*, 17(7), 75-90.
- Ziemkiewicz-Gawlik, I., Miętkiewicz, M., Brzychcy, K., & Jaroszewski, K. (2023). Elements of organisational culture as determining factors in the shaping of modern higher education institutions. *Management and Administration Journal*, 61(134), 205-215.  
DOI: 10.34739/zn.2023.61.23

**Authors' Contribution:** Justyna Zawadzka – 100%.

**Acknowledgements and Financial Disclosure:** Lack of funding.

**Conflict of Interest:** No conflict of interest.

**Ethics Declaration:** Ethical clearance was not required for this research.

**AI Declaration:** AI tools were not used in this article.

## **DETERMINANTY KSZTAŁTOWANIA KULTURY ORGANIZACYJNEJ W UCZELNIACH NIEPUBLICZNYCH**

**Streszczenie:** W warunkach dynamicznych zmian społeczno-gospodarczych w sektorze szkolnictwa wyższego rośnie znaczenie kultury organizacyjnej jako kluczowego czynnika zapewniającego spójność i adaptacyjność. Celem badań jest diagnoza determinant kultury organizacyjnej akademickich uczelni niepublicznych oraz określenie ich wpływu na kształt i kierunek zmian kultury. Badania przeprowadzono w pięciu polskich akademickich uczelniach niepublicznych metodą studium przypadku, za pomocą wywiadów kwestionariuszowych (n = 39) oraz badań ankietowych (n = 577). Wyniki wskazują, że najsilniejszy wpływ na kulturę organizacyjną mają determinanty wewnętrzne – typ uczelni i cechy pracowników – które można aktywnie kształtować. W większości analizowanych uczelni dominuje kultura zrównoważona, łącząca indywidualizm z umiarkowaną otwartością na zmiany.

**Słowa kluczowe:** determinanty kultury, kultura organizacyjna, uczelnie niepubliczne

Articles published in the journal are made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International Public License. Certain rights reserved for the Czestochowa University of Technology.

