DIFFERENCES IN THE PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN NON-PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN POLAND BY ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF – A STUDY BASED ON CAMERON AND QUINN’S MODEL

Małgorzata CIECIORA*, Piotr PIETRZAK**, Maciej DĘBSKI***, Krzysztof KANDEFER****,
Wiktor BOŁKUNOW*****

*Polish-Japanese Academy of Information Technology, Faculty of Information Management, Warsaw, POLAND
e-mail: Malgorzata.Cieciora@pja.edu.pl

** Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Management Institute, Warsaw, POLAND
e-mail: piotr_pietrzak1@sggw.edu.pl

***University of Social Sciences, Faculty of Management and Security, Warsaw, POLAND
e-mail: mdebski@spoleczna.pl

****WSB University in Warsaw, POLAND
e-mail: rektorat@wsb.warszawa.pl

***** Warsaw School of Economics, Collegium of Management and Finance, Warsaw, POLAND
e-mail: wbolk@sgh.waw.pl

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to present differences in the perception of current and desired organizational culture between two different types of workers – academic and administrative staff – in non-public universities in Poland. A synthetic review of the literature on organizational culture at universities and the workplace attitudes of the two groups of university employees was conducted and presented. Research in the form of a survey based on Cameron and Quinn’s model was conducted in three non-public universities in Poland. A sample of opinions of 115 workers was gathered and analyzed. It was found in the study that according to academic workers, the present culture was market culture, whereas for administrative workers, it was hierarchy culture. Both groups chose clan culture as the preferred culture. The findings may be useful for higher education decision makers in their attempts to transform universities into market-oriented, yet friendly workplaces. The study’s limitations include a relatively small sample of respondents. A further, more comprehensive research into the subject will be worth conducting.

Keywords: organizational culture, Cameron and Quinn’s model, Competing Values Framework model, higher education, non-public higher schools.

JEL Classification: I21, I23, M14, M54.

1 Introduction

Universities or higher education institutions (HEIs) are organizations whose main aim is to create new knowledge and well-qualified human capital (Pietrzak, 2016). In the conditions of market-driven economy, though, apart from being noble “temples of knowledge and learning,” they, especially non-public ones, are also professional workplaces that employ significant numbers of people and have to solve various kinds of organizational problems (Cieciora, 2015). Some of these problems may result from different goals, responsibilities, and working styles of two groups of workers employed in HEIs.

The first group consists of academic workers – scientists and teachers, who, if one uses business nomenclature, are involved in the operational processes of the university, that is, conducting research activities and educating students. The second one is formed by non-academic, or administrative, workers responsible for the smooth functioning of the university supporting processes such as budgeting, planning, and organization of the didactic activity or management of documentation.

The differences in the perception of how work should be organized, what sort of motivation systems would be most effective, what the overall goals of the organization should be, and how they should be achieved,

as well as the degree of formalization of relations at work may have a significant impact on the quality and efficiency of work in any organization. The aim of this study is, therefore, to examine the attitudes of the two abovementioned groups of non-public university workers in Poland toward what their workplace really looks like and what it should look like. The reason to undertake the research was that, on the one hand, scientists have always seen considerable differences between the functioning of the two types of university staff, with the focus on organizational and communication problems reported by administrative workers.

On the other hand, one might assume that the type of university ownership – public, which means that the institution receives significant public funds through a national or subnational government, or non-public, which means that the institution has to make constant efforts to compete for students' fees and other sources of funding – has a considerable impact on the organizational culture of the institution and in the case of non-public schools, it should result in creating a market-oriented culture, the same for all its stakeholders. One may back this assumption on the results of previously conducted studies on the university organizational culture in Poland which showed that non-public universities in Poland function along the lines of market culture, unlike public universities, which have a predominantly hierarchy culture (Dębski, et al., 2020).

Last but not least, an important reason to analyze issues of organizational culture, a key element of any organization's well-being and development in non-public universities in Poland, is that these institutions have been developing quite dynamically in the past 30 years and are now playing an increasing role in Polish education and science. According to Statistics Poland, in 2019, they had over 340,000 students (28% of the overall number of students in Poland) and employed 9463 full-time academic workers and 6761 full-time administrative workers (Statistics Poland, 2020).

2 Materials and methods

The aim of this study was to investigate the current and desired state of the non-public university company culture in Poland from the point of view of two groups of workers: academic workers (teachers and researchers) and administrative staff. Two hypotheses were formulated based on the literature review and objectives of the study. As a number of studies have found that there are considerable differences in the perception of existing organizational culture at their workplace by the academic staff and administrative staff in Poland (Cywińska, 2019; Kwiek, 2015; Sułkowski, 2017; Mielczarek-Taica, 2020), hypothesis 1 was stated as follows:

H1: There is a significant difference between academic and non-academic staff concerning the current state of the organizational culture of non-public HEIs in Poland.

However, it should be also noted that previous research has shown that market culture is the dominant type of organizational culture in non-public HEIs in Poland (Dębski, et al., 2020). Also, as it was previously mentioned, the sector of non-public HEIs in Poland has been constantly developing in the last few decades. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was stated as follows:

H2: The desired type of organizational culture in non-public HEIs in Poland for both academic and non-academic staff is market culture¹.

First, a synthetic review of the literature on various factors shaping the organizational culture of the two groups of university employees and the concepts and models of organizational culture in higher education is presented. After that, results of a survey conducted on a sample of 115 university workers from three non-public HEIs in Warsaw in Poland are presented and discussed. Finally, conclusions and a summary of the analysis are presented. The present study is a continuation of studies on organizational culture in Polish universities conducted by the authors

¹ The market culture is centered on results, profit, and task implementation. Leaders are hard drivers, ruthless and demanding. They encourage the staff to aggressive competition. It should be

noted that in this context, the term “market” does not refer to the marketing function or a customer in a particular market.

in 2020 with the use of “Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument” (OCAI) developed by Cameron and Quinn (Dębski, et al., 2020).

3 Literature review

3.1 Academic and administrative university workers’ attitudes toward their workplace

There is a considerable amount of literature on various factors that have impact on the motivation to work, well-being, and professional development of workers employed in HEIs. It should be stressed, first of all, that in market-driven economies, HEIs are nowadays under a growing pressure to become more productive and accountable (Blackmore and Kandiko, 2011). As far as the situation of academic workers is concerned, it results in their conviction that they have to spend “disproportionate amounts of time on developing research proposals and securing grant funds at the expense of other activities” (Wade and Demb, 2009, p.6).

The growing pressure on competition and increasing demand on accountability of the university and its employees also bring about attempts to introduce business work practices such as performance staff appraisal based mainly on measurable research performance indicators. As Sułkowski, et al. (2020) noticed, in the case of academic workers, such changes may lead to unintended consequences such as replacement of fruitful collaboration with other researchers on grand scientific projects with a rat race concentration on merely publishing more papers than colleagues.

Using the instruments of performance-related pay in the university environment was also criticized by Blackmore and Kandiko (2011), who pointed at the fact that they might not be fully effective as academic workers are motivated by factors other than money, for example, the desire to become “intellectual leaders.” Also, Sułkowski, et al. (2020) noticed that “the traditional culture of the university is based to a large extent on Merton’s CUDOS (communism, universalism, disinterestedness, organized skepticism) ethos reflected in individual commitment, scientific teamwork, dedication and intrinsic motivation over extrinsic rewards of the academic staff” (p.1). Therefore, though regular performance appraisal practices are

being adopted in HEIs in the Western world, they are still met with mixed feelings and are regarded as a controversial topic (Sułkowski, et al., 2020).

Also, studies conducted in a number of Australian universities showed that marketization, or managerialism (i.e. corporatized managerial practices) of higher education, was met with reluctance, and “academics felt market behaviour mechanisms and business-related principles were compromising the primary goals of teaching, learning and scholarship and exerting a strong negative effect on academic morale and productivity” (Winter and Sarros, 2002, p.3). Lecturers also feel that they are overburdened with work and stress, as they are expected to be highly productive teachers and researchers at the same time (Maslen, 2000).

Also, the results of other studies conducted in Australian universities backed these findings. As Fredman and Doughney concluded, “there is a broad feeling that marketisation has not delivered the promised freedom and flexibility, but further bureaucratism and control, as well as increasing pressures to work harder” (2012, pp.56-57). Similar observations concerning managerialism of higher education emerged from studies conducted in Sweden (Ekman, et al., 2018), the Netherlands (Enders and Westerheijden, 2014), and the UK (Deem, 1998).

Respondents from all the three countries showed “a clear dislike of the growing administration, the increasing competition for research funding, the obligation to fill in time consuming grant applications and the heavier workload. Examples of frustration and stress are omnipresent. (...) While a few respondents acknowledged that some amount of managerialism in the right context could be helpful, the actual effect is that it works against its own intentions” (Teelken, 2011, pp.287-288).

An example of a misguided introduction of performance-based pay system comes from Sweden, where money is paid for every student who passes a course year. This has a negative impact on the quality of education, as in order to generate more funding, the examinations have become easier to pass (Teelken, 2011). It should be stressed once again here that the problem of combining the two roles – teacher and researcher – and ensuring fair judgment of both the

components of work of an academic worker is yet another one to solve. Also, it seems that, in general, the (time-consuming) teaching part is considered as less valuable and important (Quinn, 2012).

A number of interesting observations concerning the workplace environment in Polish universities were made by Kwiek (2015) and concerned differences in age and seniority among Polish academic workers. He drew attention to the fact that the Polish academy is a “heavily generationally divided institution,” “a battlefield between the ‘independent’ and the ‘subordinate’ academic ranks (the turning point being Habilitation),” and that “the current collegiality can be viewed as the collegiality of the seniors, to which juniors have only limited access.”

Kwiek also observed the advent of changes in the academic reality in Poland, such as “an increasing interest in the internationalization of research, the mounting competition for research funds, global (rather than national) science as a reference point in research, and the widely shared belief in objective criteria; the dream of meritocracy ousting the reality of subjective judgments, and partner-like relationships based on scientific authority ousting feudal-like relationships between the two academic castes, as in decades past” (Kwiek, 2015, p.1371).

Also, in the new, market-oriented reality based on competition for research funding, it is the younger generation of academic workers who will have to adapt faster to the changing demands and spend much more time and effort on high-quality research to be able to compete with their Western European counterparts, which does not seem an easy task, as, in general, in Poland, academics spend much more time on teaching and much less time on research than the academic workers in Western Europe.

As far as the situation of administrative workers is concerned, three key observations seem to emerge from the analyses conducted. The first observation is that, in general, administrative workers in all types of HEIs would welcome a work environment that is team oriented and free from interpersonal conflict. Also, the role of one’s supervisor is very important. The likely sources of administrative stress and conflict comprise issues such as turnover, job security, interpersonal relations with supervisors and colleagues,

and lack of personal respect (Volkwein and Parmley, 2000).

The second observation is that the administrative employees play an important role in the functioning and development of HEIs (Baltaru and Soysal, 2018; Karlsson and Rytberg, 2016; Brandenburg, 2016; Gray, 2015; Kuo, 2009). The third observation is that administrative workers feel that the vital role they play is underestimated (Cywińska, 2019; Gornitzka and Larsen, 2004). For example, as far as the staff performance appraisal system in HEIs is concerned, according to Cywińska (2019), two totally different approaches have been adopted to evaluate the work of the two groups of workers.

The criteria for academic staff evaluation are clearly specified and include periodical evaluation of the quality of teaching and the quality of scientific activity. In contrast, there are no clear or unified standards on evaluation of the work of administrative staff. Moreover, due to their service role in the organization, they tend to be perceived as a source of costs and problems, which, in turn, leads to their organizational “invisibility.” Cywińska (2019) also points at the problem of dual authority, that is, a lot of administrative workers have two bosses, for example, the chancellor and the dean (Cywińska, 2019, pp.149-150).

Also, the common, overwhelming feeling is that, though their work is indispensable for the mere functioning and development of the university, they are treated as second-class, auxiliary workers. As Cywińska remarked, even the official term used to categorize administrative workers, that is, “non-academic workers,” has a pejorative meaning (Cywińska, 2019, p.149). Also, their position in the reality of the academic world in Poland can be summed as “necessary, invisible, indispensable” (Mielczarek-Taica, 2020).

3.2 Concepts and models of organizational culture in higher education

Organizational culture has been the subject of many studies for several decades. A number of definitions, concepts, and models of what can be summed up as “the personality of the organization” have been developed. Early classical definitions described organizational culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems

of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way you perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 2010, p.18) or “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others” (Hofstede, et al., 2010, p.6).

As Dębski, et al. noticed (2020), contemporary studies on organizational culture examine a wide array of factors and relations, for example, the impact of supportive organizational culture on the success of cutting-edge technology, such as cloud computing usage in a company (Gangvar, 2017), the interdependence of friendship among workers, transformational leadership, and organizational culture (Kohan, et al., 2018), or the challenges related to merging different organizational cultures in virtual teams (Bechir, 2017).

As far as studies on organizational culture in higher education are concerned, they date back to 1960s, though they were not numerous or comprehensive, as in 1988, Tierney (1988) noted the lack of cultural research on higher education and signaled the need to conduct studies on that matter (Tierney, 1988). The early works primarily concerned student cultures (Becker, 1963; Clark, 1972; Davie and Hare, 1956), organizational sagas as tools for institutional identity (Clark, 1972), or the study of academic cultures (Becher, 1981; Freedman, 1979; Gaff and Wilson, 1971).

As for the contemporary research on organizational culture in higher education, it is worth mentioning the works of Ferreira and Hill (2008), who concentrated on the differences between the non-public and public sectors, and Dżimińska, et al. (2020), who examined the interconnections between trust and quality culture at HEIs (Dżiminska, et al., 2018).

Numerous attempts have been made to create models defining the components of organizational culture. In the classical model created by Schein, organizational culture is divided into three different levels: artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions (Schein, 2010, p.24). Also, Denison focused on the link between organizational culture and bottomline performance measures such as

profitability, growth, quality, innovation, and customer and employee satisfaction (1990).

Another model, designed by Cameron and Quinn (1999), called the Competing Values Framework, puts forward the assumption that the nature of organizational culture is based on two dimensions: internal/external focus and stability/flexibility structure. Taken together, these two dimensions create four quadrants that represent four sets of values that guide organizational tasks of environmental management and internal integration. What should be stressed is that the underlying dimensions present contrasting values. For example, organizations not only need to be adaptable and flexible, but also stable and controlled. There needs to be not only growth, resource acquisition, and external support, but also tight internal information management and formal communication. The framework not only suggests an emphasis on the value of human resources, but also emphasizes planning and goal setting.

The four cultural types presented in the four quadrants of the framework are: clan culture, adhocracy culture, market culture, and hierarchy culture. Clan culture workplace is like an extended family and it rates highly loyalty, commitment, and teamwork. Adhocracy culture workplace is dynamic and risk-taking; the main values include experimentation, innovation, and entrepreneurship. Market culture is a result-oriented workplace that focuses on competition and success. Hierarchy culture, a very formalized and structured workplace, is characterized by the predominance of procedures, formal rules, stability, and predictability.

The model and the accompanying validated research method, the OCAI developed by Cameron and Quinn to define the dominant type of the organizational culture in organizations, were chosen as the research tools for this study as they have been successfully used in examining organizational culture in many branches of the industry, for example, logistics (Ližbetinová, et al., 2016), local governments (Marek, 2014), healthcare (Bing-You and Varaklis, 2016; Frey, et al., 2016), and construction industry (Teräsväinen, et al., 2018). It was also used in the previous studies on organizational culture in higher education and, as it has been already mentioned,

the OCAI method has also been used to study the organizational culture in HEIs worldwide.

The findings show that cultures vary in different countries and institutions (Gaus, 2019). For example, clan culture was both the dominant and preferred culture at the Ohio State University, in a number of Christian HEIs in the United States, and in the District of Columbia, though some of them reported a dominant type of “adhocracy” (Berrio, 2003; Obenchain, et al., 2004). Universities in Slovenia in contrast, had a highly developed market culture (Omerzel, et al., 2011), whereas at the Plekhanov Russian University of Economics in Russia, the prevailing culture was hierarchy culture, though the majority of students wished to change it to either adhocracy or market (Vasyakin, et al., 2016). As far as the Polish universities are concerned, studies conducted by Dębski, et al. (2020) signaled that public universities had a predominantly hierarchy culture, whereas at the non-public universities the dominant type was market culture.

3.3 Results of OCAI questionnaire studies conducted in Polish non-public universities

In the research, the OCAI developed by Cameron and Quinn was used. The research was carried out in three non-public universities operating in Warsaw, Poland². In total, 115 respondents filled in the questionnaire. Of this, 68 were women (59.1%) and 47 were men (40.9%). In terms of age structure, the majority of respondents (34) were between 41 and 50 years. In terms of the academic positions, 28 respondents (24.3%) were administrative staff and 87 respondents (75.7%) were academic staff. It is worth noting that the structure of the research sample, in terms of academic positions, corresponded to that of the general

population. The employment structure of Polish HEIs supervised by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education is dominated by academic staff (Statistics Poland, 2020).

The participants were asked to distribute 100 points over four alternatives that corresponded to the four culture types (i.e. clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy). They judged six dimensions of their university: (1) dominant characteristics, (2) organizational leadership, (3) management of employees, (4) organizational glue, (5) strategic emphases, and (6) criteria of success³. They were supposed to assign a higher number of points to the alternative that is most typical of their organization.

The results of the questionnaire are presented in Figs 1–6. The black solid lines represent the academic staff and the black dotted lines represent the administrative staff. Fig. 1 shows the values related to the current dominant features of the universities. The results allow us to conclude that the academic staff see universities as organizations that are focused on goals, targets, and competition (market culture). In turn, the administrative staff perceive universities as organizations that are focused on internal support, stability, and control (hierarchy culture).

Organizational leadership was the second dimension in the OCAI questionnaire. The results are shown in Fig. 2. In the opinion of the academic staff, the leaders (rectors, deans, chancellors) have the qualities of hard drivers, producers, and competitors (market culture: 32 points). It is worth noting that, according to the opinion of the administrative staff, the leaders are considered to be coordinators and organizers (hierarchy culture: 34 points).

² The authors of the study did not obtain permission to publish the names of the universities participating in the study.

³ It is worth noting that the questionnaire used in the study did not allow respondents to provide their own answers. Their only task was to distribute the points to the given alternatives.

Figure 1. Dominant characteristics (*Source: Own study*) Figure 2. Organizational leadership (*Source: Own study*)

With regards to the third dimension and the management of employees, the majority of respondents (both academic and administrative staff) chose clan culture (Fig. 3). This option focuses on teamwork, consensus, and participation. It should be noted that the difference between clan culture and hierarchy culture does

not exceed 4 points. It means that security of employment, conformity, predictability, and stability in relationships are also used in the process of management of employees at non-public universities.

Figure 3. Management of employees (*Source: Own study*)

Fig. 4 presents the fourth examined area – organizational glue. It represents what consolidates an organization. In the group of academic staff, market culture

prevails. Under this option, aggressiveness and winning are common themes. Interestingly, for administrative staff, clan culture scored the highest number of points.

Figure 4. Organizational glue (*Source: Own study*)

Figure 5. Strategic emphases (*Source: Own study*)

It is worth noting that the representatives of academic staff perceive non-public universities as organizations that emphasize competitive actions and achievement. Attaining targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant. These are strategic emphases according to market culture (Fig. 5). In the group of administrative staff, hierarchy culture, which emphasizes stability and enterprise functioning, prevails. Performance, control, and operating flexibility are the important factors for the achievement of strategic goals.

Success criteria were the last area of interest to be analyzed. The results are given in Fig. 6. Once again, for the academic staff, the option that dominated is market culture (33 points). Also, for the administrative staff, market culture prevails (27 points). They define success on the basis of winning in the marketplace. Competitive market leadership is crucial for them.

Figure 6. Criteria of success (*Source: Own study*)

4 Discussion

The results of surveys that used the OCAI, devised within Competing Values Framework proposed by Cameron and Quinn, which were conducted among 115 employees showed that according to the opinion of academic staff, non-public universities have market culture (Table 1). It means that their leaders are hard drivers and competitors. The glue that holds the university together is an emphasis on winning. In turn, according to the opinion of administrative staff, non-public universities have hierarchy culture. It is characterized by adherence to exact procedures and regulations. Emphasis is put on efficiency and low costs.

The culture is oriented toward internal support. Stability and control are important. The management of the employees is particularly focused on providing employment security.

Thus, it can be concluded that there are significant differences in the perception of organizational culture between the academic and administrative staff (there are two subcultures in non-public universities). Therefore, hypothesis 1, which stated that there is a significant difference between academic and non-academic staff concerning the current state of the organizational culture of non-public HEIs in Poland, was confirmed.

Table 1. Form of organizational culture at non-public universities in Poland – current situation
(Source: Own study)

Academic staff	Average number of points in a cross section of six dimensions	Administrative staff	Average number of points in a cross section of six dimensions
Clan culture	22	Clan culture	26
Adhocracy culture	23	Adhocracy culture	22
Market culture	29	Market culture	23
Hierarchy culture	26	Hierarchy culture	29

This supports previous findings in the literature which revealed deep divisions between these two groups of university employees. This is probably partially due to the different specificity of work of these two groups of respondents. Administrative staff play a critical role in planning, budgeting, and, in general, supporting teaching and research processes.

Their work is characterized by adherence to exact procedures, regulations, and quite a high degree of routine office activities. On the other hand, academic staff, responsible and accountable for scientific and teaching activities, are more likely to be aware of the market orientation of the HEI and its consequences for the organization and themselves. This is due to the fierce battle for students' fees and research funds with other universities and scholars, the result of which is that teachers and researchers do experience the reality of competitive work atmosphere almost on a daily basis. Yet, there is another reason for the resulting differences in the perceived organizational culture of the

two groups of workers: a striking lack of awareness of the other group's needs and problems, as well as a remarkable lack of a feeling of belonging to one team with common goals. Administrative workers have a feeling of being underestimated and treated without due respect for the useful work they perform by their "non-administrative" colleagues with scientific titles, who place themselves significantly higher in the conservative, hierarchical university structure. Academic staff, on the other hand, feel that it is them who are overburdened with incredible work and stress at the university.

However, what is surprising is the fact that the results of the study also suggest that the respondents (both academic and administrative staff), who decided to apply for jobs in non-public, market-oriented workplaces, would appreciate a tendency toward a friendlier, family-oriented working environment in the future (Table 2).

Table 2. Form of organizational culture at non-public universities in Poland – future situation
(Source: Own study)

Academic staff	Average number of points in a cross section of six dimensions	Administrative staff	Average number of points in a cross section of six dimensions
Clan culture	33	Clan culture	32
Adhocracy culture	29	Adhocracy culture	23
Market culture	18	Market culture	17
Hierarchy culture	20	Hierarchy culture	27

This is a typical feature of clan organizational culture, which is oriented toward people and customers. Thus, hypothesis 2, which stated that the desired type of the organizational culture in non-public HEIs in Poland for both academic and non-academic staff is market culture, was rejected. It seems that in HEIs, regardless of the kind of job performed, even in market-oriented institutions, both in Poland and worldwide, university employees are confused by the increasing demands on accountability and competition and, most importantly, problems with translating these demands into the university organizational culture. Simply importing business practices, such as employee performance appraisal system, into HEIs does not seem to bring the desirable effects; on the contrary, it is met with reluctance and distrust. It seems that university staff, both academic and administrative, would welcome the creation of a pleasant, friendly, and safe work environment, with the organizational culture based on cooperation, partnership, team decision making, and loyalty.

Taken together, these results suggest that, firstly, HEI decision makers should think of ways to adapt the demands of accountability and business work practices to the university work environment. Secondly, efforts should be taken to improve the communication between the two groups of university workers – academic and administrative staff. This paper has also highlighted the importance of analyzing challenges that academic workers have to face while trying to combine the roles of a researcher and a teacher. We believe that our findings could be useful for HEIs' decision makers in their attempts to increase the quality and efficiency of universities as workplaces. These findings add to a growing body of literature on the or-

ganizational culture at HEIs. The study led to interesting conclusions, but it should be remembered that it was preliminary and limited to three institutions. The study's limitations include lack of a larger, preferably international sample of respondents. The analyses should be continued, especially in the field of differences between academic and administrative staff at public universities. The opinions of students should also be taken into consideration.

5 References

- [1] Becher, T., 1981. Towards a Definition of Disciplinary Cultures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp.109-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075078112331379362>.
- [2] Bechir, M., 2017. Managing Communicative Conflicts and Relational Challenges in Virtual Teams. *Human Systems Management*; 36(2), pp.115-127. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-171755>.
- [3] Becker, H.S., 1963. Student Culture. In: *The Study of Campus Cultures*. Lunsford, T.F., Ed.; Boulder, Col.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, pp.11-26.
- [4] Berrio, A.A., 2003. An Organizational Culture Assessment Using the Competing Values Framework: A Profile of Ohio State University Extension. *Journal of Extension*, 41(2), pp.3-10.
- [5] Bing-You, R.G., Varaklis, K., 2016. Organizing Graduate Medical Education Programs into Communities of Practice. *Medical Education Online*, 21. <https://doi.org/10.3402/meo.v21.31864>.
- [6] Blackmore, P., and Kandiko, C.B., 2011. Motivation in Academic Life: A Prestige Economy. *ARPCE*, 16, pp.399-411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2011.626971>

- [7] Cameron, K.S., Quinn, R.E., 1999. *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on The Competing Values Framework*; MA, USA: Addison-Wesley: Reading.
- [8] Cieciora, M., 2015. *Zarządzanie jakością procesu dydaktycznego w szkole wyższej: kaizen-japońska jakość w Polsko-Japońskiej Akademii Technik Komputerowych (Quality Management of the Teaching Process at a University: Kaizen-Japanese Quality at the Polish-Japanese Academy of Information Technology)*. Warsaw, Poland: Wydawnictwo Polsko-Japońskiej Akademii Technik Komputerowych.
- [9] Clark, B. R., 1963. Faculty Culture. In: *The Study of Campus Cultures*. Lunsford, T.F., Ed., Boulder, Col.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, pp.39-54.
- [10] Clark, B.R., 1972. The Organizational Saga in Higher Education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, pp.178-184. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393952>.
- [11] Cywińska, M., 2019. System Oceny Pracowników Administracyjnych SOPA jako narzędzie zarządzania pracownikami w szkole wyższej (SOPA - Administrative Employee Evaluation System as a Tool for Managing University Employees). In: Górak-Sosnowska, K., Pajewska-Kwaśny, R., Eds. *Dziewięć lat w procesie zmian. Nowa rzeczywistość prawna i organizacyjna (Dean's Offices in the Process of Changes. New Legal and Organizational Reality)*. Warsaw, Poland: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH, pp.147-158.
- [12] Davie, J.S.; Hare, A.P., 1956. Button-Down Collar Culture. *Human Organization*, 14, pp.13-20.
- [13] Denison, D.R., 1990 *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- [14] Dębski, M., Cieciora, M., Pietrzak, P., Bołkunow W., 2020. W. Organizational Culture in Public and Non-public Higher Education Institutions in Poland: A Study Based on Cameron and Quinn's Model. *Human Systems Management*, 2020, 39, pp.345-355. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-190831>.
- [15] Dżimińska, M., Fijałkowska, J., Sułkowski, Ł., 2018. Trust-based Quality Culture Conceptual Model for Higher Education Institutions. *Sustainability*, 10, 2599. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10082599>
- [16] Ferreira, A.I. Hill, M.M., 2008. Organizational Cultures in Public and Non-public Portuguese Universities: A Case Study. *Higher Education*, 55, pp.637-650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10734-007-9080-6>.
- [17] Fredman, N., Doughney, J., 2012. Academic Dissatisfaction, Managerial Change and Neo-liberalism. *Higher Education*, 64, pp.41-58.
- [18] Freedman, M., 1979. *Academic Culture and Faculty Development*. University of California, Calif, USA: Press: Berkeley.
- [19] Frey, R., Boyd, M., Foster, S., Robinson, J., Gott, M., 2016. What's the Diagnosis? Organisational Culture and Palliative Care Delivery in Residential Aged Care in New Zealand. *Health & Social Care in Community*, 24, pp.450-462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12220>.
- [20] Gaff, J.G., Wilson, R.C., 1971. Faculty Cultures and Interdisciplinary Studies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 42, pp. 186-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1971.11776806>.
- [21] Gangwar, H., 2017. Cloud Computing Usage and its Effect on Organizational Performance. *Human Systems Management*, 36, pp.13-26. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-171625>.
- [22] Gaus, N., Tang, M., Akil, M., 2019. Organisational Culture In Higher Education: Mapping the Way to Understanding Cultural Research. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(2), pp.1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1410530>.
- [23] Gornitzka, A., Larse, I.M., 2004. Towards Professionalisation? Restructuring of Administrative Work Force in Universities. *Higher Education*, 47, pp.455-471. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HIGH.0000020870.06667.f1>.
- [24] Gray, S., 2015. Culture Clash or Ties that Bind? What Australian Academics Think of Professional Staff. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(5), pp.545-557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2015.1079397>.
- [25] Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., Minkov, M., 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*. 3rd ed. New York, London: McGraw-Hill.
- [26] Karlsson, S., Rytberg, M., 2016. Those who Walk the Talk: The Role of Administrative Pro-

- professionals in Transforming Universities into Strategic actors. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, pp.2-3. <https://doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.31537>
- [27] Kohan, N.A., Safari, A., Teimouri, H., (2018). Friendship, Transformational Leadership and Organizational Climate. *Human Systems Management*, 37, pp.319-331. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-17129>.
- [28] Kuo, H., 2009. Understanding Relationships Between Academic Staff and Administrators: An Organisational Culture Perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31(1), pp.43-54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800802559278>.
- [29] Kwiek, M., 2015. Academic Generations and Academic Work: Patterns of Attitudes, Behaviors, and Research Productivity of Polish Academics After 1989. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40, pp.1354-1376. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1060706>.
- [30] Ližbetinová, L., Lorincová, S., Caha, Z., 2016. The Application of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) to Logistics Enterprises. *NAŠE MORE: znanstveni časopis za more i pomorstvo* 63, Special Issue, pp.170-176. <https://doi.org/10.17818/NM/2016/SI17>.
- [31] Marek, A., 2014. Model wartości konkurujących w badaniu kultury organizacji samorządowych (The Model of Competing Values in the Study of the Culture of Local Government Organizations) *Roczniki ekonomii i zarządzania*, 42(6), pp. 289-299.
- [32] Maslen, G., 2000. Aussies Crushed by Overwork. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*
- [33] Mielczarek-Taica, A., 2020. Niebędący, niewidoczni, niezbędni: pracownicy administracyjni na rzecz doskonałości naukowej uczelni – pilotaż z badań przeprowadzonych wśród pracowników administracji szkoły wyższej (Necessary, Invisible, Indispensable: Administrative Staff for the Academic Excellence of the University – Pilot Study Conducted among University Administration employees). In: *Administracja uczelni wobec nowych wyzwań. Cyfryzacja procesów, profesjonalizacja obsługi studenta (University administration in the face of new challenges. Process digitization, professionalization of student ser-*
- vice*); 1st ed.; Górak-Sosnowska, K., and Pajewska-Kwaśny, R., Eds.; Warsaw, Poland: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH, pp. 149-170.
- [34] Obenchain, A.M., Johnson, W.C., Dion, P.A., 2004. Institutional Types, Organizational Cultures, and Innovation in Christian Colleges and Universities. *Christian Higher Education*, 3(1), pp.15-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15363750490264870>.
- [35] Omerzel, D.G.R., Biloslavo, A., Tmavcevic, A., 2011. Knowledge Management and Organizational Culture in Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, 16(2), pp.111-139. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0949-6181-2011-2-111>.
- [36] Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) Report Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument. [online] Available at: https://www.ocai-online.com/userfiles/file/ocai_enterprise_example_report.pdf. [Accessed 7 January 2021].
- [37] Pietrzak, P., 2016. *Efektywność funkcjonowania publicznych szkół wyższych w Polsce (Efficiency of Public HEIs in Poland)*, 1st ed., Warsaw, Poland: Wydawnictwo SGGW.
- [38] Quinn, L., 2011. Understanding Resistance: An Analysis of Discourses in Academic Staff Development. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37, pp.69-83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.497837>.
- [39] Schein E., 2010. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 4th Edition, Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- [40] Statistics Poland. Higher Education and Its Finances in 2019. [online] Available at: <https://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/education/education/higher-education-and-its-finances-in-2019,2,13.html> [Accessed 7 January 2021].
- [41] Sułkowski, Ł., Przytuła, S., Borg, C., Kulikowski, K., 2020. Performance Appraisal in Universities - Assessing the Tension in Public Service Motivation (PSM), *Education Sciences*, 10(7), p.174. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10070174>.
- [42] Teelken, C., 2011. Compliance or Pragmatism: How Do Academics Deal with Managerialism in Higher Education? A Comparative Study in Three Countries. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37, pp.271-90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.511171>.

- [43] Teräväinen, V., Junnonen, J.-M., Ali-Löytty, S., 2018. Organizational Culture: Case of the Finnish Construction Industry. *Construction Economics and Buildings*, 18, pp.48-69. <https://doi.org/10.5130/AJCEB.v18i1.5770>.
- [44] Tierney, W., 1988. Organizational Culture in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59, pp. 2-21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1981868>.
- [45] Vasyakin, B.S., Ivlen, M.I., Pozharskaya, Y.L., Shcherbakova, O.I., 2016. A Study of the Organizational Culture at a Higher Education Institution (Case Study: Plekhanov Russian University of Economics). *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 10, pp. 11515–11528, <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i2.980>.
- [46] Volkwein, J.F., Parmley, K., 2000. Comparing Administrative Satisfaction in Public and Private Universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(1), pp.95-116.
- [47] Wade, A., Demb, A., 2009. A Conceptual Model to Explore Faculty Community Engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15, pp.5-16.
- [48] Winter, R.P., Sarros, J.C., 2002. Corporate Reforms to Australian Universities: Views from the Academic Heartland. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 11(2), pp.92-104.