JAN CZARZASTY
Warsaw School of Economics

Why we go to work. On organisational culture of Polish companies in the SME sector

Introduction: Polish organisational culture or organisational culture in Poland?

The paper focuses on the patterns of work organisation and organisational culture in Polish Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) based on the results of a large survey study "Polish Entrepreneurs" ($N = 609$) conducted on owners and co-owners of Polish private SMEs in 2010–2011.

Culture studies of organisations are an extremely heterogeneous field. Smircich (1983) distinguished three perspectives on organisational culture, including two from which culture is treated as a variable, independent and dependent, respectively. The former provides a foundation for cross-cultural management research, the latter — for corporate culture studies. Culture studies of organisations active within a specific geographical region (in this particular case, Poland) may go in either direction: in one instance one would discuss qualities of "Polish organisational culture", while in the other — end up making empirical generalisations about the culture as shared characteristics of all organisations in the given area ("organisational culture in Poland"). The former approach implies exclusion of foreign-owned enterprises, which significantly narrows the field of study, provided Poland is often mentioned as an example of a "dependent market economy" (Noelke and Vliegenthart 2009). However, the potential damage to the empirical value of the inquiry caused by adopting that approach is limited by the fact that vast majority of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Poland are dominated by domestic capital and family-owned.

Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Poland: Main characteristics

National statistics reveal that there are a total of 1.8 million active economic entities in Poland, while Eurostat provides a lower figure of 1.5 million. Furthermore,

the share of self-employment in the entire employment structure is also high, as approximately one in each five working persons is self-employed. Enterprise sector delivers 73 per cent of Poland's gross value added (GVA), and SMEs provide nearly a half (48.5 per cent as of 2012), of which microfirms' contribution is most significant (29.7 per cent), whereas small and medium entities deliver less (7.8 per cent and 11.0 per cent, respectively). Large enterprises' share amounts to 24.5 per cent. SMEs constitute 99.8 per cent of all economic entities in Poland. In 2012, there were a total of 1,794.9 thousand enterprises in operation, of which only 0.2 per cent belonged to the largest size class. The share of enterprises from different size classes remained stable over two year reference period (2011–2012), while in the real number of such firms there was a net increase of over 10 thousand between 2004 and 2012. Individuals engaged in business activity (as opposed to legal persons) make up for 90 per cent of microfirms, and 72 per cent of entrepreneurs do not employ any staff. SMEs are a workplace for 70 per cent persons in employment, of whom 18 per cent accounts for mid-sized firms, 13 per cent for small companies, and 39 per cent for microfirms (*Działalność przedsiębiorstw niefinansowych w 2012 r.* 2013).

Organisational culture of Polish SMEs: Theoretical context, empirical findings

There is an abundant body of literature on organisational culture in Poland, which falls into two largely separate categories: h i s t o r i c a l / t h e o r e t i c a l (whose common denominator is defined by searching the past for determinants of modern organisational culture in Poland), and e m p i r i c a l (where pictures of organisational culture approached from various — in terms of methodology — angles are reconstructed using primary data). In the former category, noteworthy contributions have been made in recent years by Hryniewicz (2004, 2007), Leder (2014) or Sowa (2011). The latter could be further divided into qualitative studies, typically conducted using case-study approach (e.g. Dunn 2008) or quantitative surveys, usually performed as a part of large cross-national research (e.g. Hofstede panel studies, GLOBE project), and occasionally only at the local level — in such case, culture-oriented questions remain at a margin — as a part of broad-reaching research aiming at learning about social consciousness of Polish society in economic dimension (e.g. Gardawski 2009a, 2013).

Hryniewicz (2004, 2007) stepped forward with an influential thesis on the "manorial organisational culture". The notion stems from the assumption that social relations in contemporary organisations in Poland to a large extent echo a type of social order which used to exist in a *manor*, an economic organisation built around a latifundium. In a manor voluntarist mode of labour management prevailed. Manorial organisational culture is paternalistic, and autocracy is the dominant management style. This view is reinforced by observations made

by Sowa (2011) and Leder (2014), who claim that in modern Poland social relations, including those at a workplace level, somewhat reflect social order of the pre-partition era.

Manorial organisational culture proved resilient. Authoritarian state socialism created a fertile ground for reproduction of such type of organisational culture (e.g. Gardawski 2001; Sitko-Lutek 2005). Significantly, small private enterprises, which were allowed to operate in the state-controlled economy, benefited from the permanent undersupply of goods and services.

With the takeoff of socio-economic transformation in 1989, relatively homogeneous Polish organisational culture began to evolve and diversify. As a result of privatisation, formerly public enterprises became driven by market logic and had to remain profitable to stay afloat. So-called commercialisation produced "State Treasury Companies", which maintained ties to the state administration and access to public financial aid, and thus retained certain characteristics of state-owned enterprise (see Gadowska 2002). Multinational corporations became a channel of diffusion of new organisational culture (both in terms of national cultures of parent companies, and particular corporate cultures of huge, bureaucratic organisations) (see: Czarzasty 2009, 405, 2014, 151–153). In Polish private companies, work and employment relations underwent the process of rapid individualisation. The dominant feature in the face of SMEs sector in Poland was defined as the "paternalism of a small entrepreneur" (Gardawski 2001), which, however, goes in pair with the widely acknowledged quality of a small firm (e.g. Rainnie 1989), usually run personally by an owner-manager or their families (almost 80 per cent of Polish SMEs are family-owned).

Poland has also a place in cross-national comparative research. First and foremost, Poland is covered by Geert Hofstede's panel study, according to which the national culture is characterised by large power distance (hierarchical society), relatively advanced individualism, strong masculinity, very high preference for avoiding uncertainty, normativist orientation (indicated by a low score on long-term orientation dimension), and restraint[1]. Hofstede's model (or its specific analytical dimensions) was also used as analytical framework by Polish researchers, who generally tended to re-validate Hofstede's findings but occasionally stepped forward with claims at odds to the original model (see: Żakowska 2007 on masculinity; Sitko-Lutek 2008; Sułkowski 2001; Wolniak, 2011 on individualism). The GLOBE project (House et al. 2004) describes Poland in terms of nine cultural competences: performance orientation — relatively high (declared), relatively low (practised); collectivism (both institutional and in-group) — relatively high (declared and practised); human orientation — relatively high (declared), relatively low (practised); assertiveness orientation — relatively high (declared and practised); future orientation — moderate (declared), low (practised); gender egalitarianism — relatively high (declared), high (practised); power distance — relatively

---

[1] See: http://geert-hofstede.com/poland.html. Accessed March 3, 2015.

high (declared and practised), uncertainty avoidance — relatively high (declared) and moderate (practised).

Presentation of results

In the empirical part, the paper relies on primary data acquired through the nation-wide quantitative survey study of owners and co-owners of Polish private SMEs conducted in 2010–2011[2].

The enterprises in the sample were first categorised according to their volume of employment. That operation allowed to distinguish four brackets: below 15 staff members (45.8 per cent), hereinafter referred to as micro, between 16 and 49 staff members (41.3 per cent), hereinafter referred to as small, between 50 and 99 staff members (7.9 per cent), hereinafter referred to as medium, and 100 and more staff members (5.0 per cent), hereinafter referred to as large. In the next step, by crossing two variables: volume of employment and dominant management style (dichotomy "autocracy" vs "democracy"), a typology of enterprises was built (Table 1).

Table 1. Enterprises according to volume of employment and management style

	(%)
Micro autocratic	34.2
Micro democratic	14.0
Small autocratic	34.3
Small democratic	12.4
Medium autocratic	5.1
Total	100.0

Source: "Survey of small and medium enterprises owners" ($N = 609$). Calculations by the author.

Autocracy is the prevalent management style: 62 per cent of the sample admit to being autocratic (71 per cent, when "don't now" answers are excluded), while only 26 per cent can be deemed democratic (29 per cent without "don't now" responses). Volume of employment appears to have an impact on a management style: while in small companies two in each three respondents identify themselves as autocrats, in medium ones the shares between two styles are split evenly.

Owners of SMEs display strong preferences for paternalism. Majority declare they feel responsible for their staff (91 per cent altogether, 90 per cent autocrats

---

[2] "Survey of small and medium enterprises owners" ["Badanie właścicieli małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw"], carried out by Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej (CBOS) between October 2010 and May 2011 on a quota sample of owners and co-owners of Polish private SMEs ($N = 609$), as a part of the research project "Entrepreneurs 2011" ["Przedsiębiorcy 2011"] completed by a team led by J. Gardawski.

and 96 per cent democrats), and 53 per cent of the inquired disagree with the statement that "one should keep a distance from their employees, and should not get involved with their private lives or personal problems", while only 41 per cent believe of such conduct as appropriate. The opinions on the subject are divergent as far as management style is concerned: two thirds of self-identified democrats think they should not interfere with private lives of their employees, whereas barely a half of autocratically-inclined entrepreneurs share that view.

Individualism of SME owners appears to be strong and persistent. They are not willing to join any organisations: only one in five admitted to being a member of any business or professional association. There is also a deep shortage of social capital visible, indicated by the fact that half of the sample (50 per cent of self-proclaimed autocrats and 47 per cent of democrats) agree with the statement that "business partnerships usually do not bring anything good, so it is better to stay away from them". Only 40 per cent believe that most people can be trusted, contrary to 50 per cent who would tell otherwise. There is a correlation between the dominant management style and propensity to trust other people: while among autocratic entrepreneurs 38 per cent reply that most people can be trusted (57 per cent hold the opposite opinion), views of democrats are split evenly (46 per cent support and deny that view, respectively). Institutions are mistrusted to a comparable degree as people: 40 per cent of the sample adhere to the view that "in Poland, to cope with competition, one has to cross the boundaries of law sometimes" (39 per cent of autocrats and 46 per cent of democrats).

In the questionnaire, there was a set of 14 questions formulated to diagnose the organisational culture.

Table 2. Organisational culture of SMEs — correlates

Culture feature	Mean	Type of company				
		1	2	3	4	5
1. If there is a vacant position to be filled, we look inside the company for a candidate first. only when there is no one right for the job in the company, we will look outside.	75.7%	70.6%	73.9%	82.5%	75.8%	69.2%
Rank		4	3	1	2	5
2. When we have several candidates for the job, we will prefer to hire a person recommended by our employee.	66.6%	66.5%	68.1%	70.6%	58.1%	57.7%
Rank		3	2	1	4	5
3. There is freedom of expression, for instance, an employee can openly tell the boss that he/she is wrong.	72%	69.2%	84.3%	70.0%	82.3%	44.0%
Rank		4	1	3	2	5

4. Superiors cannot admit that they do not know something about work.	40.2%	45.0%	50.7%	38.8%	16.1%	48.0%
Rank		3	1	4	5	2
5. If an employee knows that his/her co-worker who is on medical leave is in fact not sick, they will report it to the employer.	20.4%	11.2%	32.9%	17.6%	38.7%	20.0%
Rank		5	2	4	1	3
6. When a female employee finds out she is pregnant, she will notify the employer, so a temporary replacement can be secured before she goes on maternity leave.	57.4%	53.3%	55.7%	58.2%	68.9%	56.0%
Rank		5	4	2	1	3
7. Managers are appreciated most for their ability to make quick decisions.	87.9%	82.9%	87.1%	92.9%	85.5%	95.8%
Rank		5	3	2	4	1
8. Managers consult their decisions with their subordinates.	66.9%	56.5%	82.6%	65.1%	82.3%	68.0%
Rank		5	1	4	2	3
9. Employees usually celebrate their name-days at work and would organise a little treat for their co-workers on such occasion.	47.2%	40.2%	58.6%	44.7%	62.9%	40.0%
Rank		4	2	3	1	5
10. Individual performance is assessed, so outstanding employees can be rewarded and everybody is motivated to work better.	71.5%	73.4%	72.5%	67.6%	72.1%	80.0%
Rank		2	3	5	4	1
11. Individual performance is assessed, so employees dragging behind can be watched more closely.	66.5%	69.2%	55.7%	68.6%	62.3%	73.1%
Rank		2	5	3	4	1
12. Younger employees should not tell older employees they are wrong, even if it is true.	30.6%	27.2%	31.4%	32.9%	29.0%	40.0%
Rank		5	3	2	4	1
13. When two candidates are considered for promotion, the one that has been longer with the company should be chosen.	49.3%	49.7%	41.4%	48.8%	57.4%	52.0%
Rank		3	5	4	1	2

14. One should keep an eye on employees, otherwise they will not do a proper job.	48.9%	52.9%	42.9%	48.2%	43.5%	56.0%
Rank		2	5	3	4	1
"Rank of ranks"		5	3	4	2	1

Note: (1) Micro autocratic, (2) Micro democratic, (3) Small autocratic, (4) Small democratic, (5) Medium autocratic.

Source: Czarzasty (2013, 333–334).

SMEs in focus seem to have well developed internal labour markets: three in four of the inquired would say that in their company the search for a prospective fill-out of a vacant position starts with a review of currently held human resources. Among the five company types small companies tend to rely on their internal reserves the most.

In the process of human capital maintenance and improvement opinions and references of their staff play a vital part: two in three respondents would admit to take a recommendation of the current worker backing a job applicant into consideration while contracting a new employee and would likely choose such person over a completely anonymous candidate. While in microcompanies the dominant management style is irrelevant to the owners' expectations that a job applicant presents a reference from the current worker or a lack thereof, in small companies this variable matters: democratic firms are apparently less interested in recommendations than autocratic ones.

The responses to the question on approval of open criticism towards superiors by subordinates suggest the power distance in Polish SMEs is not stretched overtly: seven in ten informants assert that employees can tell the bosses that they are wrong. The dominant management style matters significantly in that regard: democratically-oriented entrepreneurs are more open to employees speaking their mind openly than autocrats: in micro firms the difference is 15 percentage points, while in small ones — 12. In medium-sized companies the majority of owners reveal there is no acceptance of such criticism.

Uncertainty avoidance is moderately strong, which is indicated by the level of affirmative answers (40 per cent) to the question whether "Superiors cannot admit that they do not know something about work". In the vast part of smallest entities the manager (who is almost always the owner too) cares for his/her authority in such a way. In small companies, there is a noticeable difference between democratic and autocratic owners. In medium ones, nearly a half of the inquired maintain the manager would not risk "losing face" by admitting lack of knowledge on work-related matters.

Reporting unethical behaviour of a co-worker (abusing the right to medical leave) to the employer would be highly unusual. Only one in five respondents is convinced his/her employees would show more loyalty to the employers rather

than to a workmate. It is interesting that self-proclaimed democrats are much more optimistic than the autocrats.

Most owners believe that their female employee would not hide a fact that she is pregnant, so there would be enough time to look for a temporary replacement before the employee goes on maternity leave. In general, democrats appear to be more confident than autocrats but at the level of a microfirm, the difference is hardly noticeable.

The most appreciated quality of managers is their ability to make decisions quickly. Nine in ten of the inquired would reply positively to the question and no significant differences are to be observed among various company types.

The pressure to take decisions quickly may sometimes translate into doing so singlehandedly. Two in three of the inquired would admit that the managers consult their decisions with subordinates. The extent of consultation is more widespread in democratically-run companies, regardless of the volume of employment.

Nearly half the informants state that there is a custom of celebrating birthdays (name-days or similar occasions) at work with a little treat for co-workers. Social ties within the company seem to be affected by the dominant management style: both in micro- and small companies the level of positive replies is significantly higher in democratic firms than in their autocratic counterparts.

There is a widespread tendency to compare the work performance on similar positions, so that outstanding employees can be rewarded and named as role models for everybody else: more than 70 per cent of the owners admit to using such a mechanism in their firms. The dominant management style does not seem to be a variable making a significant impact, yet as far as volume of employment is concerned, there is a slightly stronger propensity in the medium-sized companies' owners to single out the leaders among their staff.

Two thirds of the inquired also reveal that in their companies individual performance is measured in order to identify employees who are dragging behind the rest and monitor their work more closely. Those who adhere to autocratic management style are a little more keen on watching underperforming employees than democrats.

Grey hair do not guarantee immunity from criticism. However, the level of positive replies to the statement that "Younger employees should not tell older employees they are wrong, even if it is true" is relatively high. Nearly one third of the inquired admit such a rule is applied in their companies. The management style seems to have no significant impact but in the mid-sized companies there is an increase in the level of positive responses.

Half of the owners admittedly follow the seniority rule in the personnel policy, while to one third it is irrelevant how long a person considered for promotion has been with the company. The most inclined to follow the rule are entrepreneurs representing small democratic companies.

Almost half of the respondents agree with the statement that "One should keep an eye on employees, otherwise they will not do a proper job". Self-proclaimed democrats are less likely to control their subordinates than autocrats.

Discussion

Discovery of a well-developed internal labour market in the Polish SMEs may suggest that companies avoid open recruitment, in order not to generate additional costs. This is a universal, worldwide pattern, as SMEs have lesser resources than large companies to be allocated to staffing (e.g. Cassell et al. 2002). In small companies, there is a visible gap in the level of responses given by self-identified democrats and autocrats, with the former being less inclined to rely on the actual employee's endorsement of a new candidacy for the job. On the one hand, hiring on personal grounds has quite negative connotations, and sometimes is even associated with nepotism (Sławecki 2011). On the other hand, prevalence of internal network based recruitment may be seen as a sign of a high level of bonding-type social capital within organisations. Time spent with the company is taken as a criterion in evaluating competing candidates for promotion by half of the inquired, while it seems irrelevant to one third of the entrepreneurs. The pattern of responses suggests that volume of employment correlates better with the tendency to use duration of employment as a condition rather than managerial style.

In mid-sized companies employees are much less straightforward in communication with their superiors than staff of micro- and small companies. As the organisation expands, it is undergoing formalisation (Walsh and Dewar 1987), which also affects communication. While there is no causal relationship between the volume of employment and suppressing bottom-up criticism, yet the turning point is to be found somewhere on the path from a small to a mid-sized company. The potential consequences of that process are quite weighty, as informal employee participation disappears, and formal is not likely to replace it (see for example the results of the European Company Survey 2011).

At first glance, the fact that two thirds of the SME owners report that decisions are consulted with employees may seem like a paradox, considering that the vast majority of respondents identify with autocracy. On the other hand, there is an evident correlation between a dominant management style and incidence of consultation practices: democratic owners are far more likely to admit it than their autocratically-oriented colleagues. So it is not size that matters most in such instance.

Uncertainty avoidance is quite substantial on average. Yet, there are serious fluctuations among company types. Furthermore, attitude towards young people criticising older colleagues also serves as an indicator of uncertainty avoidance:

it seems that Polish SMEs handle uncertainty quite well. It would not be pointless to recall GLOBE (House et. al 2004) findings on uncertainty avoidance in Poland: at the value level (declarations) it is pretty high, at the attitude level (practise) it is lower. This is at odds with the results of Hofstede's studies, even though one ought to remember the same label denotes significantly different phenomena in the two models (Venaik and Brewer 2010).

Social bonds within the company are of limited power, which is indicated by the overwhelming scepticism of the owners about the loyalty of their staff. The possible explanation could be that the employer (company) might be considered a part of the "world of institutions", opposed to the "world of people" (Nowak 1979). Reporting a misconduct of that type by a workmate could be perceived as an act of disloyalty to the "world of people", and there would certainly be risk of gaining a reputation of a "snitch" involved. It is noteworthy that democratically-inclined entrepreneurs put more faith in their employees than self-declared autocrats. It is very difficult to establish what type of social bonds dominate in the SMEs. If following a custom of celebrating such occasions as name-days at work is indeed an indicator of social integration on personal grounds, then democratically-run firms consistently have stronger social ties than those managed in an autocratic way. Another social capital-related topic, which, nevertheless cannot be thoroughly discussed in this paper, is an issue of a generally low level of trust, and shortage of bridging social capital (for a comprehensive analysis of the issue see: Gardawski 2013, 167–212).

Entrepreneurs in focus believe there is no gender-related discrimination in their firms. Majority think that their female staff members would approach them with the news of pregnancy, so it is clear they see no reasons why women employed in their companies would be afraid of telling them that they would not be available for work in the near future. More interesting, however, is the large minority of those respondents who think otherwise. Research conducted in the early 2000s (on the working population, not just employers) showed a high degree of reluctance to reveal such information to the employer, which was explained by fear of repression (the woman being laid off at any convenient excuse, because firing her due to pregnancy would be against the law) (see Gardawski 2009a).

There is a consensus among the inquired about the ability of managers to make quick decisions (regardless of whether those decisions will prove right or wrong in their consequences). What can be established is that neither dominant management style nor volume of employment make clear impact on the entrepreneurs' expectations concerning decision-making capabilities of managers. This can be treated as a correlate to masculinity, as defined by Hofstede.

A widespread practice of monitoring and comparing individual performance of workers may serve as an indicator of individualisation of employment relations. Assuming so, one may conclude that the individualisation process is advanced. There is a general agreement that a correlation between individualisation

of employment relations and the size of a workplace exists: the smaller volume of employment, the lesser likelihood for any collective body of interest representation to be found (e.g. Bouquin et al. 2007). On the one hand, majority of entrepreneurs claim to watch their staff in order to stimulate work efficiency in an encouraging way. On the other hand, individual performance is evaluated to single out underperforming staff members. While self-identified democrats more often tend to see individual performance assessment as an instrument of a constructive impact, self-proclaimed autocrats are more likely to treat it as a potential means of repression, and employees' position to defend themselves against such acts is poor, considering the absence of any organised support they could count on.

Conclusions

The SME typology presented in this paper consists of five types of SMEs: micro autocratic firms, micro democratic firms, small autocratic firms, small democratic firms and medium autocratic firms. The companies in focus are characterised by the following traits: mature internal labour markets, peer recommendation considered to be an important component of the recruitment process, relative tolerance to criticism of superiors by subordinates and the elder by the younger, coupled with a relatively high sensitivity of the managers to the need of "saving face" via their staff (by hiding their incompetence), scepticism of the owners about identification of employees with the company (they are seen as more loyal to their co-workers, who would not inform the employer of unethical behaviour of a workmate), reportedly little room for gender-related discrimination in employment, appreciation shown to managers' ability to take decisions quickly, moderate extent of employee consultation (in an informal way), moderate strength of personal social bonds among staff, widespread practice to assess and compare individual performance, which has both coercive and remunerative functions, seniority often taken into account, as decisions on promotions are being weighed, and limited trust put in employees, who in vast part are believed to require close scrutiny.

In other words, the picture of organisational culture of Polish SMEs features: autocratic and paternalistic management style, relatively low uncertainty avoidance, moderate power distance, advanced individualism, supposedly high gender equality, limited presence of community-spirit, divided loyalties, and uneven distribution of social capital.

Disparities in management style allow to propose a distinction into two types of organisational culture, which constitute two largely separate worlds of work. In a "hierarchy" type of culture, present in companies managed in an autocratic way, paternalism prevails. To people working for such companies work is important, albeit a separate dimension of human life. One comes to work with a view of

making money, and material resources obtained as a result of paid employment are used to satisfy other non-job-related needs. No strong bonds with the organisation exist, and normative particularism is evident (as indicated by tolerance of dishonest behaviour of workmates). There are no close ties among the staff either. Hierarchical order is generally obeyed, and managers struggling with the pressure to take decisions swiftly are not keen on revealing their deficits in knowledge and competences. The owners of companies with such culture tend to believe that "Whose property, their law", so employees, if they wish to participate in decision-making, should start their own business, because taking up employment with someone else is a manifestation of one's inclination to value security over freedom (and responsibility). Such companies seem to lack organisational identity, simply because they are dominated by strong personality of the owner.

On the other hand, in a "community" type of culture, observable in democratically-run companies, there are no authoritarian pressures on staff exemplified by strict control, employment relations are more balanced with more room for consultation, managers (who are usually owners as well) are relatively open to the employee voice work, and are not unreceptive to criticism, employees identify with the company, are less likely to tolerate unethical actions of colleagues but maintain close ties with one another. In such organisations people participate primarily out of material motives, yet the relationship with the company and co-workers is not merely instrumental. Work is an important dimension of human life, as it is work that satisfies fundamental social and emotional needs of an individual, and the people with whom we work together have a significant impact on our lives. The owners of companies with such culture tend to think that their subordinates can make a valuable contribution to the development of a company, even though it does not belong to them.

References

Bouquin, S., S. Leonardi, and S. Moore. 2007. "Introduction: Employee Representation and Voice in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises — the SMALL project." *European Review of Labour and Research* 13: 13–26.

Cassell, C., S. Nadin, M. Gray, and C. Clegg. 2002. "Exploring Human Resource Management Practices in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises." *Personnel Review* 31(6): 671–692.

Czarzasty, J. 2009. "Warunki pracy i kultura organizacyjna." In *Polacy pracujący a kryzys fordyzmu*, ed. J. Gardawski. Warszawa: Scholar, 343–417.

Czarzasty, J. 2013. "Kultura organizacyjna małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw w Polsce." In *Rzemieślnicy i biznesmeni. Właściciele małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw*, ed. J. Gardawski. Warszawa: Scholar, 315–347.

Czarzasty, J. 2014. "Stosunki pracy i kultura organizacyjna przedsiębiorstw." In *Rokowania zbiorowe w cieniu globalizacji. Rola i miejsce związków zawodowych w korporacjach ponadnarodowych*, ed. J. Czarzasty. Warszawa: Scholar, 150–181.

Dunn, E. 2008. *Prywatyzując Polskę.* Warszawa: Wyd. Krytyki Politycznej.

Działalność przedsiębiorstw niefinansowych w 2012 r. 2013. Warszawa: Główny Urząd Statystyczny.

Gadowska, K. 2002. *Zjawisko klientelizmu polityczno-ekonomicznego. Systemowa analiza powiązań sieciowych na przykładzie przekształceń sektora górniczego w Polsce.* Kraków: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Gardawski, J. 2001. *Powracająca klasa. Sektor prywatny w III Rzeczypospolitej.* Warszawa: IFiS PAN.

Gardawski, J. (ed.). 2009a. *Polacy pracujący a kryzys fordyzmu.* Warszawa: Scholar.

Gardawski, J. 2009b. "Świadomość ekonomiczna Polaków pracujących." In *Polacy pracujący a kryzys fordyzmu*, ed. J. Gardawski. Warszawa: Scholar.

Gardawski, J. et al. 2009. "Wstęp. Omówienie wyników badań." In *Polacy pracujący a kryzys fordyzmu*, ed. J. Gardawski. Warszawa: Scholar.

Gardawski, J. (ed.). 2013. *Rzemieślnicy i biznesmeni. Właściciele małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw.* Warszawa: Scholar.

House, R.J., P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.F. Dorfman, and V. Gupta. 2004. *Culture, Leadership and Organizations. The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies.* Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage.

Hryniewicz, J.T. 2004. *Polityczny i kulturowy kontekst rozwoju gospodarczego.* Warszawa: Scholar.

Hryniewicz, J.T. 2007. *Stosunki pracy w polskich organizacjach.* Warszawa: Scholar.

Leder, A. 2014. *Prześniona rewolucja. Ćwiczenie z logiki historycznej.* Warszawa: Wyd. Krytyki Politycznej.

Noelke, A., and A. Vliegenthart. 2009. "Enlarging the Varieties of Capitalism. The Emergence of Dependent Market Economies in East Central Europe." *World Politics* 61(04): 670–702.

Nowak, S. 1979. "System wartości społeczeństwa polskiego." *Studia Socjologiczne* 4(75): 155–173.

Rainnie, A.F. 1989. *Industrial Relations in Small Firms: Small Isn't Beautiful.* London: Routledge.

Sitko-Lutek, A. 2005. "Kultura organizacyjna okresu transformacji." *Ekonomika i Organizacja Przedsiębiorstwa* 12: 67–72.

Sitko-Lutek, A. 2008. "Kultura organizacyjna polskich przedsiębiorstw w świetle badań." *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi* 6: 49–59.

Sławecki, B. 2011. *Zatrudnianie po znajomości. Kapitał społeczny na rynku pracy.* Warszawa: C.H. Beck.

Smircich, L. 1983. "Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28: 339–358.

Sowa, J. 2011. *Fantomowe ciało króla. Peryferyjne zmagania z nowoczesną formą.* Kraków: TAiWPN Universitas Kraków.

Sułkowski, Ł. 2001. "System wartości organizacyjnych — wyniki międzynarodowych badań porównawczych." *Przegląd Organizacji* 9: 21–26.

Venaik, S., and P. Brewer. 2010. "Avoiding Uncertainty in Hofstede and GLOBE." *Journal of International Business Studies* 41: 1294–1315.

Walsh, J.P., and R.D. Dewar. 1987. "Formalization and the Organizational Life Cycle." *Journal of Management Studies* 24(3): 215–231.

Wolniak, R. 2011. "Czynniki kulturowe w polskich organizacjach." *Przegląd Organizacji* 9: 18–21.

Żakowska, M. 2007. "Kultura organizacyjna polskiego biznesu według kryteriów zaprogramowania kulturowego Geerta Hofstede." In *Kultura i gospodarka. Ku antropologii życia gospodarczego we współczesnej Polsce*, ed. J. Mucha, M. Nawojczyk and G. Woroniecka. Tychy: Śląskie Wydawnictwa Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Zarządzania i Nauk Społecznych im. ks. Emila Szramka.

Why we go to work. On organisational culture of Polish companies in the SME sector

Abstract

Despite a bulk of literature published on Polish on Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), there are very few comprehensive empirical studies available. This paper focuses on the patterns of work organisation and organisational culture in Polish SMEs based on the results of a large survey study ($N = 609$) of owners and co-owners of Polish private SMEs conducted in 2010–2011. The dominant management style in the SMEs is autocracy, and the prevailing type of organisational culture may be described as a "hierarchy" (as opposed to "community", which is the other type identified within the enterprises of democratically-oriented owners).

Dlaczego idziemy do pracy. O kulturze organizacyjnej polskich przedsiębiorstw w sektorze MŚP

Abstrakt

Mimo rozległej literatury opublikowanej w języku polskim, dotyczącej małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw, niewiele jest dostępnych kompleksowych badań empirycznych na ten temat. Niniejsza praca koncentruje się na wzorach organizacji pracy i kultury organizacyjnej w polskich MŚP w oparciu o wyniki dużego badania ($N = 609$) właścicieli i współwłaścicieli polskich MŚP prywatnych, które zostało przeprowadzone w latach 2010–2011. Dominującym stylem zarządzania w MŚP jest styl autokratyczny, a powszechnym typem kultury organizacyjnej jest tzw. hierarchia (w przeciwieństwie do „wspólnoty", która jest typem odmiennym, określającym przedsiębiorstwa zarządzane przez właścicieli zorientowanych na styl demokratyczny).