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ABSTRACT

Organizational culture is understood in a very diverse way (as a system of values and norms of activity specific for a given company, a set of basic assumptions contributing to adaptation in a new environment or a set of unwritten rules, filling the gap between what is written and what is happening in the organization, a set of norms and social values that make the entity take action, the atmosphere in the company, the management method). Different approaches to organizational culture, as well as its importance for the success of the organization meant that the study attempted to assess the impact of organizational culture on the functioning of social entrepreneurship. The purpose of the study is to indicate the main processes of organizational culture, the absorption of which in the functioning of social entrepreneurship entities would strengthen the efficiency of the actions taken. The accepted research hypothesis is to verify the assumption about the need to use these processes in the activities of such entities.
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INTRODUCTION

Organizational culture, perceived as an extremely complex problem, taking into account the values professed by people, their thinking and behavior patterns, and mainly mutual relations and cooperation methods (Walczak, 2012), is an important instrument supporting the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization's functioning. Its inclusion in the processes of managing organizations, especially social entrepreneurship, is associated with building the market value of the organization, which is a consequence of the correct/skilful use of human capital (Glińska-Neweś, 2007; Gach, 2007; Walczak, 2009). It should also be emphasized that the cultural approach to organizational management, especially the organization of social entrepreneurship, should result in the search for new ways of understanding organization and economic life, which affects the placement of these processes within the range of social sciences and humanities, especially in the epistemological and methodological sphere.

In connection with the above, the purpose of the study is to indicate the main activities envisaged for organizational culture, the absorption of which in the functioning of social entrepreneurship entities, would strengthen their competitiveness or would help increase the efficiency of implemented goals and intentions. The wide range of the phenomenon of social exclusion in Poland, referring not only to jobseekers, but also to national minorities, women, among them especially single mothers, homeless, former prisoners, chronically ill (primarily mentally ill), children from pathological families and others, forcing the search for innovative solutions in the field of socio-occupational integration of risk groups. The research hypothesis of the study is to indicate the need to take into account

---

1This kind of view was expressed by Ł. Sułkowski, considering the possibility of dealing with culture in management (Sułkowski, 2012).
organizational culture as a determinant of including such entities in activities, a kind of specific approach conditioning the implementation of assumptions and mission of their functioning.

**The concept of organizational culture**

Organization culture is a concept that was widespread primarily in the 1980s and 1990s. In the management of business entities, this is a particularly important concept, because it takes into account value systems and operating standards that are specific to the enterprise and manifest in the form of so-called artifacts (Tarnawa, 2015).

Organizational culture can be analyzed in two ways. On the one hand, it can be presented as a set of fundamental assumptions that have been shaped by a given group and contribute to adaptation in the new environment making integration within the organization possible. On the other hand, it can be presented as a set of unwritten but followed rules that allow to fill the gap between what is written and what takes place in the organization (Kopczewski et al., 2012).

In the literature on the subject, a large variety of definitions of organizational culture is observed. Due to this, their division into numerical, historical, normative, psychological, structuralist and genetic definitions appeared (Kosiorek, 2013). Generally, organizational culture can be defined as the usual / traditional way of thinking and taking action, which must be learned by new people and at the same time accepted by them at least in part, if they want to become a member of the organization. At the same time, the term culture can also be defined to what extent the hierarchy of goals of a formal nature is manifested in the minds of individuals in the organization, as well as in the behaviors they undertake. In addition, important definitions of organizational culture include those developed by M. Pęcharski, Z. Szeloch and J. Pająk.

These formulated concepts emphasize the importance of organizational culture as a certain level of conscious participation of employees in the functioning of the organization and in achieving its social goals, a set of social norms and value systems that affect the behavior of the individual and are important for the purposes of the organization, as well as a set of values, norms, as well as man’s ways of thinking and behavior in an organization, which make it possible to shape a pattern of behavior, thanks to which it is possible to form the image of an enterprise and people operating in it (Otręba, 2012). There is therefore no doubt that organizational culture is one of the most complex and ambiguous terms, the meaning of which is also constantly expanding and changing (Williams, 1981), because its elemental components are evolving (values, norms and cultural patterns), educated and widespread in a given social community, which in relation to organizational culture is an organization. Japanese psychologists also emphasize the role of values as an important element of organizational culture, describing it as a “conglomerate of attitudes, values, behaviors and beliefs, passed down from generation to generation” (Sobocka-Szczapa et al., 2019).

Organizational culture is, therefore, most often defined as a set of social norms and values that affect an individual’s undertaking of certain activities. These activities are carried out at a given time and in a specific space and are related to interpersonal relationships. On this basis, it can be concluded that each enterprise has a specific organizational culture, which consists of symbols/artifacts, consciously built, norms and values, having an unconscious nature and fundamental assumptions, which are often unnoticed. These elements shape a specific atmosphere / climate and also build interpersonal relations (employee – employee, employee – manager), as well as indicate how to respond to changes that occur in the organization and in its immediate environment (Jasińska, 2015). One of the most popular models of organizational culture, which took into account the above elements, differing in durability and visibility, is the model developed by E. Schein (Figure 1).

Owing to the organizational culture, an enterprise can function and integrate its members properly, especially by implementing strategic management, which, combined with the organizational culture, enables the absorption of changes resulting both from globalization processes and in the immediate environment. It is assumed that strategic management allows the generation of completely new opportunities (Wojtowicz, 2004a), which requires support of organizational culture, especially in the context of the full involvement of employees and managers in achieving the organization’s long-term fundamental goals. It can be assumed that the organizational culture in this situation is a tool for the organization to achieve success, with the observed dependencies being feedback. Organizational culture is also what allows for harmonious management of the enterprise, because it affects many management subprocesses, and above all, process management, production as well as human resource management. This is enabled by organizational culture functions that are both external and internal.

**The concept of entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship – a concept that is very complex and can be defined in many ways. It is often combined with an effective way of thinking, the ability to make independent
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decisions, as well as rational action or obtaining benefits. It can also be identified with the optimal organization of economic resources, willingness to take risks, and innovation (Popowska, 2015). In this context, entrepreneurship in a broad sense includes activities carried out by organizations. J. Schumpeter also described the phenomenon of entrepreneurship by negating routine and bureaucracy, opposing them with "creative destruction" (Schumpeter, 1995). Whereas Drucker (1992), in his definition, emphasized the importance of scientific foundations as a means to achieve the goal in practical activities, that is, entrepreneurship. Griffin (2009) defined entrepreneurship as a complex process involving the organization and conducting of business activity through the prism of taking the associated risk. It is also worth quoting here two definitions of Polish Authors, B. Piasecki and B. Koźuch. The first of them, emphasizing the importance of the complexity of this process, defines entrepreneurship as a process of analyzing the chances of creation and development of an enterprise, methods of financing it, creativity and innovation in creating new products or services, and accepting the risks it entails. In the opinion of this author, entrepreneurship is also taking up this challenge (Piasecki, 2003), whereas A. Koźuch describes entrepreneurship as initiating projects to meet the needs of recipients as well as to generate profits. An extremely important supplement in this case is the inclusion of observed feedback in the definition of the problem, that is, the creation by the entrepreneurship of the organization of human entrepreneurship (Koźuch and Dyndalewicz, 2004). In economics, entrepreneurship is defined as a form of work or as a factor of production, co-occurring alongside work, land and capital (Van Praag and Cramer, 2001).

When presenting only selected definitions of entrepreneurship, it should be emphasized that there are many more, which results from the selection of features that affect the adopted approach. This is a consequence of their diverse nature. This is the reason for the possibility of analyzing entrepreneurship in three contexts (attitudes, behaviors/activities, processes) (Lochnicka, 2016), all of which relate to the process of managing organizations and the functions implemented by this management, which focus on its resources (human, material, financial) (Siuta-Stolarska and Siuta-Brodzińska, 2011). An entrepreneurial organization has the opportunity to achieve success on many levels (Białasiewicz, 2008), resulting from many interrelated conditions (economic, socio-cultural, political and legal), which, as a result of the occurrence of real circumstances, can very often hinder undertaking entrepreneurial activities, which most often concerns managers' attitudes (Mikeszajkina, 2018).

The concept of social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is one of the dimensions of entrepreneurship. An important distinguishing feature in this case is the motive of this entrepreneurship, namely sensitivity to people, their deficiencies and difficulties (Glinka and Gudkova, 2011). At the same time, it should be emphasized that considerations on social entrepreneurship are similar to the directions of analyzes of the entrepreneurship research area, that is, they deal with the person of a social entrepreneur and his behavior.

---
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competences and motivations, the impact of social entrepreneurship on society and the economy, and specific conditions and circumstances with which they have been dealing with social entrepreneurs (Zeyen and Beckmann, 2011). In general, however, it can be assumed that social entrepreneurship is one of the ways of implementing/undertaking business activity, which in this case combines social and economic goals. For this reason, the widest definition of social entrepreneurship also refers to socially oriented innovation (Chell et al., 2010). This innovation is a peculiar core of this phenomenon, enabling the taking of actions and processes aimed at identifying, defining and using market opportunities, increasing society’s wealth (creating new ventures) or managing organizations in an innovative way (Zahra et al., 2009). Mair and Marti (2006) also pointed to three different ways in which researchers understand social entrepreneurship. The first way of perceiving this phenomenon is to look for alternative financial strategies for initiatives (e.g. not-for-profit) or management programs that create social value. The second way is to take account of business practices socially involved in cross-sectoral partnership in the analysis. Finally, the third way is to consider mitigating social problems and catalyzing social change (Mair, Marti, 2006). In contrast, in Poland, social entrepreneurship is analyzed in two ways (Daniele, 2007; Leś, 2008; Wygnański, 2009, Rymsza, 2010; Kaźmierczak, 2007). First, changes under the influence of transformations and new trends in existing organizations are emphasized, which results in the appearance of new entrepreneurial dynamics in them. However, the second approach indicates the emergence of new types of production and service organizations.

Social entrepreneurship can also be defined through the prism of social enterprises as the effect of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs who identify a stable and unfair balance that causes exclusion, marginalization or suffering of certain groups of people. Observed at that time, the search for inspiration to solve the problem and start a business creates a friendly ecosystem that ensures a better future for selected groups (Martin and Osberg, 2007).

Similarly to traditional entrepreneurship, also in the case of social entrepreneurship one can distinguish several types, namely the type gathering members of the local community, operating on a small scale, the type of social innovator, operating on a slightly larger scale, and the type of social engineer, identified with the entrepreneur, operating on the largest scale (Zahra et al., 2009; Smith and Stevens, 2010).

Regardless of the above-mentioned ways of analyzing and defining social entrepreneurship, the dimension and mode of operation subordinated to the implementation of tasks that enable counteracting various types of exclusion and, in most cases, lack of subordination of activities to the goal of making profit is the dominant factor in identifying entrepreneurship as a social entrepreneurship.

Social entrepreneurship is an element of the social economy, in which the basic value is participation in work and obtaining on this basis economic independence and openness to cooperation with others (social integration). Social exclusion and inequalities are to be reduced not by financial transfers but by changing the conditions of access to the labor market. They are to build a sense of participation in the life of communities and local development. Such a reorientation of social policy also requires a new definition of the area of social economy (Boni, 2007).

As compared with other European Union countries (especially those that have recently found themselves in the EU), Poland has considerable achievements in the field of social economy. This is evidenced by the content of legal acts that affect the modern vision of activating people at risk of exclusion, in which forms of help and support are used, the purpose of which is to include the individual in the mainstream of the local community by the possibility of providing work. Undoubtedly, this variant of social policy will affect the dynamic development of social work in the coming years. Important “points of support” for the Polish model of social economy are: entrepreneurship and commitment, subsidiarity and solidarity, responsibility and – above all – care for the social economy as a mechanism of empowerment of persons, institutions and communities. Pluralism in the area of social economy is also important, consisting in the parallel operation of institutions derived from the so-called old social economy of the “third sector” and those that are emerging as completely new entities (e.g. social cooperatives) (Frączek and Wygnański, 2008).

Important from the point of view of the social economy model functioning in Poland is the broad approach to its functions and social enterprises operating within it. In addition to the obvious and most frequently mentioned functions – in particular regarding integration within the labor market - other functions, such as the provision of public services, mutual services, open market services, the provision of public goods and community development activities are no less important. Local, as well as commercial and production activities, the profits of which are allocated to social purposes (Frączek and Wygnański, 2008).

Based on the idea of solidarity, the social economy assumes that those who have succeeded (individuals, institutions) should support those who are just at the beginning of the road. The social economy is therefore social in so far as it finds social support. This is determined by the attitude of public opinion, decision makers, businessmen (including representatives of financial institutions), and – perhaps above all – people directly interested. Therefore, the “new” social economy should be seen primarily through the prism of entrepreneurship understood as readiness and the ability to take
responsibility for one's fate, as well as through the prism of civic involvement, that is, assuming responsibility for the community (Frączek, Wygnański, 2008). Therefore, it seems that the key concept in the case of social economy is "responsibility", which should mean actions for the greatest possible independence and economic sovereignty, that is, making efforts so that specific individuals, organizations or communities can make sovereign decisions more than before, as to the purpose and form of your business. Therefore, the social economy is primarily a specific approach of individuals and institutions to social reality.

Social economy activities, as already mentioned, rely heavily on solidarity and cooperation. These principles are the fundamental foundations not only for the Polish model of social economy, but also a determinant of its functioning in other countries. They are also the opposite of particularism and competition. In addition, such social economy principles should include (Frączek, Wygnański ed, 2008):

1). entrepreneurship and commitment understood as a willingness to take responsibility for your fate;
2). subsidiarity, meaning the division of labor and responsibility in the area of performing public tasks, and taking into account in the social economy activities the fullest possible inclusion in the planning, implementation and impact assessment processes of the persons and communities for whom they are conducted;
3). prudence and responsibility, which make the effectiveness of solving social problems dependent on the ability to understand the complex reasons for taking actions in the framework of the social economy; important in this case is a sense of responsibility for one's actions, both directly and indirectly,
4). independence and empowerment, which means that activities in specific areas of the market, based on something more than a desire to profit, can be an effective mechanism for recovering and protecting sovereignty and subjectivity for individuals, institutions and communities.

Including the above principles in activities undertaken within the framework of the social economy means that:

1). individuals participating in them have a chance to abandon the position of the client of social transfers, as well as the chance to become an independent unit, able to take care of the fate of themselves and their loved ones; it results from the possibility, and at the same time, of having to earn income from work, which in turn means regaining dignity, which has its source in making independent choices about one's fate,
2). organizations have the chance to acquire the ability to skillfully raise funds for their own activities, which may result in complete independence from the preferences of public and private sponsors; in this way it is possible to avoid the situation of continuing the activities of public institutions for the sake of being a sovereign entity capable of undertaking activities in the public sphere, activities consistent with the mission and decision of the members and founders of the organization,
3). communities have a chance to acquire the skills of independent formulation of development strategies based on individual resources, as well as realize true self-government and strive for the well-being of citizens.

To change the model of social policy, and thus the development of social entrepreneurship, one could use the flexicurity model, which is an integrated strategy of simultaneously increasing the flexibility and security of the labor market (Kryńska, 2007; Philips and Eamets, 2007). In this case, flexibility means smoothly changing changes in the professional life of a person. Security is understood as job security. In the context of social entrepreneurship, it would be important to implement modern social security systems as one of the four pillars of the flexicurity model, enabling the combination of income support measures with the need to create conditions that guarantee mobility and adaptability of labor resources. Relating this problem to people at risk of exclusion may contribute to increasing their propensity to participate in professional activity, especially due to the promotion of gender equality and the creation of a climate of trust and dialogue, which are the main elements of the model, recorded in European Union documents. The inclusion of people at risk of exclusion should also include in the provisions for counteracting gaps in the skills and opportunities of professional work resources, as well as supporting activities enabling this type of limitation. At the same time, it should be emphasized that social partners play an extremely important role in shaping and implementing the flexicurity model, including representatives of social economy entities, that is, those who implement social entrepreneurship. They are primarily responsible for creating social benefits for all labor market actors, especially those at risk of exclusion (Rymsza, 2005; Grotkowska et al., 2005; Kryńska, 2008, Surdykowska, 2007; Czerwińska, 2008; Kryńska, 2008; Frączek, 2008).

The idea of implementing flexicurity in Poland has unfortunately failed. Nevertheless, the anticipated actions for the introduction of this model were reflected in other actions related to the functioning of the labor market (Kryńska, 2009). The key to this is the diversity of management forms and the organization of networks of institutions supporting the social economy sector. The basic legal changes strengthening the position of this sector should lead to a reduction in bureaucracy related to the creation of entities, reduction of formal requirements, clarification of the rules for participation and employment of people at risk of social exclusion in individual forms of social enterprises and financial relations (Kaźmierczak and Rymsz, 2005). The access of social economy institutions to public funds also needs to be improved (simplification and
adaptation to the needs and capabilities of entities), which mainly concerns investment financing options (Rymsza, 2006). Access to public funds should be verified on the basis of social benefits provided by social entrepreneurship entities. To increase the significance of the economic effects of the activities of social entities, many changes should be made to the financial system in entities of the social economy sector, and above all, it would be necessary to abolish the "by-nature" of economic activity in relation to statutory activities and reduce the amount of initial capital for capital companies (Jurasek-Kopacz et al., 2008). This will reduce the barrier of "learned helplessness" and claim attitudes that play an important role in the activities of social economy entities.

The purpose of the study is to indicate the main activities envisaged for organizational culture, the absorption of which in the functioning of social entrepreneurship entities, would strengthen their competitiveness or would help increase the efficiency of implemented goals and intentions. The wide range of the phenomenon of social exclusion in Poland, referring not only to jobseekers, but also to national minorities, women, among them especially single mothers, homeless, former prisoners, chronically ill (primarily mentally ill), children from pathological families and others, forcing the search for innovative solutions in the field of socio-occupational integration of risk groups. The research hypothesis of the study is to indicate the need to take into account organizational culture as a determinant of including such entities in activities, a kind of specific approach conditioning the implementation of assumptions and mission of their functioning.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research method adopted assumes substantive analysis of selected items of literature on the subject, taking into account the issues of organizational culture, entrepreneurship, with particular emphasis on social entrepreneurship and social economy entities, especially social enterprises operating in various legal forms. On the basis of the presented literature on the subject, a synthesis of organizational culture processes necessary for implementation has been made, which may affect the quality of the objectives pursued in social entrepreneurship organizations. As the basis for assessing the scale of social entrepreneurship in Poland, the study takes into account the latest statistical data from the websites of the Ministry of Family, Labor and Social Policy.

ANALYZES AND RESEARCH RESULTS

Entities of social entrepreneurship in Poland

The activity of social entrepreneurship entities in Poland is a consequence of certain specific conditions that concern: the occurrence of structural unemployment (mainly among people with low qualifications) and the large scale of hidden unemployment in agriculture, unequal access to work, especially people from high risk groups, as well as no use of instruments supporting the economic activity of people from these groups and focusing social policy primarily on material assistance. These factors influenced the wide range of social exclusion, not only for jobseekers, but also for national minorities, women, especially single mothers, homeless, former prisoners, chronically ill (primarily mentally ill), and children from families pathological. Potentially one of the most effective strategies may be the activity of social entrepreneurship entities, which, through a system of socio-educational, therapeutic and rehabilitation measures, and employment assistance, can restore excluded people a sense of social participation and make them aware of the need and need to use civic rights, and prepare them for taking individual responsibility for one's fate.

Let's look at the types of social entrepreneurship entities operating in Poland.

Social Cooperative: It is an entity created directly on the initiative of socially excluded people. This group (minimum 5 people) jointly develops the statute of the cooperative and brings it to life. In addition, the initiators choose the area of activity.

A social company: It is a form of doing business that offers an innovative view on the employment of socially excluded people, because it includes economic calculations in its activities. Specialists manage the social company. A social company may be created by associations with legal personality or foundations within the scope of their statutory activities.

Cooperative: Is a form of social enterprise. Works on general principles.

Social enterprise: Is a private, autonomous entity that provides products or services to a wider community whose founder or manager is a group of citizens. This category includes any type of profit-oriented but income-oriented initiative. This approach is characteristic of the American economy, in which the concept of social economy does not exist. This approach is different from the one we face in

1. H. Sobocka-Szczapa wrote more on this subject (Sobocka-Szczapa, 2010).
2. An extensive description of social entrepreneurship entities can be found in the publication of H. Sobocka - Szczapa (Sobocka - Szczapa, 2010).
3. The assumptions for the bill were based on the experience of Social Firms UK, Social Firms Scotland and Forth Sector in Edinburgh, social companies that are members of FAF in Germany, standards developed by CEFE (Conference of European Social Companies, Employment Initiatives and Social Cooperatives), as well as the created and tested Hotel Training Center “Kłos”, based on the dual model of the social company (Firma, 2008).
4. The basic features of a social enterprise were defined by J. Hausner, S. Mazur and N. Laurisz (Hausner et al., 2007).
Europe, where social enterprises are oriented towards social benefit.

**Non-governmental organizations (associations and foundations):** In many cases, these organizations use formulas characteristic of business entities to implement their statutory activities (social goals), but this is not necessarily related to employing representatives of groups at risk of social exclusion. Among the non-governmental organizations since 2004, we are dealing with a new type, namely public benefit organizations.

It should also be emphasized that in addition to the entities that form the core of social entrepreneurship activities, there are also entities supporting these activities, namely Social Integration Centers and Social Integration Clubs, Vocational Activity Establishments, Occupational Therapy Workshops, Protected Work Establishments and Mutual Insurance Society. They organize the education process, enabling the acquisition of professional skills, retraining or improving professional qualifications and the acquisition of other skills necessary for everyday life, as well as employing / rehabilitating excluded persons, for example due to disability (Kluczyńska and Sienicka, 2008; Kluczyńska and Sienicka, 2008a).

When looking at the structure of social entrepreneurship entities, it should be emphasized that they are very diverse, although undoubtedly the dominant ones are those which, enabling the full exercise of the right to work for excluded persons, undertake activities of an economic nature, that is, they constitute "hard" elements of the social economy. Undoubtedly – it is in these entities that one can speak of the importance of organizational culture in achieving the objectives of undertaken activities. Therefore, statistical analysis will only apply to such entities.

According to the obtained statistical data, at the end of March 2020, there were 1169 social enterprises in total in Poland, taking various legal forms (Figure 2).

It was observed that in Poland the most are social cooperatives and non-profit companies with o.o. In addition, a significant number of social enterprises operated in the form of foundations and associations. Individuals included entities operating in the form of a church legal entity (2), associations of associations (2) and cooperative of invalids (1).

In addition, the location of social enterprises by voivodship was also diversified (Figure 3). The largest number of social entrepreneurship entities operated in the Podkarpackie Voivodeship, while the smallest – in the Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship.

---


Figure 3: Number of social entrepreneurship entities by voivodeships at the end of May 2020.
Source: Own study.

The number of individual organizational forms of social entrepreneurship according to regions was different (Table 1). And so: social cooperatives in the largest number occurred in the Wielkopolskie Voivodeship, foundations were located primarily in the Śląskie Voivodeship, while associations – in the Warmińsko – Mazurskie Voivodeship. Also, non-profit companies in the largest number of operated in the Podkarpackie Voivodship. Isolated forms of ownership of social enterprises, that is, cooperatives of invalids, associations of associations and church legal entities operated only in the following Voivodeships: Mazowieckie, Lubuskie and Kujawsko – Pomorskie.

To summary, it should be emphasized that the scale of activity of social entrepreneurship entities is very small. They constitute only a fraction of a percentage among all business entities operating in Poland. However, it should also be noted that the number of such entities is systematically increasing, which may indicate the need for their functioning.

Organizational culture as an instrument to support the activities of social entrepreneurship entities

Organizational culture should allow social entrepreneurship to guarantee the effectiveness of their activities and competitiveness. It is generally assumed that organizational culture in entrepreneurship should be based on undertaking measures of a long-term, gradual nature and focused on the formation of specific transformations that are aimed at changing attitudes and behavior (Mroziewski, 2008).

Organizational culture primarily affects the formation of internal entrepreneurship. This relationship is reversible, because in order to shape internal entrepreneurship and introduce innovations, it is necessary to make some changes in the organizational culture. Therefore, for an enterprise to be entrepreneurial, it must adapt to certain values and rules that favor building entrepreneurship at the appropriate level.\(^\text{13}\)

An organization that wants to shape entrepreneurship based on its organizational culture should pay attention to certain processes/phenomena that are a derivative of this culture and reflect the level of entrepreneurship.\(^\text{14}\). These processes are equally important in the case of

\(^{13}\)However, not every organizational culture allows you to build entrepreneurship. This usually applies to culture that focuses on very traditional assumptions and does not allow it to introduce certain changes, innovations and modern technologies, or presents a negative attitude towards them (Laszuk, 2015).

\(^{14}\)These are: customer focus and future-oriented solutions, improving management at all levels, introducing a pro-entrepreneurial management process, identifying staff with the enterprise, bearing social, environmental and ethical responsibility, building pro-entrepreneurial work organization, undertaking teamwork, using and building entrepreneurial capital, which allows to finance given ideas, a reward system, taking entrepreneurship measurements internally (Laszuk, 2015).
Table 1: Entities of social entrepreneurship by voivodeships and organizational forms at the end of March 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voivodeships</th>
<th>Social cooperatives</th>
<th>Cooperatives of invalids</th>
<th>Foundations</th>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>Associations of associations</th>
<th>Non-profit companies l. l. c.</th>
<th>Church legal entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolnośląskie</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kujawsko-Pomorskie</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubelskie</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubuskie</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódzkie</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Małopolskie</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazowieckie</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opolskie</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podkarpackie</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podlaskie</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomorskie</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śląskie</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Świętokrzyskie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmińsko-Mazurskie</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wielkopolskie</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachodniopomorskie</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>550</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>263</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own study.

organizational culture functioning in social entrepreneurship entities and shaping this entrepreneurship. We will try to show it in the table. The phrase “beneficiary/stakeholder” in this case was used to emphasize the importance of participating in the departments of persons for whose support the entity was established (Table 2).

As shown in Table 2, increasing the participation of employees of social entrepreneurship companies in every process makes up the image of the organizational culture functioning in it. Potentially, this kind of participation can affect the integration of employees and their identification with the goals and strategy of the organization. This supposition has already been confirmed early in many research projects (Sułkowski, 2012). Awareness of the occurrence of diverse stereotypes and behavioral patterns allows the development of more tolerant, open and consequently more effective organizations, conducive to human self – fulfillment and cooperation. Organizational culture directly influences human capital development strategies and values perceived by managers, indirectly affecting their behavior, attitudes, and thus the actual organizational behavior of employees (Walczak, 2010). Such relationships are particularly important in social entrepreneurship organizations, because in their case there is a large diversity of human resources potential, whose behavior, in line with the entity’s objectives, can often be difficult to achieve. In social entrepreneurship and its entities, it is therefore necessary to take into account in the management of human resources, many problems, which include organizational culture, which is a component of intellectual capital, closely related to the intangible resources of each organization (Sobocka-Szczapa et al., 2019). Elements and processes of organizational culture in social entrepreneurship entities should bind and integrate company policy with human resource management policy.

The types of organizational cultures selected from the literature, characterized by the subject should serve this purpose. Among the types of organizational cultures developed by the Authors indicated, which are biopolar in nature, that is, covering two variables (goals and values), the most favorable from the point of view of the functioning of social entrepreneurship entities, it seems, are:

15 The creators of the typology of organizational cultures include R. Harrison, F. Trompenaars and Ch. Hampden-Turner. It seems that these authors have developed typologies that most reflect the needs of functioning social entrepreneurship entities (Harrison, 1972; F. Trompenaars, Ch. Hampden-Turner, 2002).
### Table 2: Processes reflecting organizational culture in shaping social entrepreneurship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational culture processes</th>
<th>Actions to support social entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td>- assessment of the demand for the company's effects, taking into account the opinions of beneficiaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- assessment of social benefits for beneficiaries, taking into account their opinions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving leadership at all levels</td>
<td>- verification of managerial competences including the methods of cooperation with beneficiaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the possibility of using the managerial competences of the beneficiaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- establishment of an opinion-negotiating body to formalize the opinion-making process as a body complementing informal assessments,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a pro entrepreneurial management process</td>
<td>- participation of beneficiaries in the broadly understood decision-making process,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- taking into account the phenomenon of beneficiaries’ participation in all manifestations of the organization's functioning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- mandatory consideration of beneficiaries' proposals in making strategic decisions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- applying a democratic management style,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying staff with a social enterprise</td>
<td>- joint decision making,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- developing an incentive system rewarding effects, depending on the capabilities of the beneficiaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- developing a system taking into account the specificity of employees/beneficiaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- developing a system enabling equal access to education processes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking social, environmental and ethical responsibility</td>
<td>- shaping relationships with employees on the basis of mutual agreement, enabling stress reduction, such as increasing satisfaction with the work performed,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- transparency of the rules of conduct in the organization, based on mutual respect, especially the lack of manifestations of lying to the beneficiaries, offensive behavior towards them, evoking a sense of distrust,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- no discrimination,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- responsibility for accepted commitments,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- transparency of information,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- achieving sustainable profit while wisely shaping relationships with all stakeholders,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- using the process of building dialogue with stakeholders to improve the company's development strategy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- building a competitive advantage strategy on the market based on ensuring lasting value for both shareholders and other stakeholders,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- providing services and products in a way that does not degrade the natural and social environment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- taking ethical values into account in running a business,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a pro entrepreneurial work organization</td>
<td>- work organization should be the result of conditions resulting from the predispositions and expectations of the beneficiaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- implementation of broadly defined humanization of work,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>- correctly defining decision-making procedures that prevent the spread of responsibility,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- balanced participation of team members, no phenomenon of “suppressing” minorities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- formulation and compliance with basic principles,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- counteracting group polarization,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using and building entrepreneurial capital</td>
<td>- creating instruments supporting employee education processes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- supporting intellectual capital of beneficiaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- promoting knowledge transfer, knowledge sharing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- promoting the use of knowledge and creating innovation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- raising funds for the implementation of plans,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above attempt to verify the directions of activities that allow applying the organizational culture in the activities of social entrepreneurship entities, as well as the presentation of the most beneficial - from the point of view of social entrepreneurship - types of organizational cultures that are acceptable in such organizations must be supplemented with categories of artifacts, values and standards that should also be included as parameters for a properly functioning organization of this type.

Among the artifacts, the most important seems to include in the activities of social entrepreneurship entities social communication patterns (verbal artifact), which may contribute to taking into account the expectations of beneficiaries as to the atmosphere prevailing in the organization. Among behavioral artifacts, it may be important to focus on the rewards and punishments used, because they reflect the social dimension of entrepreneurship. Physical artifacts, which should be included in the initial assumptions of the organization being established, are undoubtedly of lesser importance.

Norms and values of organizational culture that can contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurship in organizations of this type are more durable than artifacts, but at the same time more difficult to observe, and they can be found in the company’s stated goals (the problem of...
achieving universal acceptance), a set of features for which value or punish employees (the problem of accepting the beneficiaries’ differences), management style (the best style is democratic), or organizational structure features (the issue of information flow, issuing instructions, complicating the organizational structure).

Generally, it can be stated that organizational culture in many ways strongly influences social entrepreneurship. It is extremely important, however, that it should uniquely combine: firstly – the social dimension of functioning with its economic foundations, and secondly – enabling conflict-free activity for people at risk of exclusion. Therefore, thinking patterns that are conducive to building positive relationships, behavior patterns, that is, the attitudes of organization members and symbols (e.g. work clothes, decorative elements, slogans, used mental abbreviations) are important (Dziwulski, 2014).

Conclusions

The shaped way of communication between people, observed norms and values, accepted patterns of thinking and behavior of members of a given organization are consolidated in the form of its separate organizational culture. It is therefore a creation of human individuals that consciously and intentionally shape it, as a derivative of their belonging to an organization. Its assumptions and foundations are passed on to new members, becoming members of the organization, and are also reflected in relations, among others with clients, contractors, suppliers, subcontractors, co-workers and groups of external stakeholders. This means that culture is really shaped and co-created as a result of everyday events, which on the one hand makes it very difficult to change the habits and practices that have been preserved for years, and on the other – means that it is possible to manage cultural change. At the same time, due to the fact that organizational culture to a large extent generates the effectiveness of the organization’s operation based on modern development factors, its absorption and taking into account the functioning of social entrepreneurship entities. Otherwise, barriers arising mainly from employee resistance (reluctance, lack of patterns, lack of knowledge in the value system, etc.) may arise in the implementation of intentions. This is all the more important because generally – in management sciences – an instrumental approach dominates, emphasizing the need for conscious shaping of organizational culture (Sułkowski, 2005), which in this case is related to supporting social entrepreneurship.

In general, therefore, organizational culture, being a phenomenon specific to each organization, built by the specificity of people who operate in a given enterprise. This kind of approach makes it particularly important for the activities of social enterprises and creating entrepreneurship in them. Many organizational culture contexts, which results from the diversity of definitions, also enable the organization's individual approach to the issue of using its assumptions in the functioning of entities. It should be emphasized, however, that in creating social entrepreneurship in entities of this nature, organizational culture can be of key importance for accomplishing the mission of such organizations. Without organizational culture, it would be impossible to implement management processes or these processes would not have an adequate degree of efficiency. Therefore, it is worth ensuring that the organizational culture is appropriate, focused on many goals and positively influencing the personnel functioning within such an organization. Then she is able to properly achieve her goals and develop on many levels. The diagnosis of organizational culture as a determinant of the business success of the social entrepreneurship entity, comparable to the role of the strategy (Michelman, 2007), means that it should be oriented to increase flexibility and innovation while reducing control. This is guaranteed by models characterized in the study, which, by focusing on people in the organization, supporting teamwork and participation, as well as employee development, will increase their involvement and allow to stabilize and/or achieve a new level of efficiency or competitiveness. The condition of success is to adapt the leadership style to the type of organizational culture adopted in the entity’s activities, that is, an innovative approach to changes implemented in the organization of social entrepreneurship, which may be related to the need to manage innovation.

From the point of view of social entrepreneurship, institutional assistance, and above all financial support, is also important, which undoubtedly contributes to its development. This view was represented, among others, by S. A. Zahra, M. Wright and U. Stephan, L. M. Uhljaner and C. Stride (Zahra, Wright, 2011; Stephan et al., 2015), which requires both greater state activity as well as greater financial resources, which limits the creation of larger social needs. Therefore, institutions can be a source of resources needed in social entrepreneurship, but they can also motivate to undertake entrepreneurial activities in this area.

Social entrepreneurship is a growing area of economies. The number and diversity of organizations that fall into this sector is constantly increasing. Directions for further research in this field are proposed (Austin, 2010). However, the most important message of social entrepreneurship should be the implementation and offering of innovative solutions that allow increasing social integration, eliminating dysfunctional behaviors and affecting socio-economic development.
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