Ilona Urych[*]
Patrycja Bryczek-Wróbel[**]

* War Studies University; e-mail: i.urych@akademia.mil.pl, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4868-9460

** Military University of Technology; e-mail: patrycja.bryczek-wrobel@wat.edu.pl, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7154-7335

The Importance of Leadership in Shaping the Security and Organizational Culture of Hierarchical Units

Abstract

Nowadays, we are observing the growing role of leadership not only in organizations but also in hierarchical units. This importance is related to shaping the organizational culture of individuals and teams working in them. The aim of the article is to present the importance of leadership in shaping the security and organizational culture of hierarchical units on the example of the War Studies University. The analysis was made using Geert Hofstede's organizational culture model using participant observation. On the basis of the conducted analysis, it can be indicated that the discussed hierarchical unit is characterized by a high power distance, collectivism, masculinity, a high degree of avoidance of uncertainty and short-term orientation in time. Such dimensions of organizational culture as: avoidance of uncertainty, collectivism and power distance have the greatest impact on the occurrence of a specific leadership style, and their verification should be an integral element of the exercised power in order to increase the level of structural security of the institution and personal security of members of this organization.

Keywords
structural security, personal security, security, organizational culture

Introduction

Nowadays, in organized activities, special importance is attached to the idea of leadership, which in the practice of superiors' and leaders' actions is able to give greater meaning and effect to individual, let alone collective efforts of people and to ensure the security of the institution. The multiplicity and variety of interpretations of leadership, its understanding, types and categories of influence, sources of human abilities or qualities necessary for leadership do not facilitate an unambiguous understanding of the phenomenon. For example, according to Barbara Kożusznik,[1] a leader is a person who has mastered the art of creating a vision and presenting it in an inspiring way to other members of the organization. A leader also may be defined as a person with the responsibility to influence one or more followers and direct them to achieve a set objective. While doing so, a leader has to be aware of the strength of each of his followers and identify the areas to be improved.[2] The vision unites leaders with their followers, is associated with good communication and trust.[3] According to Grzegorz Mazurkiewicz, a leader is a person who has the power to externalize the potential of others.[4] In this approach, leadership is a process, an important feature of an organization, its potential and capital. Thus, it can be indicated that the level of the organization's leadership potential is greater in those organizations where a larger number of employees participate in its activities, take responsibility for it, make decisions, play leadership roles by supporting other employees and participate in joint exercise of power.[5] Viewing leadership in social terms, it can be pointed out that it is "a special type of exercising power. Like power, leadership is relational, collective and goal-oriented,"[6] and emphasizing the psychological dimension, the ability of an individual to influence members of an organization, motivate them and enable them to contribute to the effectiveness and success of the organization of which they are members.[7] Fullan[8] claims that the real test of strong and effective leadership is when the leader is able to make sure that team members are focused and are moving in a meaningful direction within the organization. Ann T. Hilliard notices: "There are many definitions for leadership; however, a simple meaning of leadership is the art of motivating a group or team of people to work toward a common goal based on the needs of the organization or university."[9] However, regardless of the theoretical approach or the adopted leadership paradigm, it is necessary to point out the important role of leadership in building the potential of individuals and teams, as well as in shaping their organizational culture.

1. B. Kożusznik, *Zachowania człowieka w organizacji*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne 2002, p. 153.

2. B.E. Winston, K. Patterson, *An Integrative Definition of Leadership*, "International Journal of Leadership Studies", 2006, 1 (2), pp. 6–66.

3. B. Kożusznik, *Zachowania człowieka w...*, op. cit., pp. 6–66.

4. G. Mazurkiewicz, *Przywództwo edukacyjne: kierunki myślenia o roli dyrektora*, in: *Jakość edukacji. Różnorodne perspektywy*, ed. G. Mazurkiewicz, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 2012, p. 391.

5. Ibidem.

6. J. McGregor Burns, *Władza przywódcza*, in: *Władza i społeczeństwa*, ed. J. Szczupaczyński, Scholar 1995, p. 266.

7. J. Mączyński, *Diagnozowanie partycypacji decyzyjnej*, IPiS PAN 1998, pp. 55–56.

8. M. Fullan, *Principals as Leaders in a Culture of Change*, "Educational Leadership", Special Issue, 2002, pp. 1–15, http://www.michaelfullan.ca/Articles_02/03_02.htm, (access 16.05.2021).

9. A.T. Hilliard, *Student Leadership At The University*, "Journal of College Teaching & Learning", 2010, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 93. DOI: 10.19030/tlc.v7i2.93

Description of a hierarchical unit on the example of a civil-military educational institution

The hierarchical unit analysed in this study is a civil-military educational institution – organized in accordance with the Act of 20 May 2016 on the establishment of the War Studies University.[10] It was established on 1 October 2016, in place of another organization with the same educational and military specificity that was liquidated at that time. However, its direct heritage is the Higher School of Warfare, operating from 1919 to 1946. It is worth noting that during World War II, the Higher School of Warfare was moved to the United Kingdom together with the Polish Government-in-Exile, where it continued its educational activities in Scotland. The organization is the highest-ranking civil-military university in the territory of the Republic of Poland. It is a source of highly qualified commanders for military and government administration. However, the training cycle is continuous, which means that the organization does not educate candidates for an officer degree, but develops their skills and qualifications, which distinguishes it from other military universities, such as Military University of Technology, Military University of Land Forces, Military Aviation Academy or the Naval Academy. In line with the Development Strategy of the War Studies University for 2017-2022: "The Academy as a military university contributes to the development and consolidation of military security of the Republic of Poland, the EU and NATO by [...] training military and civilian personnel for the defense and security purposes, and shaping patriotic attitudes, democracy and respect for national traditions."[11]

In addition, the Academy also educates civilian students at the bachelor's, master's and doctoral degree level in social sciences in the field of security science and in the area of management and quality studies[12] at three faculties: National Security Department, Management and Command Department, Military Department, and two institutes: Institute of Law and Institute of Military History. Apart from the faculties and institutes, education is also provided by other organizational units of the Improvement Courses Division, which prepare courses for government administration and officers. The main teaching initiatives include Postgraduate Studies in Defense Policy, preparing candidates for the general's rank and are necessary to obtain this promotion. The Academy also runs language courses for both Polish and foreign students. In addition, the Foreign Language Centre of the organization in question prepares and examines students under the NATO STANAG 6001 standardization agreement, specifying the levels of proficiency in foreign languages required for cooperation within the North Atlantic Alliance.[13] "The teaching activity of the Academy aims at ensuring that its graduates have modern knowledge and are well prepared to perform tasks in the structures of the armed forces, public administration and institutions related to security and defense in the national and in-

10. Ustawa z dnia 20 maja 2016 r. o utworzeniu Akademii Sztuki Wojennej, Dz.U. 2016 poz. 906, [Act of 20 May 2016 on the establishment of the War Studies University, Journal of Laws 2016, item 906].

11. Strategia rozwoju Akademii Sztuki Wojennej na lata 2017-2022 (przyjęta uchwałą nr 17/2017 Senatu ASzWoj z dnia 15 marca 2017 r.), [Strategy for the development of the War Studies University for 2017-2022 (adopted by Resolution No. 17/2017 of the Senate of ASzWoj of 15 March 2017)], https://www.wojsko-polskie.pl/aszwoj/u/70/d6/70d6d8a3-6312-470a-b7bd-fc147dfdd996/nr_17-2017_z_15032017_r_ws_strate-gii_rozwoju_aszwoj_na_l_2017-2022.pdf, (access 16.05.2021).

12. Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 20 września 2018 r. w sprawie dziedzin nauki i dyscyplin naukowych oraz dyscyplin artystycznych, Dz.U. 2018 poz. 1818, [Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 20 September 2018 on scientific fields and disciplines and artistic disciplines, Journal of Laws 2018, item 1818].

13. NATO STANDARDIZATION, https://www.nato.int/structur/AC/135/50years_nato/chap-ters/2_standardization.htm, (access 16.05.2021).

ternational dimension."[14] The university also has the right to confer the degree of habilitated doctor in the field of social sciences in the area of security science.[15]

The War Studies University is a hierarchical unit. It is headed by the Rector-Commandant, directly reporting to whom are: Vice-Rector for Military Affairs, Vice-Rector for Scientific Affairs, Vice-Rector for Student Affairs and Chancellor, as well as three departments (Department of National Security, Department of Management and Command, Military Department) and two institutes (the Institute of Law and the Institute of Military History).[16]

From the very beginning of its operation, the organization put a stress on foreign cooperation to perform its basic functions. This was possible, *inter alia*, thanks to the fact that it had been created with the help of a French military mission, which provided the organization with experienced lecturers from other armies, including: Georgians, Ukrainians, Estonians, Latvians, one Japanese and one French. Moreover, the aforementioned predecessor of the organization directly inherited the tradition of the Academy of the General Staff, which also accepted foreign students from almost all communist countries. The only exception was the Armed Forces of the German Democratic Republic, with which the academy did not actively cooperate, which was a result of resentments dating back to World War II, deliberately kept up by the Soviet Union. The Polish-German relations within the organization improved in the 1990s, already with the predecessor of the current one, which is symbolized by the two oaks of friendship between both nations situated on the campus next to one of the buildings, which were planted by representatives of both armed forces. The Bundeswehr Liaison Officer, responsible for Polish-German cooperation, is also assigned to this organization.[17]

The essence of organizational culture

It is extremely important that leaders understand and know their roles in maintaining or developing an organizational culture. A deeply embedded and established culture illustrates how people should behave, which can help employees achieve their goals. This behavioural framework, in turn, ensures greater job satisfaction when an employee feels that the leader is helping them complete a goal.[18]

Before considering organizational culture, it is worth referring to the general definition of culture. Barbara Szacka[19] claims that culture distinguishes man from the natural world. "It means everything that is created by man, what is acquired by him through learning and passed on to other

14. Strategia rozwoju Akademii…, op. cit.

15. Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 20 września 2018 r. w sprawie dziedzin nauki i dyscyplin naukowych oraz dyscyplin artystycznych, Dz.U. 2018 poz. 1818, [Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 20 September 2018 on scientific fields and disciplines and artistic disciplines, Journal of Laws 2018, item 1818].

16. *Akademia Sztuki Wojennej*, https://www.wojsko-polskie.pl/aszwoj/, (access 16.05.2021).

17. R. Surgiewicz, *Zarys historii Akademii Sztabu Generalnego im. gen. broni Karola Świerczewskiego w latach 1947–1962*, "Wojskowy Przegląd Historyczny", 1962, No. 3 (39), pp. 3–40.

18. Y. Tsai, *Relationship between Organizational Culture, Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction*, "BMC Health Services Research", 2011, 11 (98), pp. 1–9. DOI: 10.1186/1472-6963-11-98

19. B. Szacka, *Wprowadzenie do socjologii*, Oficyna Naukowa 2008.

V.8

people and also to the next generations through non-genetic information."[20] On the other hand, Antonina Kłoskowska has pointed out that culture is based on a specific order of human life, its non-genetic nature, a way shaped by the historical experiences of human groups.[21] Culture is an order of collective human activities, but it differs in different societies with a different historical experience. From a sociological perspective, culture is simply a regulator of social practice. Thus, culture may be called a system of behavioural patterns, the behaviours themselves and their products that are created, acquired, transformed and applied in the process of social life.[22] Thus, culture consists of the patterns of behaviour, the behaviour itself, the products of these behaviours, values, ideas and principles.[23]

Taking intso account the deliberations of many authors, Marian Golka indicated the following important features of culture:

- It is an abstract concept;

- Although it is built on nature, uses and changes it; it is not nature or its element;

- It is acquired from other people during upbringing and cooperation, hence its basis is social inheritance;

- It is always common to a given number of people, a given group in which it functions and is associated with its social features;

- It is valid in a given community and is usually regarded by its members as valuable and desirable;

- Culture includes patterns of behaviour (values, ideas, rules), the behaviour itself and the products of behaviour;

- It is capable of breaking away from its direct producer, originator, inventor; it can also be adopted by other people and other communities;

- Surrounds people on all sides and almost all their behaviour is determined or co-determined by cultural patterns that are present in a given community and its culture;

20. Ibidem, p. 79.

21. A. Kłoskowska, *Kultura*, in: *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku*, ed. A. Kłoskowska, Wiedza o Kulturze 1991, p. 21.

22. G. Banaszak, J. Kmita, *Społeczno-regulacyjna koncepcja kultury*, Instytut Kultury 1991.

23. M. Golka, *Socjologia kultury*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar 2007, p. 55.

- It has the ability to last in time, while at the same time specific to it is its relative ability to adapt to the changing conditions, needs, experiences and generations;

- It creates a relatively integrated whole that is generally violated and transformed.[24]

Organizational culture is a specific type of culture, which can be understood as any behaviour of employees related to work problem solving and conflict resolution.[25] In other words, it is a set of specific norms, values and behaviours that shape interpersonal relations in a given organization.[26] Culture also includes an organization's vision, values, norms, systems, symbols, language, assumptions, beliefs, and habits.[27] Simply stated, organizational culture is "the way things are done around here."[28]

Organizational culture describes issues related to the specificity, identity and uniqueness of a company. It is a set of characteristics or traits that distinguishes an organization from other entities so that its employees can identify with it. It is also a set of beliefs, values, behaviours, attitudes and habits that help employees and associates better understand what an organization stands for, how it works and what are its priorities.[29] "Organizational culture illuminates the distinctive image of a given organization, creates a favourable opinion, gives consistency that protects against uncertainty, and guides the choice of priorities."[30]

The issue of organizational culture generates a number of epistemological, ontological and methodological doubts, hence it is difficult to describe it and indicate a single, effective method of cognition. Nevertheless, this concept is necessary to describe many processes that occur in an organization, including its security.[31] Therefore, various models of organizational culture emerge, among which worth mentioning are the following models: E.T. Hall (1976, 1981),[32] G. Hofstede (1980, 1997),[33] E.H. Schein (1985),[34] F. Trompenaars and Ch. Humpden-Turner (1997)[35] or K.S. Camerona and R.E. Quinna (1999, 2015).[36] In this study, due to the ease of observation and the multidimensional inference field possible in a selected organization, the Hofstede model has been used for analysis.

24. Ibidem, p. 54–59.

25. L. Jabłonowska, G. Myśliwiec, *Współczesna etykieta pracy*, Szkoła Główna Handlowa 2006, pp. 11–12.

26. M. Gitling, *Człowiek w organizacji: ludzie, struktury, organizacje*, Difin 2013, p. 251.

27. D. Needle, *Business in Context: An Introduction to Business and Its Environment*, Cengage Learning Business Press 2004.

28. T.E. Deal, A.A. Kennedy, *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life, Harmondsworth*, Perseus Books 2000.

29. E. Zimniewicz, *Współczesne koncepcje i metody zarządzania*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne 2003.

30. E. Stroińska, J. Trippner-Hrabi, *Rola kultury organizacyjnej w kształtowaniu efektywności organizacji*, "Studia i Prace WNEiZ", 2016, No. 44/3, p. 209. DOI: 10.18276/sip.2016.44/3-17

31. Ł. Sułkowski, *Kultura organizacyjna od podstaw*, Społeczna Akademia Nauk 2020, p. 49.

32. See: E.T. Hall, *Poza kulturą*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN 2001.

33. See: G. Hofstede, G.J. Hofstede, *Kultury i organizacje*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne 2007.

Geert Hofstede's model of organizational culture

Geert Hofstede's model of organizational culture originally referred to national culture, but nowadays it is also used in relation to organizational culture. In this approach, the essence of organizational culture are the values. However, most visible from the outside are: symbols, heroes (characters from organizational myths, identifying specific features that are exceptionally valued in a given organizational culture, and thus constituting a specific pattern of behaviour) and rituals, which have been included in a broader category of practices. The meaning of the practices is not clear to everyone, even though they are easy to notice. However, they are easily interpreted by members of a given organization. Moreover, the authors propose to perceive organizational culture as one of the levels of an individual's "mental programming," such as: human nature (universal vs. inherited), culture (group or category specific vs. acquired) and personality (individual vs. inherited and acquired).[37]

However, the most common analyses were carried out in the 1970s at the IBM group, thanks to the proposed concept based on the following dimensions: 1) power distance, 2) individualism – collectivism, 3) masculinity – femininity, 4) avoidance of uncertainty, 5) orientation in time.[38]

Power distance is understood as "the extent to which unequal distribution of power is accepted and expected as expressed by less influential members of an organization or institution."[39] It is also closely related to the subordinate-superior relationship and the influence exerted by people occupying higher positions in the hierarchy on people at lower ranks. It is worth pointing out that all societies are characterized by inequalities, though they differ in their aversion to this phenomenon. Moreover, in cultures with short power distance, people are seen as inherently equal, and all inequalities as regards access to power are opposed. Furthermore, for power to be exercised in an ethical and moral manner, constant scrutiny is necessary. In close-up organizational cultures, superiors and subordinates work together and they need each other to achieve goals. In turn, in cultures characterized by a large power distance, all inequalities between people are treated as justified and even desirable, thus ensuring social order. There, power is considered primary to morality, while superiors are unavailable and treat their subordinates as a constant threat that can take over power. For the safety of an organization in the sense of duration and survival, it seems justified to maintain a distance of power directly proportional to the degree of hierarchy.

Individualism vs collectivism is a dimension that characterizes an individual's relationship with a group, defines an individual's place in the group and the influence of the group on an individual's

34. See: E.H. Shein, *Organisational Culture and Leadership*, Jossey-Bass 1985.

35. See: A. Trompenaars, Ch. Hampden-Turner, *Siedem kultur kapitalizmu. USA, Japonia, Niemcy, Francja, Wielka Brytania, Szwecja, Holandia*, Oficyna Ekonomiczna 2006.

36. See: K.S. Cameron, R.E. Quinn, *Kultura organizacyjna – diagnoza i zmiana: model wartości konkurujących*, Oficyna Ekonomiczna 2003.

37. A. Wojtowicz, *Istota i modele kultury organizacyjnej – przegląd koncepcji*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Małopolskiej Wyższej Szkoły Handlowej w Tarnowie", 2004, No. 5, pp. 164–165.

38. G. Hofstede, G.J. Hofstede, *Kultury i organizacje*, op. cit.

39. Ibidem, p. 58.

behaviour. In individualistic societies, an individual is perceived in terms of a subject being an independent element of society. The ties between people are loose, and private life is a sphere in which other members of society should not interfere. In individualistic cultures, joining an organization is caused by the desire for personal achievement; individual initiatives and decisions are valued. On the other hand, collectivism emphasizes the role of a group (family, clan, nation), and the value of an individual is determined by their belonging to a group. What is important here is participation in a group, belonging to it and building ties and relationships that dominate the pursuit of an individual goal. In collectivist societies, there is also confidence in group decisions. One is also responsible for other members of one's group. Balanced relations within the group that form an organization will promote structural and personal security.

Masculinity vs femininity is a dimension that defines the extent to which social roles assigned (often stereotypically) to both sexes are required in a given culture. Male organizations are characterized by activity, aggressiveness, constant gaining and competition. Achieving professional success here requires determination, and the main motivator of actions by members of culture is ambition. Moreover, they identify themselves with the statement: "a man should rule, a woman – educate." On the other hand, in female organizations, building interpersonal bonds and focusing on other people dominate. Members of female cultures value gentle, sensitive and non-aggressive behaviour, and the main motivator for their actions is serving others. The superiors' thinking is characteristic here, according to which they should look after their subordinates, which ensures personal security and development opportunities for members of an organization.

Avoidance of uncertainty is a dimension of organizational (or national) culture that determines how to cope with and approach new, ambiguous and uncertain situations. It can also be assumed that it is an indicator of a society's sensitivity to change, new and unpredictable situations. Societies with a high degree of avoidance of uncertainty regard future as a threat and therefore believe that any new situations should be anticipated and prepared for. Absolute truths and everlasting values are sought. People feel fear that they try to overcome with advanced technology, lawmaking, establishing rules and regulations, and even referring to religion. In organizations with a high degree of avoidance of uncertainty, motivation is based on security, belonging and appreciation. Vertical careers predominate according to top-down, clear rules. Strong nationalism and perception of work as the highest value are also characteristic. On the other hand, in cultures with a low degree of avoidance of uncertainty, each new day is treated as one that brings about chal-

lenges, so it is an opportunity and a chance people wait for with openness. Differences of opinion are acceptable, and therefore anything that is different should be treated with due respect and tolerance. In organizations with a low degree of avoidance of uncertainty, motivation is based on the need of achievement and recognition. Promotion can be vertical and horizontal here, hence career paths are usually "zigzag." It is worth emphasizing that avoiding uncertainty means avoiding risk, which directly translates into increased safety. However, we can only talk about security in a narrow sense, i.e. as the lack of threats. It does not seem possible to ensure conditions for the development of an organization and its members, i.e. full structural and personal security.

Time orientation defines attitude towards short-term and long-term goals and development of qualities that will make it possible to benefit in the future or to nurture the past and present, and therefore can be long or short term. Long-term oriented organizations are characterized by persistence and systematic efforts to achieve their goals. They are willing to subordinate everything to this objective. At the same time, they respect circumstances and strive to adapt to the changing conditions of the modern world. In turn, building and maintaining interpersonal relationships are dominated by the principle of status and perseverance. On the other hand, in short-term-oriented organizations, there is an expectation of quick results of actions taken. They are also characterized by the presence of strong social pressure on the behaviour imitating the behavioural patterns, which is closely related to the observance of the principle of "saving face."[40] For the security of an organization and its members, the long-term perspective seems to be much more favourable.

40. Ibidem.

An analysis of a hierarchical organization under Hofstede's organizational culture model on the example of the War Studies University.

When analysing the organization concerned in terms of Hofstede's organizational culture model, all dimensions of this model were characterized on the basis of participant observation. It is worth pointing out that this description was based on the available information, and despite all efforts to maintain scientific objectivity and holistic view of the issue, most likely it was not without fragmentary aspects. Nevertheless, it may be a contribution to further analyses in this area. Referring to the first dimension of Hofstede's organizational culture model, it may be pointed out that the War Studies University is characterized by a large power distance. The employees of the organization are not perceived as equals, and all inequalities between people are treated as justified due to the education and career advancement of employees. It is a hierarchical entity in which a strictly defined

system of social roles ensures harmony and social order, hence it is accepted and even desirable. At the same time, it is a source of certainty and predictability of the rights and duties in a strictly defined professional stratification. Authority is most important here, and at the same time primary to morality. The superiors are unavailable, do not trust their subordinates and treat them as potential candidates who could take over his power.

The entity is characterized by collectivism. The importance of the role of a professional group is essential, and therefore all activities for the benefit of the group are rewarded, while individual decisions and aspirations meet with disapproval. Thus, the value of individual employees determines their belonging and loyalty to the group. Various actions are also taken to increase the sense of belonging, such as the requirement of a strictly defined dress code (military uniform for officers and representative uniform for civilian employees), the scenario of behaviour in various situations is also precisely indicated, and messages are formulated in terms of "we." By means of various activities for the sake of the organization, joint execution of tasks, or frequent business trips, also longer and international ones, not only task-related, but also keeping up the social dimension of the functioning of the group, a sense of responsibility for its other members is created. Ties and relationships that enter the realm of private life are also built. In addition, trust is placed in group decisions, which is confirmed by adopting resolutions or decisions at various meetings, such as the Senate, the Discipline Board, the Honours Committee, the Discipline Committee, and others. A certain individualistic tendency may be noticed when some decisions lie within the competence of the person exercising central authority, which is manifested in the orders of the Rector-Commandant, although they are also the result of the work of various teams.

In terms of the third dimension of Hofstede's organizational culture, one notices distinct masculinity of the War Studies University, in which both sexes are stereotypically assigned their typical social roles. This tendency is gradually changing due to the increasing number of women serving in the military and holding managerial positions. Nevertheless, women are seen here as weaker, less task-oriented, requiring care, support and respect, while men are perceived as efficient, task-oriented and firm. In addition, competitive and aggressive behaviour can be observed in the daily functioning of the organization, which is especially visible in the ambitious pursuit of planned goals.

The organization is characterized by a high degree of avoidance of uncertainty, hence activities are constantly carried out to prepare for future threats (military, unconventional, hybrid and

others). For this purpose, training is conducted, various plans and patterns of behaviour are redefined, and laws, rules and regulations are constantly being enacted. In many situations, there is also a reference to religion and nationalism, which can be observed in the participation of members of the organization in holy masses on the occasion of various religious and national holidays, or the support of employees with the activities of a chaplain, as well as their respect for national symbols and colours. Work is the topmost value, therefore employees are motivated by rewarding them for the efficient performance of tasks. There is no respect and tolerance towards people who fail to fulfil these tasks. Vertical careers, which are carried out in accordance with precisely defined rules, are the main focus here.

The short-term orientation is specific for the analysed hierarchical unit. It is a paradigm of activities oriented towards closer goals, hence special care is given to the past and the present, which is visible in the respect for the traditions, achievements of past generations and national holidays. This respect is also visible in the design of the organization's material base, in which there are numerous plaques and photos, decorations of various employees are displayed, and the national emblem is hung in most of the rooms. The organization is also distinguished by the expectation of quick results of the actions taken, which is reflected in the maxim: "task-execution." Procedures imitating the adopted patterns of behaviour are also emphasized, which is visible during drills, reporting, organization of briefings, or observance of various ceremonies.

Conclusion

Leadership plays an important role in shaping the organizational culture of individuals and teams in various enterprises, which in turn translates into structural security of a given institution and personal security of its members.

The cognitive value of the indicated model of organizational culture consists in showing which of its components are "alive" and "useful" in the daily life of the hierarchical unit discussed. Moreover, this model shows organizational culture as a result of the perceptions of its participants as well as external observers. This approach is possible due to the fact that each individual has a certain pattern of feeling, thinking and behaviour, which he or she acquire via various forms of life, including professional life.

Based on the analysis, it may be indicated that the organization in question is characterized by a large power distance, collectivism, masculinity, high degree of avoidance of uncertainty, short-term orientation in time.

A large power distance is the basis of its functioning. In this regard, it would be worth making efforts, the essence of which would be to reduce inequalities in access to power, at least among the managerial staff. Thanks to such gestures to achieve goals, superiors and subordinates would work together and would feel that they are needed. This would reduce inequalities and disproportions resulting from the formal dimension of exercised power. Moreover, reducing the power distance due to the fact that it is closely related to building a relationship between the subordinate and the superior would have a significant impact on effective leadership in the analysed organization. In longer term, this could help to improve personal security of the members of the organization.

Collectivism is not specific to Polish culture. In the context of leadership, it can be assumed that the actions of the person in power are group-oriented. It seems reasonable to step up individualistic tendencies in respect of an individual as an independent being, although the aforementioned collectivism serves well for structural security of the organization, which, due to the role and place of the War Studies University in the state security system, may have a positive impact on improving national security.

Masculinity means that roles are stereotypically assigned to both genders. The reason for this is history and tradition, which proves that the uniformed service and professional work, and even more so managerial positions, are assigned to men. It seems worth considering here the need for superiors to pay more attention to employees' competences, knowledge and skills than to their gender and the schematic features assigned to it. Such a change could positively affect improvement of security in its broadest sense, i.e. by creating conditions for the development of the organization and its staff.

There is a high degree of avoidance of uncertainty. Thus, It can be concluded that this organization is more likely to be violent, aggressive, emotional and intolerant, as well as motivated by a sense of security, belonging and recognition. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to make efforts to ensure that motivation is also based on the need of achievement and recognition, which would increase the efficiency of the organization and its security.

The organisation is characterised by short-term orientation in time. Therefore, it would be worth considering actions aimed at not changing this dimension completely, as it would be impossible due to the historical conditions of the organization. The recommendation may concern taking a long-term orientation in certain activities. It seems that such strategy would be justified especially in the pursuit of a goal, which would increase perseverance and systematic activities aimed at its implementation and would positively affect structural security of the organization.

On the basis of the conducted analysis, it is also worth pointing out that such dimensions of organizational culture as: avoidance of uncertainty, collectivism and power distance are the ones that have the greatest impact on the occurrence of a specific leadership style and whose verification should be an integral element of the exercise of power. Moreover, in the context of the above analyses, it seems interesting and cognitively valuable to conduct research on the importance of leadership in various types of organizations, including hierarchical units. The results of the research, and consequently their practical applications, may significantly contribute to the increase in the effectiveness of individuals and teams working in them and raise the level of personal and structural security.

Bibliography

Akademia Sztuki Wojennej, https://www.wojsko-polskie.pl/aszwoj/, (access 16.05.2021).

Banaszak G., Kmita J., *Społeczno-regulacyjna koncepcja kultury*, Instytut Kultury 1991.

Cameron K.S., Quinn R.E., *Kultura organizacyjna – diagnoza i zmiana: model wartości konkurujących*, Oficyna Ekonomiczna 2003.

Deal T.E., Kennedy A.A., *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life, Harmondsworth*, Perseus Books 2000.

Fullan M., *Principals as Leaders in a Culture of Change*, "Educational Leadership", Special Issue, 2002, pp. 1–15, http://www.michaelfullan.ca/Articles_02/03_02.htm, (access 16.05.2021).

Gitling M., *Człowiek w organizacji: ludzie, struktury, organizacje,* Difin 2013.

Golka M., *Socjologia kultury*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar 2007.

V.8

Hall E.T., *Poza kulturą*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN 2001.

Hilliard A.T., *Student Leadership At The University*, "Journal of College Teaching & Learning", 2010, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 93–98. DOI: 10.19030/tlc.v7i2.93

Hofstede G., Hofstede G.J., *Kultury i organizacje*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne 2007.

Jabłonowska L., Myśliwiec G., *Współczesna etykieta pracy*, Szkoła Główna Handlowa 2006.

Kłoskowska A., *Kultura*, in: *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku*, ed. A. Kłoskowska, Wiedza o Kulturze 1991, p. 21.

Kożusznik B., *Zachowania człowieka w organizacji*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne 2002.

Mazurkiewicz G., *Przywództwo edukacyjne: kierunki myślenia o roli dyrektora*, in: *Jakość edukacji. Różnorodne perspektywy*, ed. G. Mazurkiewicz, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 2012, pp. 389–399.

Mączyński J., *Diagnozowanie partycypacji decyzyjnej*, IPiS PAN 1998.

McGregor Burns J., *Władza przywódcza*, in: *Władza i społeczeństwa*, ed. J. Szczupaczyński, Scholar 1995, pp. 261–273.

NATO STANDARDIZATION, https://www.nato.int/structur/AC/135/50years_nato/chapters/2_standardization.htm, (access 16.05.2021).

Needle D., *Business in Context: An Introduction to Business and Its Environment*, Cengage Learning Business Press 2004.

Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 20 września 2018 r. w sprawie dziedzin nauki i dyscyplin naukowych oraz dyscyplin artystycznych, Dz.U. 2018 poz. 1818, [Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 20 September 2018 on scientific fields and disciplines and artistic disciplines, Journal of Laws 2018, item 1818].

Shein E.H., *Organisational Culture and Leadership*, Jossey-Bass 1985.

Strategia rozwoju Akademii Sztuki Wojennej na lata 2017-2022 (przyjęta uchwałą nr 17/2017 Senatu ASzWoj z dnia 15 marca 2017 r.), [Strategy for the development of the War Studies University for 2017-2022 (adopted by Resolution

No. 17/2017 of the Senate of ASzWoj of 15 March 2017)], https://www.wojsko-polskie.pl/aszwoj/u/70/d6/70d6d8a3-6312-470a-b7bd-fc147dfdd996/nr_17-2017_z_15032017_r_ws_strategii_rozwoju_aszwoj_na_l_2017-2022.pdf, (access 16.05.2021).

Stroińska E., Trippner-Hrabi J., *Rola kultury organizacyjnej w kształtowaniu efektywności organizacji*, "Studia i Prace WNEiZ", 2016, No. 44/3, pp. 209–218. DOI: 10.18276/sip.2016.44/3-17

Sułkowski Ł., *Kultura organizacyjna od podstaw*, Społeczna Akademia Nauk 2020.

Surgiewicz R., *Zarys historii Akademii Sztabu Generalnego im. gen. broni Karola Świerczewskiego w latach 1947–1962*, "Wojskowy Przegląd Historyczny", 1962, No. 3 (39), pp. 3–40.

Szacka B., *Wprowadzenie do socjologii,* Oficyna Naukowa 2008.

Trompenaars A., Hampden-Turner Ch., *Siedem kultur kapitalizmu. USA, Japonia, Niemcy, Francja, Wielka Brytania, Szwecja, Holandia*, Oficyna Ekonomiczna 2006.

Tsai Y., *Relationship between Organizational Culture, Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction*, "BMC Health Services Research", 2011, 11 (98), pp. 1–9. DOI: 10.1186/1472-6963-11-98

Ustawa z dnia 20 maja 2016 r. o utworzeniu Akademii Sztuki Wojennej, Dz.U. 2016 poz. 906, [Act of 20 May 2016 on the establishment of the War Studies University, Journal of Laws 2016, item 906].

Winston B.E., Patterson K., *An Integrative Definition of Leadership*, "International Journal of Leadership Studies", 2006, 1 (2), pp. 6–66.

Wojtowicz A., *Istota i modele kultury organizacyjnej – przegląd koncepcji*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Małopolskiej Wyższej Szkoły Handlowej w Tarnowie", 2004, No. 5, pp. 159–171.

Zimniewicz E., *Współczesne koncepcje i metody zarządzania*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne 2003.

V.8