THE IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN CLUSTER MANAGEMENT

In the article the emphasis was placed on the characteristics of a business cluster, that is a community of people and organizations belonging to a given social and economic environment, which is connected by means of social, organizational, formal and informal ties basing on co-opetition. There has been presented the significance of the cluster as an organization created as a result of cluster initiative of various sectors’ representatives: business, science, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and local government. Due to the diversity of the systems of values, standards, symbols, and patterns of behavior of particular cluster partners, there was indicated the role of organizational culture in the cluster development process. The author also emphasizes that organizational culture of a cluster is the key factor conditioning the development of social capital within a cluster, since it is conducive to the improvement of the quality of interpersonal relationships, intraorganizational relationships, cooperation abilities, organizational climate and mutual trust. Moreover, it indicates that social capital of a cluster, which results from loyalty and the ability of this structure’s members to cooperate efficiently aiming to attain individual and common objectives, is a factor that determines the permanency of functioning and the development of a cluster.
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1. INTRODUCTION

One of the key challenges in the process of cluster management is the efficient use of the diversity of cluster members, aiming to strengthen its competitiveness. The diversity, which is usually reflected by the differences within: personal culture, system of values, tradition, the form of capital ownership, undertaken market activities, the potential of tangible and intangible resources, is a common phenomenon in clusters. It necessitates this diversity of partners to be taken into consideration and used in the decisive processes in the category of new possibilities, strong points, which create solid bases for undertaking more efficient strategic activities, which can be conducive to cluster development and the creation of new trends in the management of social potential.

The aim of the present paper is to characterize organizational culture of business clusters, which are a form of multicultural organizations in terms of forming social capital within their area. Owing to a complex structure and the mechanism of action of these organizations, there was indicated the possibility of integration of multicultural society on the basis of a common organizational culture. It was emphasized that it usually encompasses such common elements as: values, behavior, intentions, standards, which were identified as a result of reciprocal interactions of the members. Assuming that the market subjects which function within a cluster are capable of achieving more, particularly when they are trustworthy and when they themselves trust others, it was agreed that the greatest...
potential in the process of objective attainment are displayed by those clusters whose social capital is based on trust and cooperation.

The reflections, the outline of which has been presented in the paper, were based on the analysis of the selected results of theoretical and empirical research. The empirical research comprised mainly the analysis of the codes of ethics of 10 selected clusters, aiming to identify the key elements of their organizational culture, namely the standards and values being declared. For the purpose of the research, two theses were proposed, according to which cluster’s organizational culture: reinforces the integration and the consistency of the actions of this organization’s members in terms of the realization of the common objectives, and has profound influence on the development of social capital.

2. BUSINESS CLUSTER AS A MULTICULTURAL ORGANIZATION

A business cluster constitutes an example of an organization which is characterized by a high level of mutual relationships (formal and informal) between the partners of the sector of business, science and public administration, a sense of reciprocal obligations and subordination to one decisive center (most frequently – the coordinator). Its concept suggests a connection and association of firms that are linked vertically and horizontally through their commonalities and complementariness in products, services, inputs, technologies, knowledge, transportation, warehouse, communications and cooperation. According to P. Morosini, a cluster is a socio-economic organization that is distinguished by the coexistence of a social community of people and business entities, which cooperate and compete with one another in certain areas, and which are located in close vicinity, a certain region. J.W. Kessels clearly emphasizes that the social context of an organization should counterbalance the potential risk of unilateral self-centeredness of an individual and should foster networks that find their cohesion through mutual attractiveness, reciprocal appeal, shared interest, and passion of their members.

Usually, empirical and theoretical studies identify the peculiarity of a cluster as the result of a high concentration of actors linked by familiarity relations in a given local area, where strong closed social networks can create trust necessary to encourage profitable social-economic forms of collaboration. In sociological terms, a cluster can be treated as a community orientated towards the identification and realization of common goals, comparatively isolated from a turbulent environment, which is characterized by the advantage of formally organized relationships, and which sustains internal balance by means of social control of participants’ behaviors such as values, standards, beliefs and symbols, which decide upon the characteristics of organizational culture. In this case a community can be conceptualized as sets of relations between organizational forms or as places where

---

organizations are located in resource space or in geography. An organizational population usually is defined as the set of organizations manifesting an organizational form. Definitions of organizational form vary, but they share a common feature: they set population boundaries indicating which organizations are in the population in question and which are not. Owing to the diversity of this community, a cluster is an example of a multicultural organization, which came into being as a result of cooperation and the coexistence of a number of independent cultures. Simultaneously, this multiculturalism of a cluster creates added value since multicultural organizations:

- have an advantage in attracting and retaining the best talent;
- are able to attract and retain qualified minority key group members and keep faith with them through fair and equitable career advancement treatments, gain competitive advantage and derive high quality human resources dividends;
- are better suited to serve a diverse external clientele in a more increasingly global market;
- have better understanding of the requirements of the legal, political, social, economic and cultural environments of foreign nations;
- in research-oriented and hi-tech industries, the broad base of talents generated by a gender-and ethnic-diverse organization becomes a priceless advantage;
- are better at problem solving, possess better ability to extract expanded meanings, and are more likely to display multiple perspectives and interpretations in dealing with complex issues;
- tend to possess more organizational flexibility, and are better able to adapt to new changes.

A. Sales and P. Mirvis argue that an organization which simply contains many different cultural groups is just a plural organization, but it is considered multicultural only if the organization values this diversity. It should be noted that heterogeneous teams members of clusters enjoy an enhanced capacity for creative problem solving as they connect people with different sets of contacts, skills, information, and experiences at one place.

The cultures of cluster members may be different in spite of sharing the same system of fundamental values in a cluster. A considerable cultural diversity of cluster partners does not constitute a barrier to creating one common organizational culture (the so-called metaculture). Hence, cluster management, as a coherent socio-technical system, which, in spite of possessing certain areas of openness and ability to absorb otherness, requires that one culture becomes the ‘core’ and the others its supplements in order to create new ‘metaculture’, which integrates cluster members.

---

7 Ibidem, p. 145.
3. MULTIDIMENSIONAL NATURE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The notion of organizational culture was established on the basis of the theories which explain why culture exists, what constitutes its essence and in what way human life depends on a concrete culture. E.A. Garcea aptly emphasizes that culture is like blood: it flows in our body, but we do not usually see it; it keeps us alive as social beings, but we tend to forget about it; it shapes our living, but we are not normally aware of it. In the literature there is a variety of approaches to defining and interpreting the notion of organizational culture. It ensues even from great complexity and ambiguity of the term itself as well as from the diversification of scientists’ expectations concerning the possibility of explaining organizational phenomena in the categories of cultural analysis. Hence, organizational culture is described as:

- the normative beliefs (i.e., system of values) and shared behavioral expectations (i.e., system of norms) in an organization;
- patterns of shared values and beliefs developed which produce behavioral norms that are adopted in solving problems;
- a system of shared values (what is important) and beliefs (how things work) that interact with company’s people, organization structures, and control systems to produce behavioral norms (the way we do things around here);
- a pattern of shared beliefs and values that give the members of an institution a meaning, and provide them with the rules of behavior in their organization;
- assumptions and beliefs of managers and employees;
- collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one organization from another;
- a socially constructed phenomenon; a human product which is shared by people belonging to various groups – different groups create different cultures.

A complex approach to defining organizational culture was presented by E. Schein. According to him, organizational culture is a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. Basing on the results of his research, he stated that organizational culture exists simultaneously on three levels:

---
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assumptions represent taken-for-granted beliefs about reality and human nature. As the foundations determining the character of organizational culture, they refer to human nature, interpersonal relations, understanding of truth, organization itself as well as its relationship with environment. They constitute the deepest, so the firmest and the most difficult to identify, level of organizational culture;

values and social principles, philosophies, goals, and standards considered to have intrinsic worth;

artifacts are the visible, tangible, and audible results of activity grounded in values and assumptions.

Considering the above levels, it can be concluded that organizational culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment of artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and attached values\(^\text{17}\).

Influenced by organizational culture, within organizations there is formed organizational climate, which refers to the process of perceiving the environment of an organization and appraising it by organization’s members. Hence, organizational climate can be regarded as the expression of underlying cultural practices that arise in response to contingencies in the organization’s internal and external environment\(^\text{18}\). A.P. Jones and L.R. James derived six dimensions of this climate: leadership facilitation and support; workgroup co-operation, friendliness and warmth; conflict and ambiguity; professional and organizational esprit; job challenge, importance and variety; mutual trust\(^\text{19}\).

E. Schein many times stresses that organizational culture is the set of shared values, beliefs, and norms that influence the way employees think, feel, and behave in the workplace\(^\text{20}\). Organisational culture gives organisations a sense of identity and determines, through the organisation’s legends, rituals, beliefs, meanings, values, norms and language, the way in which “things are done around here”\(^\text{21}\). Organisational culture is made up of more ‘superficial’ aspects such as patterns of behaviour and observable symbols and ceremonies, and more deep seated and underlying values, assumptions and beliefs\(^\text{22}\). Y. Allaire and M.E. Firsiroutu argue, that the type culture is a powerful tool for interpreting organizational life and behaviour and for understanding the processes of decay, adaptation and radical change in organizations\(^\text{23}\).

According to D.L. Nelson and J.C. Quick, organizational culture plays key functions: gives members a sense of identity, increases their commitment, reinforces organizational


\(^\text{19}\) A.P. Jones, L.R. James, *Psychological climate: dimensions and relationships of individual and aggregated work environment perceptions*, “Organizational Behavior and Human Performance”, Vol. 23, 1979, p. 20.
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values, and serves as a control mechanism for shaping behavior\textsuperscript{24}. Fundamentally, organisational culture fulfils two basic functions in a cluster, namely external and internal ones, which are expressed in the way of the adjustment of this organisation to the changes of the external environment, as well as the scope of internal integration, the manner of internal coordination and regulation. As a complex structure, mainly of internal connections, it is a link between the present and the past of an organisation, maintaining in this way its continuity; it also\textsuperscript{25}:

- can provide conflict resolution, coordination and control, reduction of uncertainty, motivation, performance, a competitive advantage and a source of high reliability,
- provides a way for organisational members to meet and get along, and newcomers are required to learn the accepted behaviours, socialise and integrate into organisations,
- is helpful to organisation performance since it can serve as a significant driver of change management and high performance in the long run in the current global turbulent business environment.

A good practice in the clusters under scrutiny, within the scope of forming their organisational culture, is the creation of the codes of ethics. It ensues from the analysis of the selected codes of ethics that the key values and beliefs in clusters are\textsuperscript{26}:

- fair-play rule, partnership, care of and responsibility for a proper image of a cluster; establishment of relationship between the cluster members in an atmosphere of honesty, trust, respect, tolerance, understanding and benevolence, loyalty; confidentiality of strategic information, intellectual capital development. The investigated clusters preclude the possibility of undertaking unlawful actions, actions at the edge of the law, unethical actions, or actions breaking the commonly accepted moral rules. Their fundamental aim is to realize common objectives and simultaneously engage in the team work, contribute to the creation of an atmosphere of an activity based on trust, professionalism, efficiency, respect for others and self-esteem.

The analysed clusters indicate that their codes of ethics aim to bound the mission and vision of a cluster with indisputable values, which support internal and external relationships with key stakeholders. A cluster’s society, sticking to the above mentioned rules and values, contributes to the creation of an integrated level of cooperation orientated towards the development of a cluster as a whole. It allows determining cluster borders, which enables better understanding of one’s own role in the implementation of missions, visions and strategic objectives. A code of ethics, constituting the ethical foundations of organisational culture, determines solid basis of social existence in a cluster, and, on the other hand, it requires from the members of this organization to acknowledge and conform to the common patterns of thinking and behaving.

To summarize, it is suggested that every cluster has its own unique culture or a set of values, and different clusters may have its own comprehension of the meaning of cul-
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ture. The cluster as an entrepreneurial organization, is a set of experiences and values of particular entities, including people who create it and work there. Simultaneously, it is believed that its organizational culture is a specific genetic code of cluster’s society, a sign of its identity. It is also a system of fundamental patterns of behavior, assumptions and values, which were identified as common ones for a cluster. This culture is gradually assimilated and accepted consciously as well as subconsciously, influencing the aspirations, attitudes and behavior of particular members of this organization. Owing to that, it ensures sustainable integration of its members, and the consensus within the scope of the way of acting and the balance in intra- and interorganizational relationships. Moreover, it is conducive to the creation of efficient cluster architecture, enabling the assessment of the changes in the environment and making rational decisions. Organizational culture of a cluster works as a social glue to bond its internal stakeholders (members, employees) together and make them feel a strong part of the organizational experience, which is useful to retain only the best units, and attract new key stakeholders. It is very useful to assist in the cluster management process; helps the members to understand the organizational events, projects and objectives, which enhances the efficiency and effectiveness of the activity of this organization.

4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL – A BASIS FOR CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT

The formation process of cluster’s organizational culture influences the formation of social capital determined by cultural traditions, standards of social behavior or the bases which are conducive to cooperation. It ensues from the fact that organizational culture does not exist in a vacuum and still has a considerable influence on the formation of institutional factors, which support the development of social capital, understood as a special kind of a common good, which serves to fulfil socio-economic needs of the cluster members.

The concept of social capital, adopted from the theory of sociology, becomes more and more significant in the world of economy and management, which enables a broader look in solving organisational problems of an enterprise, concerning the relationships with stakeholders. Despite the fact that in the majority of the categories of social sciences, there is a lack of an unambiguous attitude towards defining social capital, its key descriptions can be indicated:

---

a resource, because it involves the expectation of reciprocity, and goes beyond any
given individual to involve wider networks whose relationships are governed by a high
degree of trust and shared values;
resources embedded in individual relationships;
a resource to collective action, which may lead to a broad range of outcomes, of varying
social scale;
a sum of resources, actual or virtual that accrues to an individual or a group by virtue
of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual
acquaintance and recognition;
the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through, and
derived from the network of relationships possessed by an individual or a social unit;
a group of assets that can be shared when group norms are enforced;
a combination of a network size, the relationship strength, and the resources possessed
by those in the network;
the right kind of connectivity,
investment in social relations by individuals, through which they gain access to embed-
ded resources to enhance expected returns of instrumental or expressive actions;
features of a social organization such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate
co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit;
something more than the sum of various kinds of relationships that we entertain, and a
social capital lens. Therefore, it can reveal the features of reality that otherwise remain
invisible.

According to B. Rothstein and D. Stolle the term ‘social’ implies that it captures the
interaction between people, and ‘capital’ indicates that it should be understood as an asset
of an individual, or a group that comes from relations with others. At the individual level
B. Rothstein and D. Stolle argue that ‘social capital’ refers to two different dimensions:
the number of relations that can be used as an asset by the individual, and his or her values
and attitudes. This kind of capital differs from other types of capital in the sense that it is
neither an individual asset (like human capital) nor a business asset (like traditional capital).
G. Loury, P. Bourdieu and J. Coleman argued that social capital is defined by its
function and is not embodied in any particular person, but it is rather embedded in peo-
ple’s social relationships. N. Lin’s notion of social capital contains three aspects: re-
sources embedded in a social structure - the structural (embeddedness); accessibility to
such social resources by individuals - opportunity (accessibility); the use or mobilization
of such social resources by individuals in purposive actions - action-oriented (use) as-
pects.
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Having regard to the nature of the theory of social capital, it can be assumed that industrial clusters are different from these traditional explanations in a sense that there is a belief that such clusters reflect not simply economic responses to the pattern of profitable opportunities and complementarities but also a peculiar level of embeddedness and social integration. Ch. Boari and M. Presutti emphasize that the industrial cluster is always seen as a privileged place for the creation of social interfirm networks because of the presence of trust and informality in the economic transactions of co-located actors that are facilitated by their proximity.

The issue of creating social capital constitutes a fundamental problem solved not only within clusters but also in the economy of a region or a country. The process of creating this kind of capital is long-lasting, has a few stages and is directly connected to the development of trust between people and organisations, identification and respect for the standards and common values, orientation towards cooperation and coordination. In this process trust has particular significance; it ensues from common values, beliefs, education or group membership. This term is defined as believing that the other party will behave in our best interests; an important lubricant of a social system; an important component, which makes teamwork, intra-organizational cooperation, inter-organizational partnerships stable and continuous; an attitude that allows decision makers to be vulnerable to harm in the interest of a perceived benefit; a risk management tool; expectation on the capability, goodwill, and self-reference visible in mutually beneficial behavior enabling cooperation under risk. Hence, building trust comprises: rightness, safety, respect, integrity, justice, altruism, acceptance, harmony, faithfulness. According to J.K. Rempel, J.G. Holmes and M.P. Zanna, there are three dimensions of trust, namely:

- a possibility of predicting partners' behaviour;
- a possibility of counting on a partner, i.e. their honesty, sincerity, openness;
- faith in a partner based on tangible elements ensuing from past experiences.

Practitioners and theoreticians of management emphasise the fact that trust, which in business refers to the relationships between business entities, also being an inherent element of efficient functioning of their interiors, is always reflected in the relations between people, constituting an extremely significant aspect of social ties. It is people who repre-
sent organisations, undertake actions in them; it is them on whom the future of these organisations depends. L.W. Zacher emphasises that trust, to function as a social mechanism, must be connected to a moral, political, legal (abuse of trust can have legal dimension) responsibility of the partners of a relation.41

The development of trust is achieved mainly by gradual development of mutual understanding between the participants of a relation. The factors that condition trust development are, among others, keeping words and promises people make, reliability, solidity, punctuality, lack of manipulation. Essential for building trust is an open communication/transparency between the key actors (is a building block both for such natural processes and for a cluster)42. According to T. Andersson, S.S. Serger, J. Sörvik and E.W. Hansson, in successful clusters, this task of nurturing trust typically succeeds in broadening the number of committed actors and keeping the cluster open, outward-oriented, and prone to incorporate more than just a limited group of actors.43 A high level of trust is conducive to the integration, increases the intensity of contacts, facilitates mutual agreement, builds partnership. Trust in interpersonal relations translates into: the will to work in a group and the ability to cooperate; will to create groups spontaneously, without any external command and control power, permanence and the size of industrial undertakings; economic order; culture, mission, vision; flexibility, swiftness of actions; alliances’ creation, the ability to create network organisations; strategy and management.44 Moreover, trust plays an important role in reducing transaction costs and creating a strategic advantage within a cluster.45 It also reduces the complexity and uncertainty of future events.46

Social capital in a cluster is not created through rational investment decisions as institutional and cultural factors are here of greater significance; these are: common values and interests, generally accepted principles, common experiences and cherished traditions. The creation of this capital within a cluster necessitates adequate communication, the acceptance of moral standards of this community, also respecting such rules as: loyalty, solidarity, honesty, reliability. Particular activities for the benefit of the efficient creation of social capital within a cluster should engage all members of this organisation, according to the adopted strategy. It is important that this kind of activity is performed by the partners independently of the position they occupy in the cluster structure. The efforts expended commonly for the benefit of strengthening social capital have more chances that they will be successful in a situation in which a cluster coordinator as well as a leader support grassroots initiatives of this sort and undertake intense activity to implement them.

43 Ibidem.
5. CONCLUSION

Business clusters represent concentrated, flexible, multi-dimensional networks of organizations e.g. companies, universities, vocational schools, research and development institutes, banks, government institutions, professional organizations, other non-government organizations etc. which are potentially long lasting competitive on the national and global market, develop both competition and cooperation relationships (co-opetition) between the members (internal stakeholders). The development management of cluster is a complex informative-decisive process focused on achieving information, on new development possibilities (opportunities, chances) and the continuous attempt to find and implement new solutions (changes), which enable the maximisation of the value and strength of this organisation.

Considering the fact that the cluster as an entrepreneurial organization is a set of experience and values of particular entities, including people who constitute and function in this organization, it was stated that cluster organizational culture can be a collection of standards and values, thinking, symbols, collectively accepted meanings, fixed ways of behaving, and a system of assumptions that is common for the cluster members. This culture, as a specific genetic code of cluster members, can cause repetitiveness of behaviors, emotions, individual as well as collective ideas. It can also be a mechanism ensuring and redressing the cluster balance, since it is conducive to the creation of its architecture, enabling proper prioritization of the reality, and drawing attention to things that are important, and the ones that are insignificant for its development.

It ensues from the theoretical and empirical research that organisational culture of a cluster influences the creation of social capital. Its power, scope and structure decide upon the efficiency of cooperation, effectiveness of communication, permanence of integration around the commonly realised objectives. It gives a cluster otherness, uniqueness, identity, which distinguishes it in the environment, owing to which it is perceived by stakeholders differently than the other clusters. Moreover, it causes that the members of this organisation feel the sense of this identity and otherness. Underestimating the significance of organisational culture in the process of cluster management can result in low efficiency of undertaken activities, lack of organisation’s cohesion, or stagnation in the development. The functioning of a cluster in the conditions of a turbulent environment creates not only the need but the necessity of maintaining this efficiently working internal system, which consists of technical and social subsystems, and to which organisational culture serves as an ‘adhesive’.

According to Y. Dong, J. Jin, R. Yang and S. Wu social capital in the industry cluster is kind of interactive relationship between enterprises and economic participators. Social capital, treated as a resource, a process as well as a structure, more and more frequently becomes the factor determining the success of the process of formulation and realization of effective strategies of cluster development. It ensues from the fact that this capital constitutes the basis of intra- and inter- organizational and personal relationships which are reflected, among others, in the processes of organizational learning, including knowledge.

---

transfer and development, permanent absorption and generation of innovations. O. Karakayaci indicates that social capital is one of the main components which facilitates learning and knowledge absorption of industrial clusters in general and which facilitates learning and knowledge absorption process of firms in special.

Social capital, which constitutes a certain set of skills and abilities, standards and connections, which can improve the efficiency of cluster’s functioning, facilitates coordinated activities of the partners. It is developing especially well in clusters since within their area community culture predominates. A high level of social capital of a cluster is expressed in the quality and the quantity of internal and external relations in this organization, within the scope of which there is a real possibility for its members of the common use of the gathered tangible and intangible resources. Simultaneously, it determines the ability of a cluster to transform into a knowledge organization, a learning organization, an intelligent organization, in which a creative, innovative and open for changes cluster society, able to create and maintain permanent socio-economic ties, is considered a value. P. Bourdieu defines the volume of social capital as a function of the size of the network and the volume of capital (economic, cultural and symbolic) possessed by networked individuals.

The development of social capital in a cluster depends on the degree to which the community of this organisation respects and shares the set of norms and values, and to what degree it can engage for the benefit of common activities. The potential of the social capital discourages opportunistic behaviours and induces people toward cooperation through a mechanism of shared values, norms, and trust, which arise from informal organizations based on social networks. The moment that particular cluster members perceive the value of this potential, their activity can significantly increase. In economic literature, the most frequently indicated advantages ensuing from the development of social capital within a cluster are: improved efficiency of functioning and organization’s development; permanence of the established personal relations, the ease of coordination and communication; the ease of establishing new relations, the creation of organisation’s values, efficient identification, design and implementation of changes. According to S. Huaping, L. Chunxiang, and Y. Jiagen social capital helps industry cluster realize the group competition advantages which the individual corporation is not able to achieve and enhances the competitive advantages of the industry cluster. J. Macke, D. Genari and K. Faccin emphasize that the importance of assessing social capital in collaborative networks can be summarized as: high level of social trust and strong reciprocity norms, reduce the transaction costs; social networks attenuate the risks, allowing that their members engage more

---

The importance of organizational culture in innovations; social networks facilitate the fast information dissemination and with this, they reduce the asymmetries; and social networks allow that its members solve their collective problems easily.

Moreover, social capital enables clusters to improve their innovation capability and conduct business transactions without much fuss and has, therefore, substantial implications for economic performance. Therefore, social capital can significantly influence cluster’s characteristics, the forms of participation of individuals and groups in cluster’s cooperation, or the formation of institutional, personality, technical and structural factors supporting permanent development of cluster’s competitiveness.
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**ZNACZENIE KULTURY ORGANIZACYJNEJ W ZARZĄDZANIU KLASTREM**

W artykule scharakteryzowano istotę klastra biznesu jako organizacji tworzonych w wyniku inicjatywy klastrowej, formalnych i nieformalnych relacji opartych na współpracy, przedstawicieli różnych sektorów: biznesu, nauki, pozarządowego (NGO) i samorządu lokalnego. Z uwagi na różnorodność systemów wartości, norm, symboli, wzorców postępowania poszczególnych partnerów w klastrze, wskazano na kluczową rolę kultury organizacyjnej w zarządzaniu klastrem.
cyjnej w procesie rozwoju klastra. Uwzględniając fakt, iż klastr jako przedsiębiorcza organizacja jest zbiorem doświadczeń i wartości poszczególnych podmiotów, w tym ludzi, ją tworzących i funkcjonujących w niej, stwierdzono, że jego kultura organizacyjna może być wyznaczana przez wspólnotę: norm i wartości, myślenia, symboli, kolektywnie akceptowanych znaczeń, utrwalonego sposobu działania, systemu założeń. Kultura organizacyjna klastra jako zbiór podstawowych norm, założeń i wartości, umożliwia integrację członków klastra oraz sprzyja zwiększeniu ich zaangażowania na rzecz realizacji wspólnie określonych celów. Kultura ta jako specyficzny kod genetyczny społeczności klastra, może powodować powtarzalność zachowań, emocji, wyobrażeń indywidualnych, jak i zbiorowych. Może być mechanizmem zapewniającym i przywracającym równowagę klastra, gdyż sprzyja budowie jego architektury, pozwalając odpowiednio hierarchizować rzeczywistość, zwracając uwagę na to, co jest istotne, a co nie ma znaczenia dla jego rozwoju. Autor podkreśla także, że kultura organizacyjna klastra jest kluczowym czynnikiem warunkującym rozwój kapitału społecznego w obszarze klastra. Sprzyja ona bowiem doskonaleniu jakości relacji międzyludzkich, relacji intraorganizacyjnych, umiejętności współpracy, klimatu organizacyjnego i wzajemnego zaufania. Ponadto wskazuje, że kapitał społeczny klastra, który wynika z lojalności i umiejętności sprawnej współpracy członków tej struktury w celu realizacji interesów indywidualnych i wspólnych jest czynnikiem determinującym trwałość funkcjonowania i rozwoju klastra.
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