*European Research Studies Journal*
*Volume XXVIII, Issue 4, 2025*

*pp. 1756-1770*

# Managing Contemporary Organizations in the Context of Globalization and Environmental Turbulence

*Submitted 13/10/25, 1st revision 14/11/25, 2nd revision 25/11/25, accepted 10/12/25*

Dariusz Baran[1], Ernest Górka[2], Michał Ćwiąkała[3], Gabriela Wojak[4], Dariusz Reśko[5], Monika Wyrzykowska-Antkiewicz[6], Michał Wszeborski[7], Kamil Saługa[8], Daniel Zawadzki[9], Jan Piwnik[10]

***Abstract:***

***Purpose:*** *The paper explores how contemporary organizations adapt to globalization and environmental turbulence. It examines the evolution of management theories and practices, emphasizing flexibility, strategic responsiveness, and responsible leadership in dynamic conditions..*
***Design/methodology/approach:*** *A qualitative and conceptual literature review integrates classical and modern perspectives on management, environmental adaptability, and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Analytical and comparative methods are used to synthesize current approaches.*
***Findings:*** *Effective management in turbulent environments requires adaptability, efficiency, and ethical responsibility. The study identifies flexibility, cultural awareness, and CSR integration as key drivers of resilience and competitiveness.*
***Research limitations/implications:*** *The paper is conceptual and based on secondary data, providing a foundation for future empirical studies on adaptive and responsible management.*

[1]*Department of Social Sciences and Computer Science Nowy Sącz School of Business - National Louis University, Poland, ORCID: 0009-0006-8697-5459, e-mail: dkbaran@wsb-nlu.edu.pl;*
[2]*The same as in 1, ORCID: 0009-0006-3293-5670, e-mail: ewgorka@wsb-nlu.edu.pl;*
[3]*University College of Professional Education in Wroclaw, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0001-9706-864X, e-mail: michal.cwiakala@wskz.pl;*
[4]*I'M BRAND INSTITUTE Sp. z o.o., ORCID: 0009-0003-2958-365X, e-mail: g.wojak@imbrandinstitute.com;*
[5]*The same as in 1, ORCID: 0000-0003-4129-0502, e-mail: dresko@wsb-nlu.edu.pl;*
[6]*WSB Merito University in Toruń, Polaand, ORCID: 0000-0002-2755-9352, e-mail: monika.wyrzykowska@torun.merito.pl;*
[7]*The same as in 4, ORCID: 0009-0005-3760-8540.*
[8]*The same as in 3, ORCID: 0009-0000-0440-4035 e-mail: kamil.saluga@wskz.pl;*
[9]*GLOBAL HYDROGEN, Poland, ORCID: 0009-0001-4783-3240 e-mail: daniel.zawadzki@globalhydrogen.pl;*
[10]*WSB Merito University in Gdańsk, Faculty of Computer Science and New Technologies, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0001-9436-7142, e-mail: jpiwnik@wsb.gda.pl;*

***Practical recommendations:*** *Managers should focus on stakeholder engagement, continuous learning, and sustainability to strengthen organizational resilience.*
***Originality/value:*** *The paper offers an integrative framework combining management theory, environmental adaptability, and CSR, contributing to understanding how organizations remain competitive and socially responsible in global contexts.*

***Keywords:*** *Management theory, globalization, organizational flexibility, corporate social responsibility, adaptability.*

***JEL Code:*** *M10, F60, M14.*

***Paper type:*** *Research article*

## 1. Introduction

In today's global economy, organizations operate in an environment characterized by constant change, technological innovation, and intensifying competition. Globalization and digitalization have blurred traditional market boundaries, forcing enterprises to redefine their strategies, structures, and management approaches. The complexity of modern business ecosystems requires managers to balance efficiency and flexibility while maintaining a strong ethical and cultural foundation.

Management theory and practice have evolved significantly since the industrial era. From classical concepts of scientific management and administrative principles to contemporary approaches emphasizing learning, agility, and corporate responsibility, management is now understood as both an art and a science. Effective management encompasses planning, organizing, leading, and controlling organizational resources to achieve strategic goals efficiently and sustainably (Griffin, 1999; Koźmiński and Piotrowski, 2002).

At the same time, environmental turbulence — driven by rapid technological shifts, socio-political changes, and global market dynamics — challenges the stability of traditional business models. Organizations must continuously scan and interpret their environments to identify opportunities and threats, developing adaptive strategies that ensure resilience and long-term success (Obłój, 2007; Wojtysiak-Kotlarski, 2011).

Cultural and ethical dimensions have also gained prominence. Corporate culture, employee engagement, and social responsibility have become essential factors influencing competitiveness, innovation, and reputation in global markets (Sułkowski, 2012; Rudnicka, 2012). In this context, management extends beyond operational control to include the shaping of organizational values and sustainable relationships with stakeholders.

The purpose of this paper is to synthesize key theoretical perspectives on management in the context of globalization and environmental turbulence, highlighting the interdependence between managerial effectiveness, adaptability, and social responsibility. By examining classical and contemporary approaches, the study seeks to clarify how modern organizations can navigate uncertainty, build flexibility, and align strategic objectives with ethical and cultural imperatives.

## 2. Management as Art and Science: Activities, Efficiency, and Effectiveness

The literature offers numerous, co-existing definitions of management that have evolved alongside changes in organizational realities. Classic, encyclopedic accounts—rooted in early managerial thought traced back to F.W. Taylor—treat management as a set of activities oriented toward achieving organizational objectives (Encyklopedia PWN, 2022). With industrial expansion in the nineteenth century, theory had to catch up with practice, generating diverse schools and terminologies that resist a single, universal definition; authors alternately emphasize principles of action, the configuration of resources, or economic and strategic dimensions (Pszczołowski, 1978; Koźmiński and Jemielniak, 2011; Griffin, 2005; Stoner and Wankel, 1992; Kornak, 2001; Gliński, 1974).

Adopting a widely used formulation, this article follows Griffin in defining management as a set of activities—planning and decision making, organizing, leading, and controlling—directed at human, financial, physical, and informational resources to achieve goals efficiently and effectively (Griffin, 1999; 2005).

In this view, effectiveness denotes achieving intended outcomes, while efficiency concerns prudent, waste-avoiding use of resources (Stoner and Wankel, 1992; Kotarbiński, 1975). Consequently, management may be approached as both a practical art and an analytical science: a decision process that coordinates and controls resources to deliver desired results (Bogdanienko, 2010).

Drucker's contributions foreground human resources as the pivotal organizational asset and stress alignment with cultural norms, an orientation to learning and adaptation, clarity of goals, robust information flows inside and outside the organization, and measurement systems that enable evaluation, improvement, and control (Drucker, 1995a; 1995b).

What counts as the object of management depends on context: it may be the entire organization—its structures and allocation of resources—or selected domains such as assets, knowledge, time, finance, environment, human resources, relationships, operations, strategy, quality, value, risk, and marketing (Klincewicz, 2016). Complementarily, Krupa distinguishes four fundamental resource categories—informational, human, physical, and financial—that together enable the mission and vision of the firm (Krupa, 2017).

Foundational work differentiates between principles of good administration and the operational functions through which management is performed. Fayol identified administrative, commercial, technical, financial, accounting, organizational, and security-related activities alongside well-known principles of effective management (Cichoń, 2012). Process-based perspectives conceptualize management as transforming resources via four interrelated functions: planning, organizing, leading (motivating), and controlling (Cichoń, 2012).

Planning spans strategic and operational horizons—mission, structure, strategy, decision-making, and management by objectives (Bendkowski, 2010; Bąk, 2012). Organizing establishes structures and allocates responsibilities to ensure coordinated execution (Penc, 2005). Leading provides direction, motivation, and communication that energize employees toward shared goals (Sudoł, 2002). Controlling monitors performance, compares actual to expected results, diagnoses deviations, and triggers corrective action (Chrisidu-Budnik, Korczak, Pakuła and Supemat, 2005).

Practice-oriented rules articulated by Peters and Waterman further emphasize a bias for action, customer focus, autonomy and entrepreneurship, structural simplicity, value-driven motivation, and performance through people (Peters and Waterman, 2000).

Selected managerial concepts deepen this functional view. Kaizen frames continuous improvement as a participative, incremental philosophy that combats waste and builds capability through small, steady changes supported by learning, open communication, and knowledge sharing (Mauer, 2013; Martyniak, 2002; Kowalczewski and Nazarko, 2006).

Total Quality Management (TQM) embeds quality awareness across processes by combining statistical methods, management systems, and training to meet or exceed customer expectations; reported benefits include higher customer satisfaction, efficiency, cost reduction, quality, and morale, while challenges involve upfront costs, change resistance, system complexity, and measurement issues (Wawak, 2019; Kordos, 2017; Obora, 2011).

Lean management seeks value maximization and waste minimization, improving flow, quality, lead times, and cost positions; typical trade-offs include implementation costs, cultural resistance, and potential creativity constraints when over-standardized (Trzcieliński, Pawłowski and Pawłowski, 2010). Benchmarking, finally, systematically compares processes and results against internal or external referents to identify best practices and improvement opportunities; it spans internal, external, functional, and horizontal forms and proceeds through planning, analysis, integration, and implementation.

Gains include performance, quality, innovation, and cost reductions, while time requirements, data costs, subjectivity, and reliability of comparisons remain recurring

caveats (Gonciarski, 2008; Sokołowska, 2016; Tomaszewski and Zaskórski, 2012; Imai, 2006).

The notion of "organization" is widely treated in management and sociology as a purposeful social system with internal structure and functions (Bielski, 2001). Classical and dictionary definitions converge on collective, goal-oriented action enabled by coordination, division of labor, and control (Bogdanienko, 2010; SJP, 2022; Kotarbiński, 1958; Kolczyński and Sztumski, 2002; Koźmiński and Piotrowski, 1995).

Systems perspectives portray organizations as socio-technical entities embedded in and differentiated from their environments (Krupski, 2004). Structural models, such as Krzyżanowski's five-component framework and the McKinsey 7S model, underscore the interplay among strategy, structure, systems, style, staff, skills, and shared values, with shared values forming the core around which the other subsystems orbit (Krzyżanowski, 1994; Krupski, 2004).

Within this landscape, the "enterprise" is an organizational unit conducting economic activity with legal capacity, analyzed from subjective, functional, and objective angles, and typically classified as manufacturing, service, or commercial (Walicka and Czemiel-Grzybowska, 2015).

Enterprise management coordinates resources to create value through goal setting, strategy formation, workforce development, technology and information management, and financial governance (Grudzewski and Hejduk, 2001). Strategically, an effective management system can shape competitive advantage and long-term viability by integrating analysis, planning, implementation, and control in dynamic environments (Skonieczny, 2005).

Contemporary syntheses compare models and schools of strategic management to clarify assumptions and mechanisms that guide enterprise-level choices (Melnyk & Zlotnik, 2020). More broadly, management is a continual learning endeavor: organizations adapt to business and societal environments by expanding knowledge and refining methods and techniques—an orientation that underpins firm success and the ongoing evolution of managerial thought (Klimek, 2009).

## 3. Research Organizations in Context: Environmental Layers, Actors, and Analytical Tools

In management scholarship, the organization's environment is commonly understood as the ensemble of processes and factors that affect the firm directly and indirectly, shaping both its day-to-day functioning and its developmental prospects. This view, anchored in the Polish management canon, underscores that the environment simultaneously generates opportunities and threats that condition strategic choice and performance (Koźmiński and Piotrowski, 2002).

Echoing this, Obłój argues that no organization can operate in isolation from its milieu: firms are dependent on, and must continuously respond to, environmental change. He prefers the broader notion of "environment" rather than the narrower, market-centred "surroundings," noting that contemporary strategy must account for a wider set of contextual dimensions than industry structure alone (Obłój, 2007). Griffin's schematic treatment similarly portrays the environment as multi-layered, encompassing external influences that impinge on managers and organizations across different scopes and proximities (Griffin, 1997).

Across these contributions, a consistent position emerges: every organization operates within both an internal setting and an external environment that can be structured into general (macro), task/competitive (micro), and—more recently—meso levels (Matejun and Nowicki, 2013). The general environment (often termed the remote environment) comprises broad, largely uncontrollable forces—technological, socio-cultural, political-legal, international, economic, and natural—that define constraints and possibilities for strategy.

Technological forces include R&D, patents, tele-information innovations, and adoption trajectories that can reposition competitive advantage. Socio-cultural forces span demographics, education, values, religion, and evolving social patterns that shape labor markets and consumer expectations. Political-legal forces cover taxation, labor and commercial law, regulatory scope, and state involvement in the economy.

The international layer brings cross-border rules, alliances, and geopolitical relations. Economic forces include growth, inflation, interest and exchange rates, income dynamics, and price levels. Finally, the natural environment covers climate, resource access, and physical conditions that influence costs and infrastructure (Królik, 2011; Zakrzewska-Bielawska, cit.; Matejun and Nowicki, 2013).

By contrast, the task or competitive environment comprises actors and institutions with more immediate, two-way interactions: suppliers, competitors, customers, financial institutions, labor unions, and specialized business-service providers. Managing supplier relationships is central to ensuring reliable quality and cost performance; service firms contribute specialist capabilities (IT, marketing, customer service, finance) that raise efficiency and responsiveness; and financial institutions shape investment capacity through credit provision.

Unions and broader human-capital conditions matter both normatively and legally, affecting workplace arrangements and change processes (Śmietański, 2014). Producers and partners interact with core operations (production, product development, promotion) and feed back market information that refines managerial decisions.

Competition itself is ambivalent: it creates pressure on price and innovation, but also provides learning benchmarks and reference points for market positioning and

strategy design. Globalization intensifies these dynamics by widening the competitive set, accelerating information flows, and opening new markets and resource pools that firms must learn to access and govern effectively.

To diagnose and navigate these layers, organizations employ environment-analysis toolkits calibrated to the proximity of influence. For the task environment, widely used methods include sector economic profiling, competitor analysis, portfolio matrices, sector attractiveness and life-cycle assessments, experience curves, strategic-group mapping, stakeholder analysis, and Porter's five forces. For the general environment, firms deploy Delphi studies, forecasting, strategic-gap analysis, trend extrapolation, PEST variants, and scenario planning.

Together, these techniques help identify opportunities and threats, clarify structural conditions, and inform strategic choices under uncertainty (Ciekanowski, Majkowska and Załoga, 2018). The goal is not prediction per se but preparedness: understanding which environmental features are malleable, which are constraints, and where option-creating investments are warranted.

Environmental conditions also mediate decision quality and risk. Wojtysiak-Kotlarski conceptualizes the relationship between environmental complexity and rate of change on the one hand, and organizational certainty on the other: higher turbulence and complexity elevate uncertainty, shifting decision contexts from certainty toward risk and genuine uncertainty, and thereby reshaping the design of planning, control, and adaptive learning systems (Wojtysiak-Kotlarski, 2011).

This logic has practical implications across the value chain. Spatial proximity to ports, suppliers, or customers can reduce logistics costs and cycle times; dense competitive clusters can heighten rivalry but also enable collaboration and spillovers; labor-market conditions influence recruitment, training costs, and the sustainability of advantage (Wojtysiak-Kotlarski, 2011; Hofstede, 2000).

Policy choices (taxes, regulation, trade rules) and macroeconomic conditions (interest rates, inflation, unemployment, growth) further shape pricing, production, and market development decisions, while compliance with legal requirements mitigates exposure to sanctions and litigation.

Ultimately, long-term success hinges on how effectively firms "read" and adapt to their environments. Stakeholders—from customers to regulators—co-create the boundary conditions within which strategies unfold, providing signals that managers can translate into adjustments in marketing, product development, pricing, and service models.

Attentive analysis of environmental shifts also informs supply-chain design and risk management, helping preserve profitability through cycles. In this sense, the environment is not merely a backdrop but a determinant of strategic posture and

organizational viability, and continuous environmental scanning becomes a core capability of the modern enterprise (Noga, 2009).

## 4. Global Pressures, Local Responses: Culture, Flexibility, and CSR in Management

In contemporary management discourse, globalization is treated as the broader process within which firm-level internationalization unfolds. In a lexical sense, internationalization denotes the act of becoming international or granting equal rights of use across states, highlighting its institutional and transactional facets (Słownik Języka Polskiego, 2022).

In managerial scholarship, the term is framed more substantively as the expansion and adaptation of a firm's offerings and processes to multiple national contexts, with emphasis on quality improvement and deliberate "going international" actions (Witek-Hajduk, 2012; Daszkiewicz, 2016). Globalization, by contrast, captures the deeper integration of economies, polities, and cultures through cross-border flows of goods, services, capital, people, and information, reshaping how organizations coordinate and compete worldwide (Gorynia and Owczarzak, 2004).

The motives for internationalization are largely economic and capability-seeking. Firms pursue foreign markets to increase sales and profit potential, exploit economies of scale and scope, and access resources such as technologies, inputs, and capital that raise productivity and lower costs (Hardyś-Nowak, 2014).

At the same time, globalization magnifies both opportunity and rivalry: it broadens customer reach and knowledge transfer while intensifying competitive pressures that discipline prices and quality. These dynamics spill over into managerial systems—especially finance and human resources—by expanding financing options (including foreign capital) and talent pools, while requiring new competencies in cross-cultural management, regulatory navigation, and multi-currency decision making (Rymarczyk, 2004).

The net balance of advantages and drawbacks thus remains contingent on a firm's strategic posture and integration capabilities: greater access to goods, services, technologies, trade, and investment coexists with challenges such as fiercer competition, potential loss of local autonomy, cultural frictions, resource exploitation risks, environmental burden, and employment dislocations (Hardyś-Nowak, 2014; Gorynia and Owczarzak, 2004).

Culture occupies a pivotal place in this landscape. Corporate culture—shared values, norms, and beliefs that orient behavior—structures decision processes, interaction patterns, and even visible artefacts such as dress codes and procedural routines (Serafin, 2015). Foundational principles typically invoked include respect, open

communication, integrity, accountability, innovation, diversity, collaboration, and quality orientation (Kapusta, Sukiennik, and Bąk, 2017).

Strong, well-aligned cultures can raise performance by boosting cooperation, motivation, retention, service quality, and innovative behavior, thereby improving reputational standing and customer perceptions (Sułkowski, 2012; Czaińska, 2012). Yet globalization also exposes organizations to cultural convergence pressures.

Cultural homogenization—understood as the growing similarity of cultural forms through diffusion and global media—may streamline coordination by creating more uniform expectations, but it can also erode diversity of thought, dampen creativity, and weaken sensitivity to distinct customer segments (Encyklopedia PWN, 2022; Siuda, 2011; Goliszek, 2014). Consequently, firms must balance the efficiency gains of standardization with the strategic value of local responsiveness, while investing in cultural competence to avoid misalignment in global operations (Sułkowski, 2012).

Environmental turbulence heightens these challenges. Organizational flexibility—the capacity to adapt swiftly to technological shifts, market changes, and evolving customer needs—becomes a core capability for sustaining competitiveness (Chajęcki, Krzakiewicz, and Chajęcki, 2012; Ziębicki, 2010). Turbulent environments, marked by rapid change, unpredictability, and intensified rivalry, strain planning and control systems and can depress morale, productivity, and innovation if not matched by agile structures and learning routines (Jasiński, 2005; Ziębicki, 2010).

Flexible organizations reconfigure processes, products, and resource allocations quickly; they cultivate opportunity recognition, crisis responsiveness, and prudent risk-taking to navigate shocks and capitalize on emergent niches (Kwiecień, 2018). The strategic task is thus dynamic fit: aligning decision speed, modularity, and knowledge flows with the tempo and complexity of external change.

A further, increasingly salient management challenge is the institutionalization of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Drucker's perspective reminds managers that, despite technological possibilities and shifting consumer expectations, the essence of management remains anchored in human agency and judgment; technology and demand conditions set constraints, but strategy must be built on people and responsibility (Drucker, 2009).

CSR operationalizes this responsibility by committing firms to conduct that is economically sound, socially attentive, and environmentally prudent, with accountability to employees, consumers, communities, regulators, and broader publics (PARP, 2022; Jakubów, 2008). Typical CSR domains include community engagement, environmental stewardship, fair labor and workplace standards, transparency, and support for sustainable development.

The agenda often extends into ergonomics and occupational health—designing safe, humane work systems that reduce accidents and chronic strain—thereby linking social commitments to productivity and well-being (Majchrzak, 2019).

Strategically, CSR is no longer peripheral. It contributes to trust and loyalty among stakeholders, supports reputation and brand equity, and can lower operating costs through efficiencies such as energy savings and waste reduction. It also catalyzes innovation, talent attraction and retention, and constructive relations with local communities, making it a de facto management standard in competitive, scrutinized markets (Rudnicka, 2012; Jankowski, 2016).

In aggregate, globalization and internationalization expand the arena of opportunities and constraints; cultural dynamics and turbulence define the adaptive requirements; and CSR articulates the normative expectations. Firms that integrate these dimensions—developing cross-border capabilities, nurturing resilient and inclusive cultures, building flexibility for turbulence, and embedding responsibility into strategy—are better positioned to convert environmental complexity into sustained performance advantages.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

This article has synthesized key theoretical perspectives on management, organizational environments, and the challenges faced by modern enterprises in a globalized and turbulent economy. The integration of these literature streams highlights the evolution of management as both a practical and analytical discipline, shaped by environmental complexity, technological change, and shifting societal expectations. Three interrelated dimensions—managerial functionality, environmental adaptability, and global responsiveness—emerge as central to understanding contemporary organizational effectiveness.

In relation to the first dimension, the reviewed literature demonstrates that management has progressed from classical models focused on efficiency and control toward multidimensional frameworks that integrate human, informational, and cultural factors. Early administrative theories by Taylor and Fayol provided the functional bedrock—planning, organizing, leading, and controlling—yet subsequent approaches, including Total Quality Management, Lean, and Kaizen, have embedded continuous improvement, employee engagement, and learning as defining attributes of managerial excellence (Griffin, 1999; Wawak, 2019; Mauer, 2013).

Drucker's human-centered vision remains highly relevant, positioning people as both the object and subject of management—sources of innovation, adaptability, and strategic renewal. Collectively, these frameworks reveal that efficiency alone is insufficient without cultural alignment, motivation, and value-driven leadership.

The second dimension concerns the organizational environment, which the literature portrays as a complex system of interdependent macro-, meso-, and micro-level forces. Classical and contemporary scholars converge on the view that environmental scanning and interpretation are foundational capabilities in strategic management (Koźmiński and Piotrowski, 2002; Obłój, 2007).

Firms operate amid diverse and dynamic conditions: regulatory change, globalization, socio-cultural evolution, and resource constraints. Analytical tools such as PEST, scenario analysis, and Porter's Five Forces enable systematic interpretation of these contexts, yet the literature emphasizes that prediction gives way to preparedness in volatile settings (Ciekanowski *et al.,* 2018).

Wojtysiak-Kotlarski's typology of environmental complexity and turbulence reinforces this adaptive imperative: organizations must adjust decision-making processes and structures according to uncertainty levels. Thus, sustained competitiveness depends not on environmental stability, but on the organization's capacity to learn, anticipate, and pivot effectively.

The third dimension relates to globalization, cultural dynamics, and corporate responsibility, which together redefine managerial challenges in the twenty-first century. Internationalization extends organizational reach and resource access, but also multiplies risks—cultural misunderstandings, ethical conflicts, and heightened competition (Rymarczyk, 2004; Gorynia and Owczarzak, 2004).

As enterprises expand across borders, corporate culture becomes both an asset and a liability: it unites employees through shared values yet requires continuous negotiation between local responsiveness and global consistency (Serafin, 2015; Sułkowski, 2012). Cultural homogenization, while facilitating coordination, may suppress diversity and creativity, suggesting that future organizational success depends on cultural intelligence rather than standardization (Goliszek, 2014).

Environmental turbulence further intensifies the need for flexibility, defined as the capacity to adapt structures and processes rapidly to emerging challenges (Chajęcki *et al.,* 2012; Ziębicki, 2010). In this context, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) represents a normative counterbalance—embedding ethical, environmental, and human considerations into business models.

As Drucker (2009) argues, management must remain grounded in human responsibility, not solely technological or market imperatives. CSR thus emerges as both a strategic differentiator and a societal expectation, aligning competitiveness with sustainability (Rudnicka, 2012; Jankowski, 2016).

Theoretically, this synthesis reinforces an integrative systems view of management, wherein managerial processes, environmental dynamics, and social responsibility co-

evolve. Management effectiveness arises from the interplay between internal design and external complexity, rather than from static adherence to universal rules.

Practically, the findings underscore that successful organizations are those that build adaptive capacity: they institutionalize learning, foster openness to environmental signals, invest in cultural competence, and embed ethical standards in global operations. Flexibility and responsibility are not opposites but complementary mechanisms for resilience in uncertainty.

Several limitations also merit acknowledgement. The analysis presented here draws primarily on Polish and international management scholarship, which may not fully reflect sectoral or regional variations. Furthermore, as a conceptual synthesis, this article does not empirically test the interactions among managerial systems, environmental turbulence, and CSR adoption. Future research should explore these linkages through longitudinal and cross-cultural studies, examining how organizational learning and ethical governance mediate performance outcomes in diverse institutional contexts.

In conclusion, the reviewed literature collectively portrays management as an evolving discipline navigating between stability and change, control and adaptability, efficiency and responsibility. The modern enterprise is no longer merely an economic actor but a socio-technical and ethical system embedded in a dynamic global environment. Its success depends on the capability to integrate managerial principles, environmental intelligence, and global accountability into a coherent strategic posture.

The insights synthesized herein may serve as a conceptual foundation for future studies seeking to bridge classical management theory with contemporary demands for sustainability, agility, and human-centered governance.

**References:**

Bąk, P. 2012. Wprowadzenie do zagadnienia planowania w przemyśle górniczym. Prace Naukowe GIG Górnictwo i Środowisko, 2/2012.

Bendkowski, J. 2010. Praktyczne zarządzanie organizacjami. Kompetencje menedżerskie. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej, Gliwice.

Bielski, M. 2001. Organizacje: istota, struktury, procesy. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.

Bogdanienko, J. 2010. Organizacja i zarządzanie w zarysie. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa.

Cichoń, S. 2012. Istota i funkcje zarządzania organizacji – wybrane koncepcje. Trendy ve vzdělávání, 9/2012.

Ciekanowski, Z., Majkowska, J., Załoga, W. 2018. Wpływ otoczenia na funkcjonowanie organizacji. Nowoczesne Systemy Zarządzania, 13(4), 48.

Chrisidu-Budnik, A., Korczak, J., Pakuła, A., Supemat, J. 2005. Nauka organizacji i zarządzania. Kolonia Limited.

Czaińska, K. 2012. Znaczenie kultury organizacyjnej w dobie globalizacji. W: R. Borowiecki, M. Dziura (red.), Globalne i regionalne wyzwania restrukturyzacji przedsiębiorstw i gospodarek. Wydawnictwo Fundacji UE w Krakowie, Kraków.
Drucker, P.F. 1995. People and Performance: The Best of Peter Drucker on Management. Routledge.
Drucker, P.F. 1995. Zarządzanie w czasach burzliwych. Nowe wyzwania – nowe horyzonty. Nowoczesność.
Drucker, P.F. 2009. Zarządzanie XXI wieku – wyzwania. MT Biznes.
Encyklopedia PWN. 2022. Hasło: zarządzanie. https://encyklopedia.pwn.pl/haslo/zarzadzanie;4000464.html#prettyPhoto.
Gliński, B. 1974. Mała encyklopedia ekonomiczna. Warszawa.
Goliszek, A. 2014. Homogenizacja i heterogenizacja zachowań konsumenckich w społeczeństwie globalnym. Handel Wewnętrzny, 1/2014.
Gonciarski, W. (red.) 2008. Poszukiwanie nowych koncepcji i metod zarządzania. WAT, Warszawa.
Gorynia, M., Owczarzak, R. 2004. Podstawy teorii internacjonalizacji i globalizacji działalności przedsiębiorstw. Gospodarka Narodowa, 1–2/2004.
Griffin, R.W. 1997. Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami. Otoczenie organizacji i menedżerów. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
Griffin, R.W. 1999. Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami. PWN, Warszawa.
Griffin, R.W. 2005. Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
Grudzewski, W.M., Hejduk, I. 2001. Projektowanie systemów zarządzania. Warszawa.

Hardyś-Nowak, A. 2014. Motywy internacjonalizacji przedsiębiorstw rodzinnych. Ekonomiczne Problemy Usług, 111/2014.
Hofstede, G. 2000. Kultury i organizacje. PWE, Warszawa.
Imai, M. 2006. Gemba Kaizen. Zdroworozsądkowe, niskokosztowe podejście do zarządzania. MT Biznes, Kraków.
Jakubów, L. 2008. Strategia społecznej odpowiedzialności przedsiębiorstw. Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, 20/2008.
Jankowski, M. 2016. Zarządzanie organizacją w aspekcie społecznej odpowiedzialności przedsiębiorstw. Współczesne Problemy Ekonomiczne, 417/2016.
Jasiński, B. 2005. Turbulencja otoczenia. In: R. Krupski (red.), Zarządzanie przedsiębiorstwem w turbulentnym otoczeniu. PWE, Warszawa.
Kapusta, M., Sukiennik, M., Bąk, P. 2017. Wybrane determinanty kształtujące kulturę korporacyjną. Finanse, Rynki Finansowe, Ubezpieczenia, 5(89), 2.
Klimek, J. 2009. Hermeneutyka przedsiębiorczości. Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.
Klincewicz, K. (red.) 2016. Zarządzanie, organizacje i organizowanie. Przegląd perspektyw teoretycznych. Wydawnictwo Naukowe WZ UW, Warszawa.
Kolczyński, M., Sztumski, J. 2002. Zarys socjologii organizacji. Górnośląska Wyższa Szkoła Handlowa, Katowice.
Kornak, A.S. 2001. Zarządzanie turystyką i jej podmiotami w miejscowości i regionie. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej, Wrocław.
Koźmiński, A.K., Jemielniak, D. 2011. Zarządzanie od podstaw. Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa.
Koźmiński, A.K., Piotrowski, W. 1995. Zarządzanie – teoria i praktyka. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
Koźmiński, A.K., Piotrowski, W. 2002. Zarządzanie. Teoria i praktyka. PWN, Warszawa.

Kowalczewski, W., Nazarko, J. (red.) 2006. Instrumenty zarządzania współczesnym przedsiębiorstwem. Difin, Warszawa.
Krupa, K. 2017. Zarządzanie oraz ewolucja funkcji zarządzania. W: Współczesne metody i koncepcje zarządzania wykorzystywane w przedsiębiorstwach – ogólna charakterystyka. UR Rzeszów.
Krupski, R. 2004. Podstawy organizacji i zarządzania. Prace Naukowe Wałbrzyskiej Wyższej Szkoły Zarządzania i Przedsiębiorczości, Wałbrzych.
Kwiecień, A. 2018. Elastyczność funkcjonowania podmiotów gospodarczych a sukces i kreacja wartości przedsiębiorstw. Studia Ekonomiczne, 377/2018.
Majchrzak, K. 2019. Społeczna odpowiedzialność biznesu (CSR) w działalności przedsiębiorstw sektora bankowego. Rozprawa doktorska, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa.
Martyniak, Z. 2002. Nowe metody i koncepcje zarządzania. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Krakowie, Kraków.
Matejun, M., Nowicki, M. 2013. Organizacja w otoczeniu – od analizy otoczenia do dynamicznej lokalizacji. W: A. Adamik (red.), Nauka o organizacji. Ujęcie dynamiczne. Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer Business, Warszawa.
Mauer, R. 2013. Filozofia Kaizen. Małymi krokami ku doskonałości. Helion.
Melnyk, O., Zlotnik, M. 2020. The Essence and Basic Models of Strategic Enterprise Management. Economics, Entrepreneurship, Management, 7/2020.
Noga, A. 2009. Teorie przedsiębiorstw. PWE, Warszawa.
Obłój, K. 2007. Strategia organizacji. PWE, Warszawa.
Obora, H. 2011. Geneza i rozwój koncepcji kompleksowego zarządzania jakością TQM. Nauki o Zarządzaniu, 8/2011.

Penc, J. 2005. Podstawy nowoczesnego zarządzania. Projektowanie warunków rozwoju i strategii organizacji. Łódź.
Peters, T., Waterman, R.H. 2000. Poszukiwanie doskonałości w biznesie. Wydawnictwo Medium, Warszawa.
Pszczołowski, T. 1978. Mała encyklopedia prakseologii i teorii organizacji. Ossolineum, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk.
Rudnicka, A. 2012. CSR – doskonalenie relacji społecznych w firmie. Wolters Kluwer Polska, Warszawa.
Rymarczyk, J. 2004. Internacjonalizacja i globalizacja przedsiębiorstwa. Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa.
Serafin, K. 2015. Kultura organizacyjna jako element wspierający realizację strategii przedsiębiorstwa. Studia Ekonomiczne, 222/2015.
Siuda, P. 2011. Homogenizacja i amerykanizacja globalnej popkultury. Kultura – Historia – Globalizacja, 20/2011.
Skonieczny, J. 2005. Analiza strategiczna. W: M. Moszkowicz (red.), Zarządzanie strategiczne. Systemowa koncepcja biznesu. PWE, Warszawa.
Słownik Języka Polskiego. 2022. Hasło: organizacja. https://sjp.pl/organizacja
Słownik Języka Polskiego. 2022. Hasło: internacjonalizacja. https://sjp.pwn.pl/sjp/internacjonalizacja;2466637.html
Sokołowska, S. (red.) 2016. Koncepcje organizacji i metody zarządzania. Możliwości i ograniczenia. Difin, Warszawa.
Stoner, J.A.F., Wankel, C. 1992. Kierowanie. PWE, Warszawa.
Sułkowski, Ł. 2012. Czy kultury organizacyjne zmierzają do unifikacji? Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi, 3–4/2012.

Sułkowski, Ł. 2012. Zmiana kultury organizacyjnej z perspektywy funkcjonalizmu. Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie, 13(12).
Sudoł, S. 2002. Przedsiębiorstwo. Dom Organizatora, Toruń.
Śliwiński, R. 2023. Organizacja pracy w modelu hybrydowym. Ekonomia i Zarządzanie.
Śmietański, R. 2014. Związki zawodowe i ich wpływ na rozwój społeczny i gospodarczy. Studia Ekonomiczne, 167/2014.
Tomaszewski, Ł., Zaskórski, P. 2012. Benchmarking jako strategia ciągłego doskonalenia organizacji. Nowoczesne Systemy Zarządzania, 1/2012.
Trzcieliński, S., Pawłowski, K., Pawłowski, E. 2010. Materiały dydaktyczne. Wydawnictwo Politechniki Poznańskiej.
Walicka, M., Czemiel-Grzybowska, W. 2015. Przedsiębiorczość dla inżynierów. Difin, Warszawa.
Wojtysiak-Kotlarski, M. 2011. Teoria przedsiębiorstwa a koncepcje zarządzania i praktyka biznesu. Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH, Warszawa.
Ziębicki, B. 2010. Elastyczność jako kryterium efektywności organizacyjnej. Acta Universitatis Lodziensis Folia Oeconomica, 234/2010.