SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2026
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SERIES NO. 253

DYSFUNCTIONS IN ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEMS: COMPENSATORY MECHANISMS

Jacek PASIECZNY

University of Warsaw, Faculty of Management; jpasieczny@wz.uw.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-9405-3861

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to analyze organizational dysfunctions as an inherent element of organizational functioning and to identify mechanisms that enable organizations to compensate for or balance such dysfunctions. The study seeks to explain how organizations maintain operational capacity despite structural, process, and behavioral disturbances and to identify mechanisms that limit their negative consequences.
Design/methodology/approach: The study adopts a qualitative research approach due to the exploratory nature of the problem. Empirical data were collected through in-depth interviews with representatives of organizations and their stakeholders. The study included employees and clients of both private and public organizations operating in different sectors. In total, more than sixty respondents participated in the research, and fifty-one interviews were recorded and transcribed.
Findings: Identified dysfunctions include excessive centralization, autocratic management styles, excessive bureaucracy and reporting, conflicts between departments, unclear division of responsibilities, and problems related to outsourcing and labor cost reduction strategies. Despite these problems, organizations continue to function by balancing structural and process tensions. Key compensatory mechanisms include experienced employees, informal cooperation networks, and organizational resources such as reputation or market position.
Research limitations/implications: The study is based on purposive sampling and qualitative interview data, which limits statistical generalization. Future research could extend the analysis through comparative or quantitative studies examining relationships between organizational dysfunctions, resilience, and adaptive capabilities.
Practical implications: The findings highlight the importance of balancing formalization and flexibility in organizational structures and supporting mechanisms of cooperation and organizational learning. Informal relationships and experienced employees play a key role in maintaining organizational effectiveness.
Originality/value: The paper contributes to the literature by treating organizational dysfunctions not only as pathologies but also as inherent elements of complex organizational systems and by identifying compensatory mechanisms that enable organizations to maintain operational capacity despite disturbances.
Keywords: organizational dysfunctions; compensatory mechanisms; organizational resilience; organizational learning; organizational structures.
Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

The issue of organizational dysfunctions constitutes an important area of research in management sciences, as organizations – understood as complex social systems – operate under conditions of uncertainty, bounded rationality of decision-makers, and often conflicting interests among organizational participants. Under such conditions, organizational processes rarely proceed in a fully rational and optimal manner, and various disturbances, tensions, and inefficiencies constitute a natural element of the functioning of organizational structures. Classical studies on organizations already indicated that decisions made within organizations are often the result of compromises, organizational routines, and adaptive processes rather than purely rational calculation (March, Simon, 1958). Consequently, various types of organizational dysfunctions may be treated not only as manifestations of inefficiency but also as an inherent element of the functioning of complex organizational systems. Interest in the issue of organizational dysfunctions has a long tradition in organization theory. Classical analyses of bureaucracy indicated that organizational solutions designed to increase operational efficiency may simultaneously generate unintended consequences. An example is provided by analyses of bureaucratic dysfunctions, which showed that excessive formalization and orientation toward procedures may lead to a loss of organizational flexibility and the emergence of rigid patterns of action (Merton, 1940). These analyses were further developed in studies of the functioning of bureaucratic structures, which demonstrated that mechanisms of control and formalization may contribute to the persistence of inefficient organizational practices and limit the organization's ability to introduce change (Crozier, 1964). An important contribution to the development of research on organizational functioning was also made by the behavioral theory of the firm. According to this perspective, organizations are perceived as systems of coalitions composed of different groups of stakeholders whose goals are not always aligned. Under such conditions, decision-making processes within organizations have a negotiated and adaptive character, and the decisions made are often the result of bounded rationality and the availability of information (Cyert, March, 1963). Consequently, organizations develop various routines and procedures that stabilize their functioning but may simultaneously lead to the emergence of specific organizational dysfunctions. Contemporary research on organizational pathologies also focuses on the analysis of phenomena such as organizational misconduct, corruption, or unethical behavior within organizations. The literature indicates that such phenomena may have a systemic character and result from specific organizational, cultural, or institutional conditions. In particular, it is emphasized that processes of institutionalization of certain organizational practices may lead to the normalization of undesirable or unethical behaviors (Ashforth, Anand, 2003). Studies on the phenomenon of organizational wrongdoing indicate that organizational irregularities may result both from individual decisions made by members of organizations and from broader organizational mechanisms that facilitate the reinforcement

of particular patterns of action (Palmer et al., 2016). At the same time, organizations are not merely passive victims of their own dysfunctions. In many cases they develop adaptive mechanisms that allow them to limit the negative consequences of disturbances and maintain their operational capacity in a changing environment. These mechanisms may include, among others, processes of organizational learning, the development of informal networks of cooperation, or the use of excess organizational resources (Argote, Miron-Spektor, 2011). In this context, particular importance is attributed to the concept of organizational resilience, which refers to the ability of organizations to adapt and maintain operational effectiveness under conditions of disturbances or crises (Duchek, 2020). Research indicates that organizations characterized by a high level of resilience are able not only to respond to crises but also to use them as impulses for organizational change and for the development of new adaptive capabilities (Hillmann, Guenther, 2021). The literature also emphasizes the role of learning processes based on organizational errors and failures. Analyses show that experiences related to failures may constitute an important source of organizational knowledge, enabling the identification of organizational weaknesses and the introduction of changes in structures and processes (Desai, 2016). From this perspective, organizational dysfunctions may paradoxically serve as stimuli for organizational learning and for increasing the adaptive capabilities of organizations. The issue of organizational dysfunctions has also been addressed in the context of analyses of organizational pathologies and their impact on the effectiveness of organizational functioning. Research indicates that organizational dysfunctions may result from structural, cultural, or institutional factors, and their consequences may include decreased operational effectiveness, organizational conflicts, or limitations in the adaptive capacity of organizations (Pasieczny, 2016, 2017). Despite the growing interest in the issue of organizational dysfunctions in the management literature, relatively few studies focus on the analysis of mechanisms that enable organizations to function despite the occurrence of such disturbances. Most studies concentrate on identifying the sources of organizational pathologies or analyzing their negative consequences. Much less frequently analyzed, however, are the processes that enable organizations to compensate for or balance dysfunctions over the long term. In particular, attempts to integrate research on organizational dysfunctions with concepts related to organizational resilience, organizational learning, and organizational adaptive mechanisms are relatively rare in the literature. Therefore, a research gap can be identified in the insufficient recognition of mechanisms for balancing organizational dysfunctions that enable organizations to maintain their operational capacity despite the occurrence of structural or process disturbances. Of particular interest is the question of how organizations compensate for the negative consequences of dysfunctions through the use of various adaptive mechanisms, such as flexible organizational structures, learning processes, or informal organizational relationships. The aim of this article is to analyze organizational dysfunctions as an element of organizational functioning and to identify mechanisms that enable their balancing. The study aimed to answer the following research questions: What forms of organizational dysfunctions

are most frequently discussed in the literature on organization and management? What mechanisms allow organizations to maintain operational stability despite internal dysfunctions? To what extent can organizational resources, institutional position, and informal practices compensate for organizational dysfunctions?

The article adopts a systemic perspective, according to which organizational dysfunctions are not merely negative phenomena but may constitute an integral element of the functioning of complex organizational systems. In particular, an attempt is made to identify compensatory mechanisms that allow organizations to limit the effects of dysfunctions and maintain their operational capacity under conditions of disturbances. The contribution of this article to the development of the literature can be considered in several dimensions. First, the article proposes an approach that treats organizational dysfunctions not only as negative phenomena but also as elements of the functioning of complex organizational systems that may coexist with adaptive mechanisms within organizations. Such an approach complements the dominant stream of research in the literature, which focuses primarily on identifying the sources of organizational pathologies and analyzing their negative consequences (Ashforth, Anand, 2003; Greve et al., 2010). Second, the article integrates two streams of research that are often analyzed separately in the management literature, namely research on organizational dysfunctions and research on organizational resilience and organizational adaptive capabilities (Duchek, 2020; Hillmann, Guenther, 2021). The adopted perspective makes it possible to indicate that adaptive mechanisms within organizations may function as compensatory mechanisms that limit the negative consequences of organizational dysfunctions. Third, the article develops the discussion on the role of mechanisms for balancing dysfunctions within organizations by emphasizing the importance of processes such as organizational learning, the adaptation of organizational structures, and the use of informal mechanisms for coordinating activities (Argote, Miron-Spektor, 2011; Desai, 2016). Identifying these mechanisms makes it possible to better understand how organizations are able to maintain their operational capacity despite the occurrence of various disturbances in their functioning. As a result, the article contributes to a deeper understanding of the nature of organizational dysfunctions and the mechanisms that enable their balancing in the process of organizational functioning.

2. Dysfunction as an Element of Organizational Functioning

Organizations are complex social systems operating under conditions of uncertainty, multiple stakeholder interests, and bounded rationality of decision-makers. As a result, organizational processes rarely correspond to models of rational design of management structures and procedures. In practice, the functioning of organizations is often associated with the occurrence of various inefficiencies described in the literature as organizational

dysfunctions or organizational pathologies. The issue of organizational dysfunctions constitutes an important area of research in management sciences, particularly in the context of analyzing organizational effectiveness and sustainability. Dysfunctions may be understood as persistent or recurring disturbances in the functioning of organizations that lead to decreased operational efficiency, the generation of losses, or the waste of resources (Pasieczny, Glinka, 2016). The literature indicates that organizational pathologies are not incidental phenomena but often constitute an inherent element of the functioning of organizational systems (Pasieczny, 2017). Research on organizational pathologies has a long tradition in organization theory. Classical analyses of bureaucratic structures already indicated that organizational solutions generate both functional and dysfunctional effects (Merton, 1940). In a similar vein, scholars analyzed the phenomenon of unintended consequences of organizational actions, which may lead to the emergence of rigid procedures and excessive formalization (Crozier, 2009). Contemporary research indicates that organizational dysfunctions may take various forms, such as inefficient organizational structures, conflicts of interest, decision-making errors, opportunistic behavior, pathological phenomena in social relations, corrupt practices, and others (Ashforth et al., 2008; Ashforth, Anand, 2003; Greve et al., 2010; Treviño et al., 2014). From a systemic perspective, organizations should be perceived as complex adaptive systems in which dysfunctions are often the result of tensions between different elements of the system (Anderson, 1999). In such an approach, organizations are not fully rational structures but rather dynamic systems in which both adaptive and disorganizing mechanisms emerge (Weick, Sutcliffe, 2011). Various classifications of organizational dysfunctions have been proposed in the literature. One of the most frequently cited typologies includes structural, process, and behavioral dysfunctions (Vaughan, 1999). Structural dysfunctions result from an inadequate fit between the organizational structure and the organization's environment or strategy (Donaldson, 2001). They may lead to excessive centralization, conflicts of competence, or a lack of coordination of activities. Process dysfunctions refer to inefficiencies in the implementation of fundamental organizational processes, such as decision-making, communication, or knowledge management (Argote, Miron-Spektor, 2011). Research indicates that particularly in complex organizations problems often arise related to the flow of information and the coordination of activities between organizational units (Gulati et al., 2012). Behavioral dysfunctions, in turn, result from the behaviors of individuals and groups within organizations, such as opportunism, abuse of power, or unethical conduct (Ashforth, Anand, 2003). The sources of organizational dysfunctions can be analyzed at different levels: individual, organizational, and institutional. At the individual level, a key role is played by the cognitive limitations of decision-makers and decision-making errors resulting from heuristics and cognitive biases (Bazerman, Moore, 2012). At the organizational level, structures of power, incentive systems, and control mechanisms are of significant importance (Ocasio, 1997). Improper design of these elements may lead to the emergence of dysfunctional behaviors, such as manipulation of information or excessive risk-taking (Sitkin, Pablo, 1992).

At the institutional level, dysfunctions may result from environmental pressures (Pfeffer, Salancik, 1878) and mechanisms of institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983). Organizations often adopt organizational solutions not because they are effective but because they are socially legitimized. Contemporary systemic approaches indicate that dysfunctions do not always lead to organizational failure. In many cases, organizations develop adaptive mechanisms that allow them to compensate for the negative consequences of disturbances (March, Simon, 1958). One such mechanism is the phenomenon of loose coupling, which enables the limitation of the spread of problems within the organizational system (Weick, 1976). As a result, dysfunctions occurring in one area of an organization do not necessarily lead to destabilization of the entire system. A similar role is played by organizational slack, which increases an organization's ability to absorb shocks and adapt to changing conditions (Bourgeois, 1981; Cyert, March, 1963). These resources may take various forms, such as financial surpluses, personnel reserves, or excess organizational competencies. The importance of organizational learning processes is also emphasized, as they allow organizations to adapt to emerging dysfunctions (Argote, Miron-Spektor, 2011). In this context, dysfunctions may serve as stimuli for organizational change and innovation. Compensatory mechanisms may be understood as processes and structures that enable organizations to maintain operational effectiveness despite the occurrence of disturbances or inefficiencies in certain areas of activity (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011). In the management literature, this phenomenon is increasingly analyzed in the context of organizational resilience, which refers to the ability of organizations to survive and adapt under conditions of disturbances (Duchek, 2020). Compensatory mechanisms may take both formal and informal forms. Formal mechanisms include, among others, crisis management procedures, control systems, and risk management structures (Sitkin, Pablo, 1992). Informal compensatory mechanisms, in turn, include social relationships, organizational norms, and networks of cooperation. Organizational resilience is one of the key compensatory mechanisms enabling organizations to function under conditions of dysfunction (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011). Resilient organizations are characterized, among other things, by the ability to learn quickly, the flexibility of organizational structures, and well-developed networks of cooperation (Duchek, 2020). These mechanisms allow organizations not only to survive crises but also to use them as opportunities for development (Vogus, Sutcliffe, 2007). One of the most important compensatory mechanisms is the design of organizational structures in a way that enables the limitation of the effects of dysfunctions. An example is the decentralization of decision-making, which makes it possible to increase organizational flexibility and shorten response times to changes in the environment (Mintzberg, 1983). Another mechanism is organizational modularity, which makes it possible to isolate problems within specific parts of the organization (Schilling, 2000). Social mechanisms such as trust, cooperation, and social capital also play an important role in compensating for organizational dysfunctions (Nahapiet, Ghoshal, 1998). Social relationships may enable informal problem-solving and limit the consequences of formal organizational dysfunctions. The literature

indicates that in many organizations informal networks of cooperation play a key role in ensuring effective functioning (Krackhardt, Hanson, 1993).

3. Research Methodology

Due to the exploratory nature of the research problem and the limited state of knowledge concerning mechanisms for balancing organizational dysfunctions in the practice of organizational functioning, a qualitative approach was applied in the study. Qualitative research is particularly useful in the analysis of complex organizational phenomena in which context, the interpretations of organizational participants, and the processual nature of the studied phenomena are of key importance (Denzin et al., 2023). This approach makes it possible to achieve a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of organizational functioning and to identify relationships that are difficult to capture using quantitative methods. The study employed the method of in-depth interviews with representatives of organizations and their stakeholders. Interviews are one of the fundamental qualitative research techniques in management sciences, enabling the collection of detailed information about the experiences, interpretations, and organizational practices of the studied individuals (Kvale, Brinkmann, 2009). In particular, they make it possible to identify organizational mechanisms that may not be directly visible in formal documents or organizational structures. The selection of the studied organizations was purposive. The aim of such a selection was to include in the study employees of organizations diversified in terms of size, industry, and organizational form, which made it possible to capture different contexts in which organizational dysfunctions occur as well as different ways of compensating for them. In qualitative research, purposive sampling is a commonly used strategy that enables the selection of cases that are particularly useful for analyzing the studied phenomenon (Patton, 2015). The study included employees and clients of both private and public organizations. The respondents included, among others, employees and clients of: a large decentralized public institution responsible for phytosanitary control, a housing cooperative, a university, a private primary school, an international automotive corporation, a private medical clinic, an internet service provider, a large retail chain, and a catering company. Such diversity of cases made it possible to analyze organizational dysfunctions in different types of organizations and in different institutional contexts. In total, interviews were conducted with more than 60 respondents. The respondents included employees occupying various organizational positions, including representatives of management, operational employees, and – in some cases – clients of the studied organizations. Including the perspective of clients made it possible to obtain a more diverse picture of organizational functioning and to identify dysfunctions visible from the perspective of external stakeholders. Among the conducted interviews, 51 were recorded and subsequently transcribed (table 1). The transcripts

constituted the primary empirical material used in further data analysis. The remaining interviews were documented in the form of detailed research notes prepared immediately after the interview. The material derived from these interviews formed part of a broader research process. However, it was not subjected to coding and is not drawn upon in the present article.

Table 1.
List of interlocutors

Company/Sector	Size	Respondent type/Number of Interlocutors
Phytosanitary Control	Over 2000 employees	President – 1 Branch directors – 3 Inspectors - 12
University – 1	Over 5000 employees	Dean – 1 Professors - 3
University – 2	Over 3000 employees	Dean – 1 Professor - 1
Housing cooperative	100 employees	Technical Specialist – 1 Secretary - 1
Primary school	60 employees	Teacher - 1
International automotive corporation (local branch)	150 employees	HR specialist – 1 Controlling specialist - 2
Medical Clinic – 1	Over 1000 employees	HR Specialist - 1
Medical Clinic – 2	30 employees	President - 1
Internet provider	100 employees	President – 1 Finance director – 1 Technical manager - 1 Organizational specialist – 1
Retail chain	Over 1000 employees	Procurement specialist – 1 Secretary - 1
Catering company	50 employees	Quality manager - 1
Producer of seedlings	20 employees	Owner – 1 Export manager - 1
Handling company – 1	Over 200 employees	Operations manager -1
Handling company – 2	Over 300 employees	Operations manager - 1
Construction company	70 employees	Owner – 1 Operations manager - 1
Manufacturer of rehabilitation equipment	80 employees	Finance specialist - 1
Manufacturer of household appliances (local branch)	40 employees	Sales representative – 1 Secretary - 1
Shoe manufacturer	200 employees	President – 1 Chief accountant – 1 Quality manager - 1
Merchant ship	20 employees	First officer – 1 Sailor motorist - 1

Source: own elaboration.

The analysis of the collected empirical material was conducted using qualitative data coding procedures. This process involves the systematic identification and categorization of fragments of empirical data in order to extract key themes and interpretative patterns (Saldaña, 2013). Coding enables the gradual transition from raw empirical data to more general analytical categories. The data analysis proceeded in several stages. In the first stage, open coding was conducted, which involved identifying basic categories appearing in the respondents' statements. In the next stage, thematic coding was applied, which allowed the identified

categories to be grouped into broader analytical areas related to the occurrence of organizational dysfunctions and mechanisms for their compensation. Such an approach is widely used in qualitative research concerning organizations (Miles et al., 2014). The data analysis process had an iterative character, which means that the interpretation of the empirical material was gradually developed as the analysis of subsequent interviews deepened. Such an approach allows for a more in-depth understanding of the studied phenomena and for the identification of new analytical categories emerging during the process of data analysis. In order to increase the credibility of the research results, several procedures characteristic of qualitative research were applied. One of these was the triangulation of data sources, which involved the use of information obtained from different categories of respondents, including employees of organizations as well as their clients. Triangulation is a commonly used strategy for increasing the reliability of qualitative research because it enables the confrontation of different interpretative perspectives (Denzin, 2012). Additionally, case triangulation was applied, consisting of the analysis of different types of organizations operating in various sectors of the economy. The analysis of multiple cases makes it possible to identify both similarities and differences in the mechanisms of organizational functioning and increases the potential for generalizing analytical conclusions (Yin, 2018). An additional element increasing the credibility of the research was the systematic procedure of coding the empirical material and documenting subsequent stages of the data analysis. The transparency of the analytical process is one of the key criteria of quality in qualitative research in the social sciences (Miles et al., 2014). When interpreting the results, it is necessary to take into account the limitations typical of qualitative methods. The research strategy applied was based on purposive case selection, which means that the obtained results are not statistically representative of the entire population of organizations. In qualitative research, however, the objective is not statistical representativeness but rather a deeper understanding of the analyzed phenomena and the identification of mechanisms and processes occurring within organizations (Patton, 2015). Another limitation concerns the nature of the empirical data based on interviews with respondents. Data of this type have a declarative character and rely on the individual interpretations of organizational participants. This means that the opinions presented by respondents may be partially conditioned by their experiences, organizational roles, or subjective interpretations of the organizational situation (Kvale, Brinkmann, 2009). For this reason, in qualitative research it is important to take into account different perspectives and to confront information obtained from different respondents. The diversity of the studied organizations in terms of industry, size, and organizational form may also be considered a limitation. On the one hand, this made it possible to analyze organizational dysfunctions in different institutional contexts; on the other hand, it makes direct comparison of certain aspects of organizational functioning more difficult. However, case diversity is often used in qualitative research in order to increase the analytical potential of studies and to identify common mechanisms occurring in different organizational contexts (Yin, 2018). Finally, it should be

emphasized that the analysis of the data was based on an interpretative process characteristic of qualitative research. Although the use of systematic coding procedures and the documentation of subsequent stages of data analysis increase the transparency of the research process, the interpretation of empirical material always depends to some extent on the perspective of the researcher (Miles et al., 2014). In order to limit this type of risk, the analysis employed an iterative character of data coding and confronted interpretations with different fragments of the empirical material.

4. Results

The study revealed a number of phenomena recurring in many of the analyzed organizations, although they are not always evaluated in the same way.

Centralization of power and the importance of headquarters. Centralization and decentralization are key parameters of organizational structures. Extreme centralization means that the most important strategic decisions are made by a central decision-making body, which limits the autonomy of lower organizational levels.

At the beginning of the 2000s the managers were French and they came here to manage the company. There was no possibility that a Pole could be a director. Poles could be managers or rank-and-file employees. [FMP01]

The final decisions were made by the board in France, while in Poland decisions belonged to the directors and ultimately to the president, who in any case acted according to the guidelines from France. [FMP01]

However, in another institution centralization is perceived differently by both its clients and employees.

We consulted the first shipment with the inspection (…).

Q: With the local branch or with the headquarters? With the main office. They were the ones who learned the regulations of the destination country and told us what the requirements were. [KFK02]

It should be more unified so that all branches operate in a similar way. (…) Sometimes everyone interprets the regulations a little differently. [KFP02]

In many analyzed organizations the source of dysfunction is excessive centralization. However, as the above quotations indicate, problems may also arise from the lack of central coordination and control. Therefore, the source of dysfunction seems to be deviations from the desired level of centralization, which is specific to each organization.

Autocratic and bureaucratic management style. The hierarchical structure of organizations leads to multi-stage decision-making processes and the dominance of procedures.

The management style was certainly bureaucratic, but it could also be said that it was autocratic, because everything had to be approved at successive levels. [FMP01]

First the order was prepared by an employee in SAP, then approved by the manager, later by the director, who often did not even technically know how to use the system. [FMP01]

All final decisions were practically made by the owner. [FIP01]

The president could change his mind by 180 degrees at the last moment and no one could oppose it. [FIP01]

All of this then goes to the rector and it takes an incredibly long time…. [UP01]

A consequence of an autocratic, but also highly hierarchical, structure of power is a large power distance within the organization and, consequently, difficulties in correcting erroneous decisions.

Misalignment of decisions with local realities. Decisions made by managers at headquarters do not always take into account the local market or cultural context.

Very often decisions were made by people who came here and had little understanding of our market and the realities of how the company operates. [FMP01]

They came here from headquarters, basically they didn't know anything, but they were the most important… And they pushed their own suppliers. [SSWP01]

The misalignment of decisions with local realities often causes irritation among employees, but it may also significantly affect work efficiency and become a strongly dysfunctional factor.

Symbolic projects and superficial changes. Some organizational changes primarily serve to build the image of managers or institutions.

This move to the new office was supposed to show that the president had completed a major reorganization project that would bring savings. In reality, it turned out that the office was more expensive, worse located, and more difficult for employees to commute to. [FMP01]

We changed the name so that it would sound better in English for accreditation purposes. But our students are mostly from Poland, and in Polish it sounds terrible. [UP02]

Introducing changes is associated with the necessity of incurring costs, although these costs are not always easy to estimate. In the case of superficial changes, these costs are particularly burdensome, as such changes do not bring the expected organizational benefits.

Excessive bureaucracy, reporting, and data manipulation. A large number of reports and analyses sometimes become more important than real operational activities. Employees sometimes demonstrate considerable creativity in creating a false but management-approved picture of reality.

Over time there were more and more reports coming from headquarters and we had to prepare monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, and annual forecasts. At some point the reports became more important than the client itself. [FMP01]

If the targets were unrealistic, we had to adjust the data so that it looked as if they were achievable. [FMP01]

We took data from the THIN AIR system, but we often called this system by a more expressive name. [FMP02]

We prepare these 12-page syllabi, but everyone knows that it cannot really be used in practice. [UP01]

The phenomenon outlined here has an extremely dysfunctional character not only because it essentially describes work without value. It also creates an organizational fiction that deepens when decisions in an organization are made on the basis of foundations that are completely detached from reality.

Organizational chaos and unclear division of responsibilities. An important problem is the lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities.

It was not clear who was responsible for what. In the initial period there was a substitution table, but later it completely faded away. [FMP01]

An unclear division of responsibilities creates another risk.

If someone was very committed and coped well with their work, they were given even more responsibilities. [FMP02]

We had such an irreplaceable employee. When he died there was chaos for a long time. [UP01]

An unclear division of responsibilities leads to employee dissatisfaction and the overburdening of certain parts of the organization. It generates conflicts, results in professional burnout, and leads to excessive exploitation of valuable organizational resources.

Conflicts between departments. Tensions between departments hinder cooperation. The more complex the organizational structure becomes, the more visible the tensions are, and sometimes even conflicts arise between different parts of the organization.

Between finance and accounting it was not cooperation, but rather a tug of war. [FMP01]

Accounting recorded documents according to its own rules, and controlling later had to correct the data. [FMP01]

The administrative division was constantly fighting with the technical division. [SM01]

There was constant shifting of responsibility between the HR department and accounting. [FIP01]

A problem for many organizations is the silo structure, which is characterized by weak information flow between divisions that are simultaneously interdependent because they are connected by organizational processes.

Outsourcing and control problems. The outsourcing of functions leads to the loss of organizational knowledge and the loss of control over selected areas. Another problem is often a poorly functioning internal control system resulting from an improperly designed structure or simply a lack of supervision.

Accounting was first moved to Slovakia and later to India, and this made communication very difficult. Our employees had to explain every accounting operation in detail. [FMP01]

When an inspection came, it discovered that an employee had entered the refrigerator temperature for the entire day in advance on the sheet. And he was supposed to check it every two hours… [FKM01]

In some situations, the possibilities for controlling employees are limited, and the cost of operating a control system may be very high. However, in cases involving the introduction of changes, high complexity, or safety concerns, strict control is necessary, which in practice does not always occur.

Labor cost reduction strategy. Companies sometimes minimize employment costs at the expense of organizational stability.

Students were employed under civil-law contracts because the company did not have to pay social security contributions. [FMP01]

Instead of hiring a new employee, the duties were distributed among the remaining employees. [FMP02]

The president said that instead of the workshop manager he would hire several workers from the Far East and save money on that. [FIP01]

The director does not want to dismiss him because although he is weak, he has a low salary. [SP01]

Attempts to reduce labor costs are common regardless of the type of organization or the industry in which it operates. However, they often lead to the loss of valuable organizational knowledge resources and weaken employees' engagement and their attachment to the organization.

Compensatory factors and mechanisms. One of the compensatory factors within an organization is experienced and committed employees. They constitute a specific form of organizational memory of the company.

A person working in the HR department for many years knew the history of the company and could find the necessary documents within a few minutes. With such employees it was much easier to solve problems. [FMP01]

It is difficult to negotiate with doctors. But they must be taken care of because they are the most important for us. [KMM01]

As organizations grow, organizational culture changes. Organizations move from a relational culture to a corporate culture. This is not always accepted by employees, but at the same time it provides greater predictability and repeatability of organizational behaviors.

At the beginning the company functioned somewhat like a family business and employees helped each other. Over time the atmosphere changed and corporate formalization began to dominate. [FMP02]

Our university is practically a corporation – indicators, procedures, standards, slots… [UP01]

Informal actions of employees that allow the organization to function despite dysfunctions may also serve as a compensatory mechanism. On the other hand, strong formalization keeps the organization at a stable level and makes it predictable, although not very innovative.

We operate somewhat by inertia, while at the same time trying to patch holes and put out fires. The old guard of employees knows the company and tries to ensure that it somehow continues to function despite everything. [FMP01]

If we do not know something, we call another region. We activate our private contacts. [KFP01]

Moreover, some dysfunctions can be compensated by organizational resources.

The company has a nice brand that some people associate positively with. They come back to the company. [FMP01]

We were the first such supermarket in the country. [SSWP01]

They may also be compensated by a monopolistic position combined with a sense of mission.

Our task is control. Someone has to do it for the good of consumers. [KFP02]

The results of the study are presented in a synthetic form in Table 2.

Table 2.
Main types of organizational dysfunctions and compensatory mechanisms

Area of dysfunction	Mechanism of the problem	Main consequences	Compensatory mechanisms
Centralization / lack of coordination	Mismatch of the level of centralization	delays, inconsistency of decisions	local improvisation, informal consultations
Autocracy and bureaucracy	Multi-level approval processes, high power distance	slow decisions, difficulty correcting errors	experienced employees bypassing system constraints
Misalignment with local realities	Decisions detached from local practice	frustration, decline in efficiency	employees' local operational knowledge
Superficial changes	Symbolic projects instead of functional ones	costs without benefits, deterioration of work	everyday operational adjustments
Excessive reporting	Dominance of indicators over reality	organizational fiction, erroneous decisions	informal knowledge, bottom-up corrections
Unclear division of responsibilities	Diffusion of responsibility	overload, conflicts, risk of knowledge loss	key employees as organizational memory
Conflicts between departments	Silo structure and weak horizontal coordination	tensions, correction of errors, decline in efficiency	personal relationships between employees
Outsourcing and cost cutting	Loss of knowledge and weakening of supervision	communication problems, lower quality, instability	brand, market position, engagement of part of the staff

Source: own elaboration.

5. Discussion

The results of the conducted study indicate that organizational dysfunctions are a widespread phenomenon and occur in different types of organizations regardless of their size, sector, or ownership structure. At the same time, the analysis of the empirical material shows that organizations rarely operate under conditions of full organizational efficiency. In practice, their functioning rather consists of balancing various structural and process tensions that may lead to the emergence of dysfunctions. These findings are consistent with the assumptions of the behavioral theory of the firm, according to which organizations operate under conditions of bounded rationality, incomplete information, and diverse interests of organizational participants (Cyert, March, 1963; March, Simon, 1958). Contemporary research on organizations also emphasizes that decision-making processes in organizations often have an adaptive and incremental character rather than a fully rational one (Felin et al., 2015; Gavetti et al., 2012).

The empirical findings can be interpreted through the three analytical categories: structural, process, and behavioral dysfunctions. Structural dysfunctions concern the design of organizational arrangements, including centralization, hierarchy, unclear division of responsibilities, and silo structures. Process dysfunctions relate to the way organizational activities are coordinated and controlled, including reporting systems, decision-making procedures, outsourcing, and coordination mechanisms. Behavioral dysfunctions concern managerial and employee behaviors, such as autocratic leadership, data manipulation, symbolic actions, and informal practices developed to compensate for organizational shortcomings. Although these categories are analytically distinct, the empirical material demonstrates that they frequently overlap and reinforce one another.

The issue of centralization illustrates primarily a structural dysfunction, although its consequences extend to organizational processes. One of the important conclusions resulting from the study is that many organizational dysfunctions arise from tensions between different principles of organizing activities, such as centralization and decentralization, formalization and flexibility, or control and employee autonomy. The results indicate that both excessive centralization and too low a level of central coordination may lead to organizational problems. On the one hand, excessive centralization limits the autonomy of local units and slows down decision-making processes; on the other hand, the lack of central coordination may lead to inconsistency of actions and divergent interpretations of procedures. The literature emphasizes that the effectiveness of organizational structures depends primarily on their fit with the context of organizational activity, including the complexity of the environment, strategy, and the nature of the processes being carried out (Burton et al., 2020; Donaldson, 2001). Research on organizational design also indicates that organizations often operate under conditions of persistent structural tensions that cannot be completely eliminated but can only be managed through appropriate coordination mechanisms (Smith, Lewis, 2011).

The findings concerning extensive hierarchy and autocratic management represent an interaction between structural and behavioral dysfunctions. An important area of dysfunction revealed in the study concerns the functioning of extensive hierarchical structures and an autocratic management style. In many analyzed organizations, decision-making processes were highly centralized and multi-stage, which led to longer decision-making times and increased power distance between management and employees. These findings are consistent with earlier analyses concerning dysfunctions of bureaucratic structures, which indicate that excessive formalization and extensive hierarchy may lead to a loss of organizational flexibility and limit the organization's ability to adapt (Crozier, 2009; Merton, 1940). At the same time, contemporary research on organizational structures indicates that hierarchical control mechanisms still play an important role in coordinating activities in large organizations, especially under conditions of high complexity and institutional responsibility (Puranam et al., 2014). This means that the problem is not hierarchy itself but rather its excessive expansion or its improper fit with the nature of organizational activities.

Excessive reporting is primarily a process dysfunction, as it affects the way organizational information is generated, interpreted, and used in decision-making. In some cases, reporting and generating indicators became an end in itself rather than a tool supporting management processes. This phenomenon may be interpreted in the context of research on the institutionalization of organizational practices and so-called organizational rituals, which involve formally fulfilling institutional requirements without having a real impact on the functioning of the organization (Bromley, Powell, 2012; Meyer, Rowan, 1977). Contemporary research also indicates that in organizations strongly oriented toward indicator and audit systems there may occur the phenomenon of the performativity of indicators, in which organizational actions become subordinated to the logic of reporting rather than to the actual improvement of results (Espeland, Sauder, 2016).

Conflicts between departments constitute a structural dysfunction that subsequently generates process inefficiencies by disrupting coordination and information flows. The empirical material analyzed also clearly revealed conflicts between organizational departments and problems resulting from silo organizational structures. In many organizations, individual organizational units functioned to a large extent autonomously, which hindered the flow of information and the coordination of activities. These findings are consistent with earlier research indicating that functional structures may contribute to the emergence of communication barriers between departments and hinder cooperation between organizational units (Gulati et al., 2012). At the same time, research on organizational design indicates that this problem is particularly visible in organizations with a high degree of functional specialization, where individual units develop different logics of action and different systems for interpreting information (Puranam et al., 2014).

Outsourcing and labor cost reduction strategies illustrate process dysfunctions associated with the organization of work, although they also produce behavioral consequences such as declining engagement and knowledge sharing. The results of the study also point to the importance of dysfunctions related to outsourcing and labor cost reduction strategies. In some of the analyzed cases, outsourcing led to the loss of organizational knowledge and the deterioration of communication between organizational units and external entities. The management literature indicates that outsourcing may bring benefits in the form of cost reduction and increased organizational flexibility; however, it is also associated with the risk of losing key competencies and weakening control over organizational processes (Holcomb, Hitt, 2007; Lahiri, 2016). Similar problems may arise in the case of strategies strongly oriented toward reducing labor costs, which may lead to decreased employee engagement and the loss of organizational knowledge (Kalleberg, 2011).

Importantly, compensatory mechanisms were observed across all three categories of dysfunctions. Experienced employees, informal networks, and organizational resources reduced the negative consequences of structural, process, and behavioral deficiencies rather than eliminating their underlying causes. One of the most important conclusions from the study, however, is that despite numerous dysfunctions organizations do not cease to function. The analysis of the empirical material indicates that in many cases organizations develop compensatory mechanisms that enable them to limit the negative effects of dysfunctions. Particularly important in this context are experienced employees who serve as carriers of organizational knowledge and help solve problems resulting from the inefficiency of formal organizational structures. The management literature emphasizes the importance of tacit knowledge and employee experience for the functioning of organizations, especially under conditions of uncertainty and organizational complexity (Argote, Miron-Spektor, 2011; Felin et al., 2015).

Another important compensatory mechanism is the existence of informal networks of cooperation among employees. In many analyzed cases, employees used private contacts and interpersonal relationships to solve organizational problems that could not be effectively resolved within formal procedures. These findings confirm earlier research on informal organizational structures, which indicates that networks of social relations play a key role in the flow of knowledge and in solving organizational problems (Krackhardt, Hanson, 1993; Nahapiet, Ghoshal, 1998). Contemporary research on social capital in organizations also indicates that informal relationships between employees may increase the organization's ability to adapt and solve problems under conditions of uncertainty (Adler, Kwon, 2002; Soda et al., 2018).

The compensatory mechanisms revealed in the study may also be interpreted in the context of the concept of organizational resilience. The literature indicates that organizational resilience refers to the ability of organizations to maintain operational effectiveness despite disturbances and to adapt in the face of crises and uncertainty (Duchek, 2020). Resilient organizations are

characterized, among other things, by the ability to learn from experience, flexible organizational structures, and well-developed networks of cooperation (Hillmann, Guenther, 2021). The results of the present study suggest that compensatory mechanisms may constitute one of the key elements in building such organizational resilience, as they enable organizations to maintain their operational capacity despite the occurrence of various dysfunctions.

The results of the study also fit into the broader discussion on organizational paradoxes. The literature emphasizes that organizations often operate under conditions of persistent tensions between conflicting logics of action, such as stability and change, control and autonomy, or efficiency and flexibility (Smith, Lewis, 2011). From this perspective, organizational dysfunctions may be perceived not only as manifestations of organizational inefficiency but also as side effects of attempts to balance different organizational requirements. The results of the present study indicate that the ability of organizations to function despite the occurrence of such tensions depends largely on the development of compensatory mechanisms and the adaptive capabilities of organizations. Taken together, the findings suggest that organizational dysfunctions rarely occur in isolation. Structural arrangements shape organizational processes, while process failures often stimulate dysfunctional behaviors or informal adaptive responses. This interdependence explains why the empirical cases are best understood as configurations of mutually reinforcing structural, process, and behavioral dysfunctions rather than as isolated organizational problems.

6. Conclusions

This study contributes to the literature on organizational dysfunctions by demonstrating that such dysfunctions are neither isolated phenomena nor exclusive to particular sectors or organizational forms. The empirical findings show that dysfunctions emerge across private companies, public institutions, and non-profit organizations, suggesting that they are an inherent feature of complex organizational systems rather than exceptional cases of organizational failure. The study also highlights that organizational dysfunctions rarely occur independently. Instead, they form interconnected configurations in which structural arrangements shape organizational processes, while process failures frequently reinforce dysfunctional managerial and employee behaviors. The findings further indicate that organizations continue to function despite the presence of numerous dysfunctions because they develop compensatory mechanisms. Experienced employees, informal networks of cooperation, organizational memory, and valuable organizational resources help maintain operational continuity even when formal structures or processes prove inadequate. These mechanisms increase organizational resilience, but they should not be interpreted as solutions to the underlying organizational problems. Rather, they temporarily mitigate the consequences of structural and process deficiencies.

The study also offers several managerial implications. Managers should recognize experienced employees and informal collaboration networks as valuable organizational assets and actively support them through knowledge-sharing practices, mentoring, succession planning, and the systematic documentation of organizational knowledge. At the same time, organizations should avoid becoming overly dependent on individual employees or informal workarounds. Recurring reliance on informal solutions should be treated as a diagnostic signal indicating deficiencies in organizational structures, coordination mechanisms, or decision-making processes that require formal organizational improvement. In this sense, compensatory mechanisms should complement, rather than substitute for, continuous organizational redesign.

The study has several limitations. The findings are based on qualitative interviews conducted in organizations operating in different sectors and institutional contexts. Although this diversity made it possible to identify recurring patterns of dysfunction, the results are not intended to provide statistical generalization. Future research could examine the relationships between structural, process, and behavioral dysfunctions using comparative case studies or quantitative approaches, as well as investigate the conditions under which compensatory mechanisms contribute to long-term organizational resilience rather than merely sustaining ineffective organizational arrangements.

Overall, the study suggests that understanding organizational dysfunctions requires moving beyond the analysis of isolated organizational problems toward examining the interactions between organizational structures, processes, and behaviors. Such an integrated perspective provides a more comprehensive explanation of why dysfunctions persist and how organizations are nevertheless able to maintain operational effectiveness over time.

7. Summary

The aim of the article was to analyze organizational dysfunctions as an element of organizational functioning and to identify mechanisms that enable their balancing. The results of the conducted research indicate that organizational dysfunctions are a widespread phenomenon and take various forms, including structural, process, and behavioral problems. Among the most frequently occurring phenomena identified were excessive centralization or lack of central coordination, an autocratic management style, excessive bureaucracy, conflicts between departments, an unclear division of responsibilities, and problems resulting from outsourcing and labor cost reduction strategies. At the same time, the results of the study indicate that organizations rarely operate under conditions of a complete absence of dysfunctions. In practice, their functioning rather consists of balancing various structural and process tensions and developing compensatory mechanisms that make it possible to maintain operational capacity despite the occurrence of organizational disturbances. In particular,

an important role is played by experienced employees who serve as carriers of organizational knowledge, informal networks of cooperation among employees, and organizational resources such as the reputation or market position of the organization. The results of the present study contribute to the literature on organizational dysfunctions by indicating that these phenomena should be analyzed not only in terms of organizational pathologies but also as elements of the functioning of complex organizational systems. From this perspective, it is particularly important to take into account compensatory mechanisms that allow organizations to limit the effects of dysfunctions and maintain their operational capacity in a changing and uncertain environment. The obtained results also have practical implications for the management of organizations. They indicate the importance of maintaining a balance between formalization and flexibility in organizational structures, as well as the need to support mechanisms of cooperation and organizational learning. In particular, it is important to appreciate the role of informal organizational relationships and the experience of employees in ensuring the effective functioning of organizations. At the same time, it should be emphasized that the presented results are exploratory in nature and result from qualitative analysis conducted on a limited number of organizational cases. In future research, it would be worthwhile to consider deepening the analysis of mechanisms for balancing organizational dysfunctions through the use of comparative studies or quantitative methods that would enable the analysis of relationships between organizational dysfunctions and organizational resilience. A particularly interesting direction for further research may be the analysis of the role of compensatory mechanisms in organizational learning processes and in building the adaptive capabilities of organizations under conditions of increasing environmental complexity.

References

1. Adler, P.S., Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept. *Academy of Management Review*, *27*(1), 17-40. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.5922314
2. Anderson, P. (1999). Perspective: Complexity Theory and Organization Science. *Organization Science*, *10*(3), 216-232. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.3.216
3. Argote, L., Miron-Spektor, E. (2011). Organizational Learning: From Experience to Knowledge. *Organization Science*, *22*(5), 1123-1137. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0621
4. Ashforth, B.E., Anand, V. (2003). The Normalization of Corruption in Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 1-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25001-2

5. Ashforth, B.E., Gioia, D.A., Robinson, S.L., Treviño, L.K. (2008). Re-Viewing Organizational Corruption. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*(3), 670-684. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.32465714
6. Bazerman, M.H., Moore, D.A. (2012). *Judgment in Managerial Decision Making*. John Wiley & Sons.
7. Bourgeois, L.J. (1981). On the Measurement of Organizational Slack. *Academy of Management Review*, *6*(1), 29-39. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1981.4287985
8. Bromley, P., Powell, W.W. (2012). From Smoke and Mirrors to Walking the Talk: Decoupling in the Contemporary World. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *6*(1), 483-530. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2012.684462
9. Burton, R.M., Obel, B., Håkonsson, D.D. (2020). *Organizational Design*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108681162
10. Crozier, M. (2009). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Routledge.
11. Cyert, R.M., March, J.G. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Prentice Hall.
12. Denzin, N.K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *6*(2), 80-88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186
13. Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S., Giardina, M.D., Cannella, G.S. (2023). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications Inc.
14. Desai, V. (2016). Learning to learn from failures: the impact of operating experience on railroad accident responses. *Industrial and Corporate Change, Oxford University Press and the Associazione ICC, 25*(2), 199-226.
15. DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101
16. Donaldson, L. (2001). *The Contingency Theory of Organizations*. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452229249
17. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: a capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, *13*(1), 215-246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7
18. Espeland, W., Sauder, M. (2016). *Engines of Anxiety: Academic Rankings, Reputation, and Accountability*. Russell Sage Foundation.
19. Felin, T., Foss, N.J., Ployhart, R.E. (2015). The Microfoundations Movement in Strategy and Organization Theory. *Academy of Management Annals*, *9*(1), 575-632. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2015.1007651
20. Gavetti, G., Greve, H.R., Levinthal, D.A., Ocasio, W. (2012). The Behavioral Theory of the Firm: Assessment and Prospects. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *6*(1), 1-40. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2012.656841
21. Greve, H.R., Palmer, D., Pozner, J. (2010). Organizations Gone Wild: The Causes, Processes, and Consequences of Organizational Misconduct. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *4*(1), 53-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416521003654186

22. Gulati, R., Puranam, P., Tushman, M. (2012). Meta-organization design: Rethinking design in interorganizational and community contexts. *Strategic Management Journal*, *33*(6), 571-586. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.1975
23. Hillmann, J., Guenther, E. (2021). Organizational Resilience: A Valuable Construct for Management Research? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *23*(1), 7-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12239
24. Holcomb, T.R., Hitt, M.A. (2007). Toward a model of strategic outsourcing. *Journal of Operations Management*, *25*(2), 464-481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2006.05.003
25. Kalleberg, A.L. (2011). *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarized and Precarious Employment Systems in the United States, 1970s-2000s*. Russell Sage Foundation.
26. Krackhardt, D., Hanson, J.R. (1993). Informal networks: The company behind the chart. *Harvard Business Review*, *71*(4), 104-111.
27. Kvale, S., Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
28. Lahiri, S. (2016). Does Outsourcing Really Improve Firm Performance? Empirical Evidence and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *18*(4), 464-497. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12075
29. Lengnick-Hall, C.A., Beck, T.E., Lengnick-Hall, M.L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*(3), 243-255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001
30. March, J.G., Simon, H.A. (1958). *Organizations*. Wiley.
31. Merton, R.K. (1940). Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. *Social Forces*, *18*(4), 560-568. https://doi.org/10.2307/2570634
32. Meyer, J.W., Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *He American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363.
33. Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE.
34. Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations*. Prentice Hall.
35. Nahapiet, J., Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage. *The Academy of Management Review*, *23*(2), 242. https://doi.org/10.2307/259373
36. Ocasio, W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(S1), 187-206.
37. Palmer, D., Smith-Crowe, K., Greenwood, R. (Eds.) (2016). *Organizational Wrongdoing*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316338827
38. Pasieczny, J. (2017). Organisational Pathologies Under Conditions of Economic Downswing. *Economics and Culture*, *14*(1), 21-30. https://doi.org/10.1515/jec-2017-0002

39. Pasieczny, J., Glinka, B. (2016). Organizational Dysfunctions: Sources and Areas. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *4*(4), 213-223. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2016.040413
40. Patton, M.Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
41. Pfeffer, J., Salancik, G.R. (1878). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Harper & Row.
42. Puranam, P., Alexy, O., Reitzig, M. (2014). What's "New" About New Forms of Organizing? *Academy of Management Review*, *39*(2), 162-180. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0436
43. Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE.
44. Schilling, M.A. (2000). Toward a General Modular Systems Theory and Its Application to Interfirm Product Modularity. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*(2), 312. https://doi.org/10.2307/259016
45. Sitkin, S.B., Pablo, A.L. (1992). Reconceptualizing the Determinants of Risk Behavior. *The Academy of Management Review*, *17*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.2307/258646
46. Smith, W.K., Lewis, M.W. (2011). Toward a Theory of Paradox: A Dynamic Equilibrium Model of Organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(2), 381-403. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2011.59330958
47. Soda, G., Tortoriello, M., Iorio, A. (2018). Harvesting Value from Brokerage: Individual Strategic Orientation, Structural Holes, and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(3), 896-918. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0123
48. Treviño, L.K., den Nieuwenboer, N.A., Kish-Gephart, J.J. (2014). (Un)Ethical Behavior in Organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *65*(1), 635-660. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143745
49. Vaughan, D. (1999). The Dark Side Of Organizations: Mistake, Misconduct, and Disaster. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *25*(1), 271-305. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.271
50. Vogus, T.J., Sutcliffe, K.M. (2007). Organizational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda. *2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 3418-3422. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSMC.2007.4414160
51. Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391875
52. Weick, K., Sutcliffe, K.M. (2011). *Managing the Unexpected: Resilient Performance in an Age of Uncertainty*. John Wiley & Sons.
53. Yin, R.K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. SAGE.