UNIWERSYTET JANA DŁUGOSZA W CZĘSTOCHOWIE
Podstawy Edukacji 2025, t. 18

http://dx.doi.org/10.16926/pe.2025.18.08

Hanna KĘDZIERSKA
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4187-2764
University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland

Alicja LISIECKA
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0080-6314
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland

Contact: h.a.kedzierska@uwm.edu.pl; alicja.lisiecka@mail.umcs.pl
How to cite [jak cytować]: Kędzierska, H., & Lisiecka, A. (2025). Culturality as a Field of Educational Research: Insights from Higher Education. *Podstawy Edukacji*, *18*, 123–138.

Culturality as a Field of Educational Research: Insights from Higher Education

Abstract

This article examines the concept of culturality within the academic context, providing a semantic reconstruction of the notion informed by Anna Jawor's (2023) cultural studies perspective. Empirically, it draws on focus group interviews with university faculty, aimed at understanding how participants interpret their experiences of academic culturality and how these interpretations shape educational interactions. Using a constructivist grounded theory, seven dimensions of academic culturality were identified. The study highlights the heuristic value of culturality for educational research and underscores the need for further systematic inquiry.

Keywords: culturality, university, education, grounded theory.

Introduction

Contemporary academic education takes place amid profound cultural, social, and institutional transformations. These changes reshape traditional educational relationships, redefine participants' roles, and alter prevailing normative frameworks (Segiet, 2024). In this context, there is a growing need for ana-

lytical categories that can capture the subtle, often hidden mechanisms shaping academic life. One such category—largely absent from pedagogical discourse—is culturality. Far from being a mere set of etiquette rules, it represents a complex, dynamic network of meanings that links individual and social dimensions and underpins the didactic climate of any educational setting.

This article aims to establish culturality as a legitimate field of pedagogical inquiry, with a focus on higher education. It begins with a semantic reconstruction of the concept of culturality, drawing particularly on Anna Jawor's (2023) cultural studies framework. The empirical basis of the analysis comes from focus group research with university faculty, designed to capture the meanings they assign to their own experiences of academic culturality and to provide an initial insight into how these meanings influence the dynamics of the didactic situation.

The article situates itself within the broader field of research on academic education by advocating for the inclusion of culturality among key theoretical categories. These categories help deepen our understanding of the contemporary challenges facing higher education. In doing so, the article contributes to ongoing debates about the university's future as a space not only for knowledge transmission but also for cultivating attitudes and values. Given its normative potential and its ability to illuminate relational and identity-forming processes, culturality also has a universal quality, allowing its application in educational research beyond the confines of academia.

On the Concepts of Culture, Culturality, and Ethos

The term culture derives from the Latin verb *colo*, *colere*, meaning "to cultivate" (Jabłońska, 2019). Initially, it referred to the cultivation of the land, but over time its meaning expanded to encompass all forms of "cultivation"—both in the sense of human self-improvement and the transformation of nature. In this view, culture encompasses everything that can be developed, actualized, and shaped by human activity (Daszkiewicz, 2010). The metonymic use of the term appeared in Cicero's notion of *cultura animi*—the "cultivation of the spirit"—achieved through philosophy. In antiquity, culture was not understood as an autonomous concept but was always tied to a specific sphere of life, such as the spirit or the mind. Its Greek equivalent was *paideia*, signifying the process of shaping the human being through virtues such as justice, compassion toward people and animals, and courtesy (cf. Schaefer, 2015). Greek *paideia* represented the ideal of the accomplished citizen and exerted a profound influence on Roman culture as well as on Christianity (Daszkiewicz, 2010). In a sociological perspective, culture is understood as the totality of the material and immaterial products of human activity, encompassing values and recognized norms of con-

duct that have been objectified and accepted within a given community and subsequently transmitted both to other groups and to future generations (Gruchoła, 2010). Turning to anthropological thought, culture may also be conceived as a system of beliefs upheld within a particular community (Buliński, 2002). According to Ward H. Goodenough (1964, p. 36):

> culture consists of whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members, and do so in any role that they accept for any one of themselves. Culture, being what people have to learn as distinct from their biological heritage, must consist of the end product of learning; knowledge, in a most general, if relative, sense of the term. By this definition, we should note that culture is not a material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behavior, or emotions. It is rather an organization of these things. It is the forms of things that people have in mind, their models for perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them. As such, the things people say and do, their social arrangements and events, are products or by-products of their culture as they apply it to the task of perceiving and dealing with their circumstances. To one who knows their culture, these things and events are also signs signifying the cultural forms or models of which they are material representations.

Culture is a collective phenomenon, cumulative in nature, and evolving over time (Gruchoła, 2010). The term "culture" carries multiple meanings. It may refer to a set of norms and rules regulating behavior, traditions, religions, customs, and social practices, as well as to personal refinement and etiquette. It also encompasses artistic heritage, including masterpieces of painting, architecture, and literature, as well as cultural events (Mihułka, 2018). When used in everyday language, the term culture acquires a "strong evaluative connotation" (Jabłońska, 2019, p. 132).[1] While the adjective "cultural" may simply denote ways of life and retain a degree of objectivity, describing something or someone as "cultured" expresses approval, representing a form of judgment always made within a specific context (Jawor, 2023).

In pedagogical thought, being well-bred, which characterizes a cultured individual, has been described in terms such as good manners, etiquette, courtesy, politeness, and refinement (Wrońska, 2019). Social refinement also encompassed aesthetic education—that is, familiarity with art and engagement in creative activity (Wojnar, 1964). In the 1970s, Andrzej Tyszka (1971) argued that a cultured person should demonstrate authentic participation in culture, openness in views and attitudes, creative and expressive engagement, reflectiveness, a serious and profound approach to knowledge, art, and morality, as well as the possession of a personal worldview (cf. Zalewska-Pawlak, 2017; Olbrycht, 2019). According to more recent social opinion research conducted in Poland, a cultured person is characterized by the ability to behave appropriately in any situation, tact, carefulness in speech, avoidance of vulgarity, courtesy, respect, tolerance and openness, cleanliness and neat attire, reading, formal education, at-

[1] All translations into English of the original texts are the authors' own translations.

tendance at the theatre, cinema, and philharmonic, knowledge of art, reflectiveness, and engagement in social matters, among other attributes (Burszta et al., 2010; cf. Wilk, 2016). Thus, the standard of a cultured person encompasses a broad and heterogeneous set of traits.

Anna Jawor (2023) highlights, in her study of the model of a cultured person in Poland, that no comprehensive term has so far been established for culturally appropriate behaviors and the traits of cultured individuals. Jawor proposes to fill this theoretical gap by introducing the concept of culturality, derived from the adjective "cultured". Jawor (2023, p. 8) understands culturality broadly:

> as the totality of dispositions in individuals that allow them to be regarded as 'cultured.' These are traits and behaviors positively valued by society, socialized in children and expected, to a greater or lesser extent, from adults. They pertain to various aspects of life, from the control of physiological activities to forms of interpersonal communication. They encompass a wide range of attitudes, from elementary ones that cannot be disregarded to 'higher-order' ones worth aspiring to. Culturality spans from a gesture (someone behaves in a cultured manner, e.g., saying 'Good morning') to a personality trait (someone is cultured, i.e., it is difficult to imagine them not saying 'Good morning'). These are values always positively connoted.

In this framework, culturality manifests across several domains: **attitudes** (appropriate behavior, respect for others, punctuality, hospitality, care for language, nature, and country), **rituals** (greetings, introductions, table manners), **communications** (greetings, expressions of thanks, congratulations), **personal appearance** (hygiene, attire, smiling), **virtues** (kindness, conscientiousness, honor, accountability for one's word, honesty), **mental attributes** (broad interests, eloquence, sense of humor, critical thinking), and **engagement in cultural activities** (reading, attending theatre or cinema, visiting museums, engaging in artistic creation) (Jawor, 2023). Culturality may be considered in multiple ways—as a regulator of social life, a manifestation of personality, a life stance, an attitude toward the world, and as practices that aesthetically shape the social environment. As a normative phenomenon, culturality must always be examined with regard to its specific context.

The broad understanding of culturality presented by A. Jawor aligns it closely with the concept of ethos proposed by Czesław Robotycki (1980). The category of ethos is complex, encompassing a set of social facts that Robotycki identifies as morality and custom, corresponding to two fundamental dimensions of social reality: attitudes and behaviors. The moral dimension comprises worldview, values, judgments, and norms. Custom, on the other hand, is constituted by: the normative personal model (a set of conceptions regarding proper behavior), patterns of personal behavior (the actual behaviors of community members), ritual rules (gestures, expressions, etiquette), and the realm of material references (meanings and evaluations attributed to material objects). Specific relations exist between these categories, and their observation allows the researcher to un-

derstand the complex transpositions of prevailing norms into the sphere of human action. The spheres of morality and custom mutually influence each other through the attitude–behavior relationship. Robotycki's proposed model of ethos pertains to groups distinguished by a certain cultural and normative cohesion. However, this system "does not operate in isolation, and its elements undergo changes under the influence of external information" (Robotycki, 1980, p. 31). The system evolves, and the process of change can be subject to empirical exploration. Robotycki (1980, p. 32) writes:

> The ethos of any group (community), is conditioned by its structural characteristics and historical fate; hence, the elements of ethos are historically variable (some more durable, others less so). The model thus demonstrates that situations are possible in which historical changes result, for example, in a discrepancy between values and personal patterns, which does not necessarily lead to the disintegration of the ethos.

Tracking the process of change, as manifested in the everyday life of a given group (cf. Sulima, 2000), allows one to understand the role of external factors in the transformations occurring within a specific ethos.

Academic Culture and Academic Culturality

Academic culture, understood as the ideological and normative framework delineating the scope of activity within the university community (Sztompka, 2014), has been largely shaped by the so-called "traditional" model of the university, formulated by Wilhelm von Humboldt in the first half of the nineteenth century (Zakowicz, 2012). Academic culture embodies the realization of the values underpinning the idea of the university and its ethos, which in turn shape the identity and mission of higher education institutions. In the traditional university, the ethos encompassed the pursuit of truth, academic freedom, scholarly integrity, a sense of community, civic education, and the social responsibility of the academic community (Zakowicz, 2012).

As Jacek Hołówka (2015) observes, contemporary universities increasingly depart from the classical model of academic ethos, adopting structures and operational mechanisms characteristic of production-oriented enterprises. Alongside critical perspectives on these transformations, there is also a conviction regarding the necessity of market-oriented higher education as a factor conducive to social, technological, and economic development, while simultaneously emphasizing its potential to enhance the quality of educational processes (cf. Marszałek, 2008; Andrzejczak, 2015; Makieła, 2017). Under these conditions, the concept of the "university person" undergoes transformation, often remaining in a state of mutual tension. This tension manifests, on the one hand, in the defense of traditional values and the dignity of *homo academicus*, and on the

other, in the—frequently not fully recognized by the academic community—impact of market mechanisms, which impose pressures for efficiency and the rationalization of costs and benefits (Czerepaniak-Walczak, 2014, p. 16).

Like culture more broadly, academic culture is subject to both processes of reproduction and evolution (Czerepaniak-Walczak, 2015), shaped by profound cultural, social, and economic transformations (Sułkowski, 2016). Within increasingly egalitarian and entrepreneurial academic structures, individuals representing diverse cultural codes, lifestyles, and differing conceptions of the role and functioning of higher education institutions converge, resulting in the coexistence of heterogeneous organizational models and the creation of spaces with a hybrid, often ambivalent, character. This new normativity transforms the traditional roles performed by university members, their behaviors, attitudes, and competencies, which in turn entails changes in interpersonal relationships, particularly between teacher and student (Kaczmarek, 2017). Consequently, academic culturality undergoes transformation as well (cf. Hrehorowicz & Gietka, 2023). Changes in the values and practices of academic culture affect both the conditions—subjective and objective—and the course of student education (Kaczmarek, 2017). In the context of evolving academic culture, it becomes increasingly apparent that

> the didactic situation is not static, but dynamic, unstable, and variable; it develops not according to predetermined, predictable patterns, but rather chaotically. Consequently, there exist neither fixed schemes for structuring curricular content nor orderly patterns for creating educational experiences (Gofron, 2012, p. 55).

Analyzing the complex conditions of the educational environment therefore requires the use of appropriately nuanced theoretical categories. One such category—sensitive to diverse changes and bearing considerable axionormative significance—appears to be precisely (academic) culturality.

Methodological framework

This article draws on a research project initiated in April 2025, designed to examine the dynamics of change in academic culturality. Despite the centrality of culture and civility to the functioning of higher education, empirical investigations into the transformation of academic culture remain scarce (Hrehorowicz & Gietka, 2023; Biały, 2011). The study addresses this gap by exploring how culturality is reshaped within the university setting, attending to the interplay of institutional norms, generational shifts, and broader socio-cultural forces. At the outset of the project, during the conceptualization phase of the research constructs, a preliminary framework of research problems was formulated in the form of the following questions: (1) How do academic teachers construct and

experience academic culturality (2) How do these constructions inform and shape the dynamics of the educational setting? These questions enabled, on one hand, a clear delineation of the research field's scope, and on the other, the undertaking of key methodological decisions essential for conducting the qualitative research central to the project.

The research project was divided into two stages. In the first stage, the results of which are presented in this article, focus group interviews were conducted with two groups of academic staff from two public universities in Poland. The choice of method (FGI) was driven by the need to access knowledge resources – both individual and collective – that often remain unconscious to participants and only emerge during discussion. This allows the researcher to more accurately identify key areas relevant to the research objectives that may have previously gone unnoticed. Furthermore, as emphasized by Barbour (2011), focus group research supports the refinement of research instruments. In the second stage of the project, the data obtained from the focus group interviews will be used to develop a scenario for in-depth individual interviews (IDI) (Mińsk, 2017), which will be conducted with faculty members from public universities.

Academic teachers representing the social sciences were invited to participate in the focus group interviews. Utilizing a convenience sampling strategy (Patton, 2002), participants were recruited based on the following criteria: employment in a teaching or teaching-and-research role and a minimum of five years' experience in higher education. In total, 14 academic staff members took part in the study, with professional experience ranging from 5 to 38 years, holding roles such as assistant, adjunct, and professor. Additionally, two doctoral students who had completed mandatory pedagogical internships – thus possessing teaching experience with students – were also invited to participate.

The interviews were conducted between May and June 2025. Participants provided informed consent for both their participation and the recording of the focus group discussions. The spontaneous group discussions lasted approximately three hours in the first group and two hours in the second group.

The empirical data were analyzed following the procedures of postmodern grounded theory methodology (Charmaz, 2013).

Academic culturality as experienced by teachers

In the participants' accounts, culturality is documented both at the individual and social levels, manifesting in everyday, easily observable practices as well as in subtle, less easily discernible attitudes and orientations. Analysis of the interviewed faculty members' statements reveals the multidimensional nature of academic culturality—encompassing behavioral, cognitive, axiological, rela-

tional, and identity-related components—and indicates that the dynamic changes occurring within it have a significant, often adverse, impact on everyday teaching practice.

Through analysis of the empirical material, seven principal dimensions of academic culturality were reconstructed from the participants' accounts: (1) culturality as a set of ritual and customary behaviors; (2) culturality as an expression of respect, maturity, and readiness for "adult-to-adult" relationships; (3) culturality as a matter of identity and affiliation with the university; (4) culturality understood as participation in cultural life; (5) culturality as an intellectual stance; (6) culturality as an area of generational conflict; and (7) culturality as an unstable and negotiable category.

Culturality as a set of ritual and customary behaviors is rooted in the habitual understanding of culture, in which gestures and forms function as normative regulators of social relations (Bourdieu, 2009). In this context, faculty members associate culturality with personal culture, understood as knowledge of and adherence to etiquette, the demonstration of politeness and courtesy, and the use of forms of communication appropriate to the university setting. In this sense, culturality becomes a set of normative customary codes governing interactions within the academic space. Teachers primarily relate culturality to observable behaviors, such as greeting others, punctuality, appropriate attire, avoidance of vulgar language, and refraining from eating during classes:

> always open restroom doors, […] not saying good morning, not opening windows, not holding doors. Well, I could, so to speak, list a whole series of various behaviors […]. And my favorite: eating, drinking during classes, doing a thousand things that, in my view, do not align with the dignity of the academy. It didn't happen before, now I see that it does. (Maria)

Adherence to the norms of academic etiquette is perceived by some of the teacher participants in the focus group interviews as a prerequisite for maintaining basic didactic order. Failure to follow traditionally accepted norms often evokes surprise, more frequently dissatisfaction and frustration, and occasionally even a sense of threat:

> And when they (the students) are called out on it, what affects me the most, really affects me personally, are either the comments or the facial expressions […] and this is met, for example, with some kind of, or some uhh, or some muttering under the breath, or eye-rolling. […] I think, I am dissatisfied with such behaviors, I think it is precisely uncultural, inappropriate, does not conform to certain norms, precisely etiquette […] or simply personal culture. But then the situation occurs again, I ask again, and nothing changes. And that is what irritates me the most—that no change occurs, even though I ask the students for something, I feel like I'm hitting a wall. Each time I have to ask again, to point it out again, I am more irritated. […] So, when I hear such language at the university, I feel concerned, even threatened. Because it seems to me that this is the least appropriate place to use such language. (Dorota)

For the majority of the interviewed faculty, adherence to norms and customs constitutes a significant aspect of educational practice. However, it is often met by students with disregard, and sometimes with overt disapproval or misunderstanding.

The second dimension of culturality emerging from the faculty members' accounts is the perception of **culturality as an expression of respect, maturity, and readiness for "adult-to-adult" relationships**. This dimension extends beyond the sphere of observable behaviors—although it is intrinsically linked to them—encompassing intentions, attitudes, and the manner of presence toward another person. The interviewed faculty emphasized the importance of care for others, attentiveness, openness to dialogue, and communicative competence. In this conception, culturality assumes the character of a relational axiology, the absence of which is experienced as symbolic exclusion from the space of respect, rather than merely a deviation from convention. Mature relationships with students, as expected by the faculty, carry an educative component (Kapias, 2015) aimed at restoring the desired order. However, this educative function is not fully realized due to the perceived weakening of academics' authority and position:

> We have reached a point where the student can do anything, and sometimes we can do nothing. And it's unclear how to behave. I often worry whether pointing something out or saying something might later be used against me, or whether a complaint might be filed about me, and I've already experienced situations like that. (Natalia)

Participants stressed that in the "adult-to-adult" relationship, which they consider appropriate for the university, both parties should demonstrate openness and understanding. Yet academics feel that only they are required to accommodate students, while students make no effort to understand the needs and expectations of their instructors or the conditions under which they operate, even though they should:

> It is up to them (the students) to make the effort and to show some attempt to understand, to accept that we are also different. (Beata)

The third dimension emerging from the data is **culturality as an issue of identity and belonging to the university**. In the accounts, particularly from more senior faculty members, culturality appears as an element of the academic ethos, serving as a symbolic indicator of identification with the community and the internalization of its core values. It takes the form of a distinct sense of "being part of" a space imbued with specific values and meanings that distinguish the university from other social environments:

> Here, I identify with a certain institution that inherently tells me how I should behave. I can relax the dress code, yes, I can dress more casually, I can do some other things. But there are cultural canons in academia that must not be broken, because if we destroy

> them, we can essentially announce the end of the university. Perhaps it would be worth it, I don't know. Some things have ended, so maybe it would be worth letting this end too. But when that happens, I certainly won't be here anymore, because I cannot live without these things. (Maria)

At the same time, faculty members perceive the infiltration of external value systems and alternative logics of operation into the university, characteristic of other social fields, such as the market (Sułkowski, 2016). This process leads to the blurring of the boundaries of academic culture, weakening its culture-shaping and identity-forming functions, and transforming relationships within the academic community, where maintaining a coherent system of references and shared meanings becomes increasingly difficult:

> We observe a shift toward a very utilitarian perception of knowledge, culture, everything in order, and students are just like that. They want concrete results—what will I gain from this—and this will probably deepen further, and at some point we probably won't even talk about such autotelic values anymore. (Natalia)

The understanding of **culturality as participation in cultural life**, as expressed by the faculty, confirms that this category extends beyond mere adherence to the rules of etiquette, encompassing active engagement with culture and openness to new experiences (cf. Burszta et al., 2010). In this dimension, culturality is associated with possessing a basic knowledge of the culture in which one operates, as well as an attitude of readiness to learn and independently seek new forms of participation. Some faculty members expressed the view that students do not engage with high culture in ways they would consider desirable. Moreover, students are often absent from the university's cultural life, which, according to faculty, is in a state of regression. This situation reveals a lack of a shared communicative space:

> I talk with students about when they last visited an exhibition, when they went to the theater, what they have done, and suddenly there is silence, and you no longer know whether it was only me or if they don't want to speak. Yes. It's as if I lose the language in which I could discuss anything beyond the classical, transmission-focused content. (Maria)

Some teachers note that contemporary students pursue their cultural needs primarily outside the university, often within the realm of popular culture, and emphasize that these activities can also be valuable and developmental. At the same time, concerns are raised that, within the academic context, students' alternative cultural activities do not contribute to fostering mutual understanding:

> (Students) are engaged in pop culture or elsewhere. Meanwhile, I am not there. As a result, a completely different outside-academic stream of activity is probably created, which I cannot access. I don't know whether it's because I am not active or because it develops so far from where I am that I cannot reach it. Perhaps then it would be easier for me to understand students and their various behaviors. […] But, on the other hand, I cannot accept the university becoming a site of pop culture. Not everything that comes

> from pop can pour into the university, because then […] my level of discomfort would prevent me from working here. (Maria)

Analysis of the interviewed faculty members' statements reveals that they associate academic **culturality with the willingness to engage in intellectual effort, independent thinking, and cognitive curiosity.** Intellectual maturity here entails not only possessing a certain body of knowledge but also a readiness to deepen it, the ability to critically engage with scientific and cultural content, and reflective participation in academic life. Deficiencies in this dimension manifest as indifference, lack of engagement and autonomy, and an instrumental approach to education, which are sources of disappointment and frustration for some faculty members:

> Sometimes I just hit a wall with their unwillingness, lack of engagement, and I feel that they do not internalize certain values that I would like to share with them. They choose only what they want. (Patrycja)

The sixth dimension identified in the study—**culturality as an area of generational conflict**—reveals differences in the understanding of norms and values between faculty and students, as well as the tensions that accompany them. Faculty members acknowledge that behaviors considered appropriate or neutral by students may be interpreted by them as signs of not being well brought up or insufficient sensitivity to academic cultural norms. Conversely, students may perceive academic forms as artificial, outdated, or inadequate in relation to contemporary student life. In this context, culturality becomes a matter of negotiation and a potential source of axiological tension. Some faculty members highlight the difficulty of finding a common communicative language that would engage students while simultaneously respecting academic standards:

> I wonder what they actually understand, that is, in what language should I speak to them, to the students, so they don't fall asleep, don't scroll, so that it is attractive. (Beata)

At the same time, observations point to different areas of sensitivity in younger generations. Differences in the perception of academic culturality have both axiological and communicative dimensions, requiring faculty to reflectively negotiate their own expectations and flexibly adapt their teaching strategies to the evolving generational context:

> I think it would be hard for them to understand that this is upsetting to us. I think it's a matter of mindset and approach, unfortunately. They are sensitive, but in a different way—not in terms of sensitivity to culture or etiquette. They are sensitive simply because they are emotionally sensitive and cannot cope with it, but these are two different issues. (Jolanta)

The final dimension of academic culturality, as reflected in the teachers' statements, is the perception of **culturality as an unstable and negotiable category**. This dimension highlights an awareness of the fluidity of broadly under-

stood cultural norms and the need to revise one's own expectations. Teachers recognize that the boundaries of what is considered "cultural" shift over time, and that the category itself is susceptible to reinterpretation. The "axiological suspension" experienced by faculty—stemming from difficulties in assessing what should be regarded as appropriate and what should not, combined with the conditions of constant change—intensifies a sense of uncertainty:

> Every group is different, every seminar is different. And we are on some… I don't know… shifting sands. (Patrycja)

Consequently, some teachers express a need for clear, top-down guidelines that could help re-establish order in educational interactions at the university and reduce tensions arising from axiological ambiguity:

> Some concrete norms that would state clearly, simply, in their language: this is appropriate, this is not. (Beata)

This perspective underscores that academic culturality is not a fixed construct but a dynamic, contested field, where the search for stability continually intersects with the realities of change.

Implications for the Educational Context at the University

The tensions and uncertainties experienced by faculty, arising from the dynamic nature of academic culturality, carry far-reaching consequences for educational interactions. The instability of norms, divergences in the understanding of values, and the absence of a "shared language" contribute to the fragmentation of the didactic space, in which instructors and students operate within quasi-parallel axiological realities, and at times, in a climate of social identity conflict (cf. Klimek, 2024). Under such conditions, the teaching process becomes more complex and emotionally demanding. Discrepancies in understanding and adhering to customary and ethical norms generate feelings of disappointment, powerlessness, and frustration among the interviewed faculty, diminishing their assessment of their own pedagogical competence and standing, while also negatively influencing their perception of the students' broader axiological condition (cf. Robotycki, 1980). Functioning across divergent cultural spaces limits the possibility for students and faculty to co-construct a shared system of reference that would support both dialogue and critical reflexivity (cf. Olbrycht, 2019). Differences in the perception of values and norms foster tensions and hinder mutual understanding, thereby weakening the formative and identity-shaping potential of the university (cf. Segiet, 2024). Consequently, teachers are compelled to continuously negotiate their expectations and boundaries within educational interactions, heightening emotional strain and necessitating the development

of adaptive and mediatory competencies in everyday academic practice. This, in turn, shapes contemporary understandings of the role of the university teacher (cf. Kaptur, 2011; Barańska & Nowak-Kluczyński, 2019).

The results of the present study indicate the need for further reflection on the role of the university in shaping norms and values, as well as on strategies to support faculty in fostering a coherent educational environment—a space for shared intellectual work—amid the evolving conditions of academia (cf. Kapias, 2015). Seemingly minor, everyday situations within the academic space, often overlooked, carry considerable significance for faculty and can profoundly affect their professional functioning. Student behaviors perceived as uncivil, the disregard of norms, or failure to follow established rules are experienced by academics in a highly personal manner, impacting their work comfort, teaching engagement, and, in some cases, decisions regarding the continuation of an academic career:

> I feel very uncomfortable with this. It complicates my daily functioning. I take it very personally. Based on certain student reactions—not only toward me but also toward others or in various situations—I construct a negative image of my workplace, of my work, which discourages me from coming to work. I am mainly speaking about teaching, not research. Many times I have considered resigning and have even taken steps to change jobs for this very reason. It may seem trivial, but for me it is not. It hinders my work here to such an extent that I have considered changing my job or profession. So, this is an important aspect of my functioning within the academic environment. (Dorota)

Consequently, everyday interactions and minor breaches of cultural norms are far from inconsequential—they exert a tangible influence on the professional quality of life of faculty and, by extension, on the university's didactic climate. Academic life is not normatively neutral, and the work of university teachers must be "axiologically meaningful" (Murawska, 2017) in order to provide them with sources of significance and personal satisfaction.

Conclusions: Towards Conceptualising the Category of Culturality in the Educational Setting

The conducted study confirmed the complex and dynamic nature of culturality (Jawor, 2023). When considered in the context of higher education, culturality emerges as a broad constellation of dispositions, behaviors, and attitudes characterizing individuals who are well-mannered and actively engaged in cultural life. It encompasses not only personal manners and adherence to social etiquette but also involvement in academic, artistic, and cultural activities, including the appreciation of art and literature and participation in social events. Culturality is context-dependent, representing a multifaceted, dynamic category that reflects both societal and individual expectations toward an individual

and/or a group. The findings observed within the academic environment may be interpreted more broadly and applied to education in general. One may assume that each educational setting gives rise to specific forms of culturality, which can be studied empirically and which shape the character of educational relationships—affecting both their tangible outcomes and the subjectively perceived quality. Through their actions and attitudes, individuals simultaneously shape the culturality of a given educational environment and are shaped by it.

Within contemporary academia, new forms of culturality are emerging, which can no longer be analyzed solely in terms of the dualism between the "old" and the new university. This new culturality possesses a hybrid nature and thus follows a distinct logic that can be mapped to enhance understanding (Stochmal & Maciejewski, 2018). The dynamics of these interrelated processes call for systematic, in-depth educational research, as they may reveal conditions influencing the educational process that would otherwise remain imperceptible.

References

Andrzejczak, A. (2015). Uniwersytet przedsiębiorczy i odpowiedzialny społecznie. *Edukacja Ekonomistów i Menedżerów, 38*(4), 117–130.

Barańska, M., & Nowak-Kluczyński, K. (2019). Epizodysta naukowy – o pracy nauczyciela akademickiego. Między dydaktyką a nauką. *Studia Edukacyjne*, *53*, 161–185.

Barbour, R. (2011). *Badania fokusowe*. Transl. B. Komorowska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Biały, K. (2011). *Przemiany współczesnego uniwersytetu od idei von Humboldta do modelu uczelni przedsiębiorczej*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Bourdieu, P. (2009). *Rozum praktyczny. O teorii działania*. Transl. J. Stryjczyk. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.

Buliński, T. (2002). *Człowiek do zrobienia: jak kultura tworzy człowieka*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

Burszta, W. et al. (2010). *Kultura miejska w Polsce z perspektywy interdyscyplinarnych badań jakościowych*. Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.

Charmaz, K. (2013). *Teoria ugruntowana. Praktyczny przewodnik po analizie jakościowej*. Transl. B. Komorowska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Czerepaniak-Walczak, M. (2014). *Homo academicus* w świecie *homo oeconomicus*. O obszarach i przejawach zmagań z akademickim zniewoleniem. *Pedagogika Szkoły Wyższej, 15*, 11–24.

Czerepaniak-Walczak, M. (2015). Po pierwsze rentowność? Odzyskiwanie edukacji uniwersyteckiej. *Więź, 1*(659), 16–25.

Daszkiewicz, W. (2010). Podstawowe rozumienie kultury – ujęcie filozoficzne. *Roczniki Kulturoznawcze, 1*, 43–64.

Gofron, B. (2012). Proces kształcenia jako otwarta kulturowo przestrzeń badań i praktyk dydaktycznych. *Podstawy Edukacji*, *5*, 47–63.

Goodenough, W.H. (1964). Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In: D.H. Hymes (ed.), *Language in Culture and Society. A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology* (pp. 36–39). New York, Evanston, London: Harper & Row.

Gruchoła, M. (2010). Kultura w ujęciu socjologicznym. *Roczniki Kulturoznawcze, 1*, 95–114.

Hołówka, J. (2015). Gdzie to dostojeństwo? Jak zmienia się etos uniwersytetu. *Więź, 1*(659), 7–15.

Hrehorowicz, A., & Gietka, M. (2023). Kultura akademicka pokolenia "Z", czyli o praktykowaniu przez studentów pedagogiki zachowań wpisujących się w kulturę akademicką. *Transformacje, 1*(116), 203–222.

Jabłońska, A. (2019). Wychowanie do kultury: przeszłość i teraźniejszość, pytania i propozycje. *Seminare. Poszukiwania naukowe, 3*, 131–144.

Jawor, A. (2023). *Kulturalność: rekonstrukcja wzorca człowieka kulturalnego w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Kaczmarek, K. (2017). Rozważania na temat roli dydaktycznej nauczyciela akademickiego w opinii jego samego i studentów. *Argumenta Historica. Czasopismo Naukowo-Dydaktyczne, 4*, 63–72.

Kapias, M. (2015). Aktywność aksjologiczna realizowana w procesach wychowawczych w środowisku akademickim. *Edukacja Ekonomistów i Menedżerów*, *36*(2), 61–76.

Kaptur, P. (2011). Idealny nauczyciel akademicki – mit czy realizm? In *Forum Oświatowe*, *1*(44), 71–76.

Klimek, J. (2024). Konflikt tożsamościowy – geneza i charakterystyka zjawiska. *Perspektywy Kultury, 47*(4), 289–308.

Makieła, Z.J. (2017). Model uniwersytetu trzeciej generacji XXI wieku – przedsiębiorczy, innowacyjny uniwersytet. *Folia Oeconomica Cracoviensia*, *58*, 23–38.

Marszałek, A. (2008). Uniwersytet przedsiębiorczy jako odpowiedź na wyzwania XXI wieku. *Przegląd Organizacji, 9*, 19–22.

Mihułka, K. (2018). Koncepcje kultury a nauczanie i uczenie się języków obcych – zarys teoretyczny. *Neofilolog*, *47*(1), 21–35.

Miński, R. (2017). Wywiad pogłębiony jako technika badawcza. Możliwości wykorzystania IDI w badaniach ewaluacyjnych. *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej, 13*(3), 30–51; https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8069.13.3.02.

Murawska, A. (2017). Kariera akademicka – człowiek w drodze do siebie i do sensu. *Pedagogika Szkoły Wyższej*, 22, 37-45.

Olbrycht, K. (2019). *Edukacja kulturalna jako edukacja do wzrastania w człowieczeństwie*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Robotycki, Cz. (1980). *Tradycja i obyczaj w środowisku wiejskim. Studium etologiczne wsi Jurgów na Spiszu*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN.

Schaefer, L. (2015). History and Civility. *NAMTA Journal, 40*(1), 103–111.

Segiet, W. (2024). Edukacja akademicka. O znaczeniu wiedzy i wspólnotowości. In: A. Odrowąż-Coates, Z. Kwieciński, & M.J. Szymański (ed.), *Przesilenie. Kręgi kryzysów kontekstów edukacji – wyzwania dla pedagogiki* (pp. 161–170). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.

Stochmal, M., & Maciejewski, J. (2018). Hybrydyzacja obszarów badawczych środowiska (nie)bezpieczeństwa nie tylko w dyscyplinie socjologii. *Historia i Polityka, 23*(30), 87–101.

Sulima, R. (2000). *Antropologia codzienności*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.

Sułkowski, Ł. (2016). *Kultura akademicka. Koniec utopii?* Warszawa: PWN.

Sztompka, P. (2014). Uniwersytet współczesny; zderzenie dwóch kultur. *Nauka, 1*, 7–18.

Tyszka, A. (1971). *Uczestnictwo w kulturze. O różnorodności stylów życia*. Warszawa: PWN.

Wilk, T. (2016). Dobre wychowanie jako kategoria modelująca codzienne życie: kontekst indywidualny i społeczny. *Chowanna, 2*(47), 193–215.

Wojnar, I. (1964). *Estetyka i wychowanie*. Warszawa: PWN.

Wrońska, K. (2019). Ogłada – nieobecny dyskurs w pedagogice. Próba (re)konstrukcji pojęcia. *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny, 254*(4), 20–38.

Zakowicz, I. (2012). Idea uniwersytetu Wilhelma von Humboldta – kontynuacja czy zmierzch? *Ogrody Nauk i Sztuk, 2*, 62–74.

Zalewska-Pawlak, M. (2017). *Sztuka i wychowanie w XXI wieku. W poszukiwaniu zagubionej teorii sztuki życia i sztuki w wychowaniu*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Kulturalność jako obszar badań pedagogicznych: refleksje na przykładzie szkolnictwa wyższego

Streszczenie

Artykuł podejmuje problematykę kulturalności w kontekście akademickim, proponując semantyczną rekonstrukcję kategorii w oparciu o perspektywę kulturoznawczą Anny Jawor (2023). Część empiryczna opiera się na wywiadach fokusowych z nauczycielami akademickimi, których celem było zrozumienie, w jaki sposób uczestnicy interpretują własne doświadczenia kulturalności akademickiej oraz jak te interpretacje kształtują interakcje dydaktyczne. W ramach konstruktywistycznej teorii ugruntowanej wyodrębniono siedem wymiarów kulturalności akademickiej. Wyniki podkreślają heurystyczny potencjał pojęcia kulturalności dla badań edukacyjnych i wskazują na potrzebę dalszych, pogłębionych badań w tym obszarze.

Słowa kluczowe: kulturalność, uniwersytet, edukacja, teoria ugruntowana.