

Received: June 2023
Accepted: December 2023
DOI: 10.7862/rz.2023.hss.63

Agata GIERCZAK¹
Kazimierz NAGODY-MROZOWICZ²
Alicja ŻAK-LYKUS³

SELF-COMPASSION AND THE RATIONALITY OF PRAXEOLOGICAL LEADERSHIP

The aim of the theoretical analysis is to define the connections and dependencies between the rationality of decisions made and personality determinants, in this case the construct of being good to oneself. The achievement of the intended goals was based on a systematic review of the literature on the subject, referring to the results of foreign and domestic empirical research, mainly in the field of social sciences and philosophy. The implementation of the theoretical goal complements the research gap that comes from the fact of inflation in the field of *self-compassion* and *praxeological leadership*, and their mutual functional connections. The practical usefulness of the conducted analysis is an interesting and solid contribution to asking research questions and planning further research on the participation of personality factors in decision-making processes in leadership.

As a result of the critical analysis, a concept of praxeological leadership was presented, which highlighted the role and importance of self-compassion, indicating the positive and negative aspects of the analyzed correlation in the decision-making process in management and leadership.

Keywords: leadership, self-compassion, decision-making, cognitive processes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Praxeology focuses on the analysis of the conscious actions of human individuals and the logic of their actions. The praxeological method is based on deductive reasoning, which allows drawing conclusions about an individual's behavior in the context of achieving their goals. Praxeology studies the decision-making process and actions of individuals, analyzing their logical relationships and rationality, and assessing the pragmatism of the effects.

¹ Agata Gierczak, Rzeszow University of Technology, Poland; e-mail: agatag@prz.edu.pl (corresponding author). ORCID: 0000-0002-8402-0919.

² Kazimierz Nagody-Mrozowicz, General Tadeusz Kościuszko Military University of Land Forces in Wrocław, Poland; e-mail: kazimierz.nagody-mrozowicz@awl.edu.pl. ORCID: 0000-0002-9211-5256.

³ Alicja Żak-Lykus, WSB Merito University Wrocław, Practical Psychology, Opole Branch, Poland; e-mail: alicja.zak-lykus@opole.merito.pl. ORCID: 0000-0002-5712-4026.

Rationality is mentioned as one of the basic properties of effective action. In itself, it is the unconditional domain of praxeology and as such it became the subject of this analysis. However, this concept occupies a special place in science, language and culture (Łukaszyński, 2002; Haus, 2005; Draskovic, Bauk, Delibasic, 2016; Jokiel, 2017; Jankowska-Mihułowicz, 2012; Masiukiewicz, 2018; Piaseczny, 2005; Kotlarek, 2014; Kalinowski, 2014; Niemczuk, 2019; Nogal, 2014; Lisak, 2016). Every action, in order to be considered effective, efficient, beneficial, and productive, is also rational in itself. Particularly socially important are various perspectives of decision-making processes, whose subjectified rationality refers to personalized power in heterogeneous organizational domains (types of organizations), and nominal varieties of the managerial function (manager, supervisor, commander). Therefore, *the rationality analyzed in the presented considerations refers to the decision-making process within various managerial roles played in the management process, which is supported by leadership*. This rationality of decision-making processes in management and leadership and its personal determinants, mainly self-compassion as a kind of universal attitude, constitute the goal of the theoretical analysis undertaken and determine its application value.

The rationality of managerial decisions can be considered in terms of *substantive rationality* and *methodological rationality*. Praxeological leadership should be perceived in two forms – ontological and methodological leadership; the one which is naturally innate, and that which is assimilated. In other words, an ontological leader is a natural leader, a methodological leader is a professionally educated manager. In the light of the above distinction, real leadership occurs in an ontological version, and in this form it is determined by personality, including the attitude of compassion towards oneself. A specific prototype of the ideal of praxeological leadership would be the combination and unification of both aspects mentioned, ontic and methodological, into one compatible whole. This theoretical and application goal guides this analysis, which is the starting point for further, more detailed research work.

The *substantive rationality* of a decision consists in adapting the choice made "to the circumstances and in general to everything that can be stated in a true court of law". A rational decision in the substantive sense, transformed into an executive action, fully corresponds to reality and transforms it in accordance with the laws governing it, including psychological, personality, decision-making, behavioral regularities, etc., including self-compassion as a relatively permanent personality disposition.

When the choice in action is made in accordance with the *decision-making rules* based on the information available to the decision-maker, we are dealing with a *methodologically rational* decision. In this case, self-compassion would be an aspect of knowledge, self-awareness, self-reflection, self-knowledge, the effect of introspection, etc., which is related to how the decision-maker perceives themselves while making the decision and after it has been made and potentially implemented.

One may wonder whether substantive rationality – which is ontologically, i.e. inextricably and permanently related to the decision-maker – is also based on personality traits, as well as situational conditions. If so, is it also based on mental properties, which by their very nature constitute a source of ambivalent, probable and potential conditions. One type of personality trait that is controversial in terms of leadership is the attitude of self-compassion. Due to the fact that self-compassion is a common social attitude and decision-making is based on rationality, the question of the relationship between the process of leadership and self-compassion as a personality property (trait) becomes

important. Situational determinants of rationality have been excluded from these considerations as issues that go beyond the scope of this analysis.

In relation to the two aspects of rationality mentioned above, a common type of attitude was analyzed, namely self-compassion. In order to answer the question about the relationship – positive, negative or ambivalent – between the rationality of praxeological leadership and self-compassion, the hypothetical relationships must be subject to logical, theoretical and deductive analysis. The phraseological discrepancies appearing in the paper are the result of the semantic limitations of the term: *self-compassion*, which each time mean the same personality aspect.

Self-compassion means being sensitive to your own suffering, and at the same time showing a feeling of care and kindness towards yourself. It involves accepting one's own failures and imperfections without judging them negatively. Self-compassion can also be understood as a state or trait consisting of three components: *kindness, reflection, and a sense of community with people*. Kindness is about showing understanding and kindness towards one's own weaknesses and mistakes. Reflectivity means focusing on current experience and awareness of emotions, without judging or criticizing them. A sense of community with people is about seeing your situation as something that may also concern other people.

2. LEADERSHIP AND A COGNITIVE PROCESS

Leadership is a type of conscious and purposeful human behavior that takes place in some social structure. However, the influence of power on leadership is expressed in two important social functions, namely in the *social roles played and interpersonal relations*. The determining role of power in relation to leadership means that the phenomenon of power influences the final shape of leadership in a specific situation. This should be understood in such a way that the process and mechanism of leadership are revealed in precisely defined and real, often formalized social and organizational circumstances. Leading is a form of playing a social role, in which the personality, motivation and various attitudes of the role player play an important role.

The process of playing a leadership role takes place in an established position and in a specific organizational structure. The result of the above implication is the assumption that:

leadership is the influence of the person playing this role on a specific individual, group and organizational social entity in precisely defined situational conditions. It is a relationship between the leader and the subject of leadership influence, which is based on mutual trust, trust and attachment (Nagody-Mrozowicz, 2021).

Cognitive processes in the sense of cognitive psychology and cognitive science are sets of activities undertaken to create and determine specific cognitive structures using the cognitive system (mind) (Maruszewski, 1983), which are also the basis for the information processing process within the functioning of the nervous system of a given organism. (Maruszewski, 2017). The activation of the cognitive process by the organism indicates not only the need to acquire or change knowledge about the environment, including its properties, but also the process of shaping behavior in a specific environment and receiving information from it, storing and transforming it, and returning it to the environment in forms of reactions, referred to as feedback (Nęcka, Orzechowski, Szymura, Wichary, 2020).

The concept of cognitive processes in the form of a classical definition, described as the simplest form of a real definition, providing the characteristics of the defined species (definiendum) by specifying its superior genus and the so-called species difference (definiens, differentia specifica) (*Encyklopedia PWN*, <https>), contains the ontological and functional definiens of the concept of leadership. The leadership has been defined below.

Leadership is a cognitive process that requires not only interpersonal skills, but also the ability to analyze and understand complex problems and make appropriate decisions. Leaders must be well-informed to be able to effectively manage their team and achieve their goals.

Leadership as a cognitive process involves the ability to recognize and analyze the needs of one's subordinates and the situation in a given organizational structure. The leader must be able to understand what the expectations of their team are, and what factors influence the functioning of the organization as a whole.

An important skill of the leader is the ability to think creatively and make innovative decisions. Leadership is not only about directing the actions of other people, but also about the ability to introduce changes and improve the activities of specific organizational structures. Leadership as a cognitive process requires understanding the meaning and conscious use of resources in order to achieve intended goals.

Leadership requires communication skills. The leader must be able to clearly convey information and direction and listen to their subordinates. Communication is crucial to effective leadership because it allows one to build trust, resolve conflicts and motivate the team.

Leadership requires constant development and learning. Leaders should be open to new ideas and perspectives in order to adapt to changing conditions and expectations. Leadership is a continuous process that requires constant development of one's skills and knowledge in relation to the characteristics of the external environment. These processes begin with self-awareness.

Praxeological leadership is an approach to leadership based on practice and experience. It is a form of leadership that focuses on applying practical skills and techniques in managing and leading a group or an organization (Nagody-Mrozowicz, 2023). *Praxeological leadership* is a conglomerate of a complex, multidimensional nature, in which personalistic, intellectual, volitional, teleological and behavioral components can be distinguished. This applies to both the dimension of motivation, as well as established dispositions and attitudes, and should be expressed in adequate behaviors with a strongly emphasized role of effectiveness. The pragmatic dimension is the measure of things and the main evaluation criterion for these events.

3. LEADERSHIP RATIONALITY

Initial attempts to determine the characteristic content and connotations of the concept of rationality show that this concept belongs to a group of concepts that have the so-called families of meanings.

The scope of such concepts is not, as we know, a group of objects characterized by a set of features common to all elements of this scope and only them, but it is many subsets, connected only by partial similarities. In this way, these subsets create a family to which a family of meanings corresponds, constituting the meaning of the concept (Pawłowski, 1986).

Amsterdamski notes that:

For many years, science was treated as the embodiment of human rationality (...), a specific feature of our culture, its development was presented as the result of the consistent application of a rational research method... no one questioned the rationality of science and its development... Despite epistemological discrepancies regarding how rational knowledge is possible and what its method consists in, and despite axiological conflicts regarding the role of science in culture, ... there was a common consensus within which these disputes took place. It was defined by... such a concept of human rationality and such an ideal of scientific knowledge that on their basis the question about the rationality of science did not arise at all (Amsterdamski, 1994).

A comparative analysis of the types of rationality distinguished in contemporary semantic and methodological literature creates the opportunity to alleviate misunderstandings and antagonisms related to the concept of rationality. The main causes of these misunderstandings, such as the lack of a clear definition of the scope of the concept of „rationality”, the difficulty in distinguishing between descriptive and evaluative features, and changes in the concept of human rationality and the ideal of scientific cognition, can be resolved through the analysis and presentation of different types of rationality (Pawłowski, 1986). Presenting the types of rationality allows one to understand that there are many different approaches and perspectives on this concept. There is no one universal definition of rationality or one appropriate method of determining what is rational, and this means that it can be understood and assessed differently in the context of axiology, culture, nation and – obviously – the scientific field.

Rationality is a necessary condition for all discourse; it is an autonomous value in our civilization, it is also related to ethics because rational action requires strength of character and has great social significance. To attribute rationality to an opinion, action or person is to define it positively. To deny them rationality is to show disregard, to exclude them from the scope of permissible controversy. Meanwhile, many misunderstandings have accumulated around the concept of rationality (Tałasiewicz, 1995).

The authors of this work do not intend to resolve the existing polemics, emphasizing only a few main aspects of the resulting difference in views.

At the beginning, it is necessary to distinguish two terms, rationalism and rationality, which are understood as synonyms, but in fact they have a slightly different meaning, are ambiguous and require clarification (Bombik, 2001). Ajdukiewicz stated that the concept of ”rationalism” is not clearly defined enough (Ajdukiewicz, 2004), and on the basis of this argument, the word ”rationalism” is understood to mean relatively clearly defined philosophical directions, the representatives of which consider reason to be the most valuable cognitive power of man and attribute it to the derivation of judgments and drawing conclusions have a principled role in the cognitive process (Stróżewski, 2005). ”Rationality” is a concept whose understanding is determined by the stage in the progress of science, and its etymology derives it from the Latin word ”ratio”, which is ambiguous in itself (Jasiński, 2022), meaning both reason, the basis, principle and a cause (Morawiec, 2014). It determines the semantic framework of the feature that belongs to its object, because it has a reason for its existence and content. Reason is rational since it is discovered

by mind, and rational because it is consistent with reason as a human faculty. As Herbut writes:

In the cognitive domain, the word "reason" describes the logical basis for recognizing certain sentences as true, and in the domain of action – the norms of conduct considered to be binding (Herbut, 1997). Morawiec states that "The closest meaning of the Latin word *ratio* is the one thanks to which this word refers to the words of the Polish language: reason, or principle (Morawiec, 2014).

Tischner also points to a similar etymology of the word "rationality", linking rationality, especially with acts of human thinking (Tischner, 2000). According to Wojewoda (Wojewoda, 2010), the understanding of rationality is related to the narrative and metaphors present in culture, history and tradition. The decision to choose a tradition is determined by respect, the power of arguments, the ability to explain facts and the influence of authority. As a result, the belief in the existence of an objectified criterion of rationality is erroneous, and the search for such a criterion is doomed to failure. It turns out that establishing one model of rationality is impossible, which should teach a person intellectual humility and respect for different ways of interpreting the world (Wojewoda, 2010), including the cultural conditions of understanding rationality (Sztajer, 2009). For the considerations carried out here, the fact that "rationality" refers to the ontic and epistemic spheres is not more important, because although in both trends it indicates the existence of specific reasons, principles, foundations and causes of the existence of being and its cognition, but the argumentation carried out it is not focused on the analyzed variables, self-compassion and leadership (Jasiński, 2022).

The concept of rationality can be understood in various contexts and perspectives, which also contributes to a considerable diversity of its meanings. For instance, in a philosophical context, rationality may be understood as a person's ability to think logically and make rational decisions, while in a scientific context, rationality may refer to the application of scientific methods and logical reasoning in the research process. Moreover, the concept of rationality can be used in moral, economic, political, etc. contexts, where it has different meanings and connotations. Therefore, to precisely define the characteristics and connotations of the concept of rationality, it is necessary to take into account the different contexts and perspectives in which it is used. The authors of the presented analysis show the relationship between rationality and self-compassion.

The multitude of related meanings revealed by the semantic and methodological analysis of the concept of the name "rationality" can be organized in various ways. The adopted criteria for the division of objects constituting designates of the name "rationality" and the criteria for grouping features constituting the characteristic content of individual subsets allow, in the sense of the concept of "rationality", distinguishing smaller wholes called types of rationality (Bombik, 2001).

A comparative analysis of the scope and content of the classified types of rationality allows a closer explication of the entire family of meanings of this concept. However, due to the objectives of the research undertaken and the amount of space determined by the editorial rules, the authors decided to limit themselves to presenting one selected typology of rationality, omitting from the query very valuable scientifically, cognitively and applied concepts: Życiński (Życiński, 1983; 1985), Kleszcz (Kleszcz, 1998; 2003), Bombik

(Bombik, 2001), Tałasiewicz (Tałasiewicz, 1995), Bronk (Bronk, 2009) and Sztajer (Sztajer, 2009).

As part of the understanding of rationality in three orders, Morawiec explains (Morawiec, 2014) that in the first order regarding being, rational action consists in a thoughtful and logical ordering of various parts of a given object of action (e.g. the decision-making process itself). In the second order, concerning cognition, rationality results from maintaining the logical order of cognitive activities. Here, the rational approach is one that is guided by the laws of being and cognition, i.e. the principles of logic and scientific research methods (i.e. the decision-making process would be based on available scientific data). In the third order, rationality concerns action, and the motive is the purpose of the action. An action is considered rational when it is subordinated to achieving a specific goal. This means that rationality involves choosing actions that bring the expected results, i.e. are pragmatic.

Morawiec mentions two more concepts of rationality: objective and subjective. The objective concept of rationality is the improvement of an object or situation through an action. This means that the action that seeks to improve a given item or improve a given situation is rational. The subjective concept of rationality assumes that a man is the measure of rationality. This means that what is rational is what is consistent with an individual's own values, goals and preferences, including other personality properties (Morawiec, 2014). In both of these approaches, the authors of this work perceive the importance of self-compassion as a personality property that influences the decision-making process in management and leadership. Identifying such a relationship is important not only for diagnostic, research and theoretical purposes, but also for prognostic and application purposes, which can be used in broadly understood economic practice.

4. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SELF-COMPASSION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

Self-compassion will be defined according to Neff (2003a, b) as

being sensitive and open to one's own suffering, while experiencing a feeling of care and kindness towards oneself, by adopting an understanding, non-judgmental attitude towards one's own failures or imperfections, being aware that one's own experience is part of the common experience of people.

It can be understood as a trait, but also as a state (Neff, 2003a, b; Leary et al., 2007; Neff, Hsieh, Dejitterat, 2005). It consists of three components: *kindness, reflection, and community with humanity*. The first involves being kind and understanding in the face of one's own weaknesses and mistakes. The second is to focus on experiencing the present moment, being aware of your own experiences, without judging, criticizing or repressing them. The third is the ability to perceive one's situation as an element characteristic also of others (Neff, 2003a, b; 2004). The above dimensions are theoretically and definitionally separate, but they interact with each other, creating one common variable that is deductively and practically related to objective and subjective rationality.

Self-compassionate people are statistically significantly more extroverted, i.e. friendly, talkative, prone to fun, seeking stimulation, optimistic in life, with a cheerful mood, agreeable, i.e. positive attitude towards others, conscientious, i.e. organized and persistent in action according to the five-factor model personality (Neff, Rude, Kirkpatrick, 2007). They also show significantly higher life satisfaction (Neff, 2003a, b; Wei, Liao, Ku,

Shaffer, 2011; Neff, Pisitsungkagarn, Hsieh, 2008), and higher mental well-being (Baer, Lykins, Peters, 2012; Neely et al., 2009), level of optimism (Neff, Rude, Kirkpatrick, 2007), empathy (Wei et al., 2011), lower empathic sensitivity and tendency to feel personal distress when confronted with someone's negative emotions (Dzwonkowska, Żak-Łykus, 2014), greater ability to regulate one's own moods (Neff, 2003a). They are characterized by a lower level of fear of failure (Neff, Hsieh, Dejitterat, 2005), a lower tendency to avoid people and fear of being close to them (Wei, Liao, Ku, Shaffer, 2011). Self-compassion according to Neff (2003a, b) is by definition directly related to compassion and care for others, but it does not mean being selfish, self-centered, or choosing one's own needs over the needs of others. A self-compassionate person recognizes that suffering and failings are part of human nature and therefore all people, including themselves, are worthy of compassion (Neff, 2003b). Self-compassion is not the same as self-pity (Goldstein, Kornfield, 1987, as cited in Neff, 2003b). It is neither synonymous with self-esteem, nor the same as self-esteem (Neff, 2003b, Dzwonkowska, 2011), although it is associated with certain elements of self-esteem. The negative aspects of self-esteem are related, among others, to self-absorption, narcissism, and concentration on oneself, with a simultaneous lack of interest in others (Damon, 1995; Seligman, 1995, as cited in: Dzwonkowska, 2013). Nevertheless, it is difficult not to mention the construct of self-esteem, because in psychology it is understood as „a person's affective reaction to himself. Like other affective reactions, self-esteem may have the character of both a »hot«, intense emotion and a »cold«, intellectualized judgment” (Strelau, Doliński, 2015).

In Rosenberg's (1965) definition, ”self-esteem is a positive or negative attitude towards the self, a kind of global self-assessment”. (...) High self-esteem means the belief that one is ”good enough”, a valuable person, while low self-esteem means dissatisfaction with oneself, a kind of rejection of one's own Self. Therefore, by assumption, we should not expect real self-esteem, but one that uses the available awareness, attitudes and beliefs, i.e. opinions about oneself. Other researchers have described self-esteem as unconscious, hidden, revealing spontaneous affect towards oneself, activated automatically, without conscious reflection (Bosson, 2006; Greenwald and Banaji, 1995; Greenwald and Farnham, 2000; Gregg, 2003). An implicit attitude is an unidentified or incorrectly identified trace of past experience that may influence an individual's behavior. Implicit appraisal is not introspectively accessible by definition (Greenwald, Ganaji, 1995), although more recent research results call this statement into question (Gawronski, Bodenhausen, 2006). In management and leadership, which are the subject of our considerations, high optimal (secure) self-esteem is of particular importance, as opposed to high but fragile (defensive) self-esteem and low self-esteem. High, secure self-esteem allows one to shape and strengthen positive self-esteem, most often well-established in the early period of development (Kernis, Paradise et al., 2000), which in turn enables you to take care of yourself and feel compassion for yourself.

Self-compassionate people have less desire to satisfy the needs of others and greater ability to say no to requests (Barnard, Curry, 2011); this competence is exceptionally useful for managers and leaders due to their generally very active and stressful lifestyle and way of functioning, it allows them to take care of themselves, maintain balance and psychosomatic health.

Research using fMRI technology (Longe et al., 2009, cited in: Neff, Pommier, 2012; Neff, Costigan, 2014) has shown that when self-compassion is aroused, neural areas responsible for feeling general compassion towards others, very similar to those related to empathy. While self-compassionate people report being as kind to themselves as they are

to others, people with low levels of self-compassion report being more kind to others than to themselves (Neff, 2003b). Pommier (2011) did not obtain a significant relationship between self-compassion and compassion for others. The relationships between these constructs were obtained in other studies (Neff, Pommier, 2012), they depended on: stage in life, experience in meditation, gender. The relationships between compassion for oneself and others, as Neff writes, constitute a new but interesting area requiring further research (Neff, Pommier, 2012; Neff, Dahm, in press). People with a higher level of the described disposition cope better with activities in the space of social life (Allen, Goldwasser, Leary, 2012), have a higher level of compassion towards humanity and other people, altruism, the ability to forgive, and taking someone else's perspective (Neff, Pommier, 2013), a sense of closeness to other people (Neff, 2003b), personal readiness for change and self-development (Neff, Rude, Kirkpatrick, 2007), they better perceive other people's competences (Neff, Hsieh, Dejitterat, 2005). People with a higher level of self-compassion are more willing to resolve interpersonal conflicts by balancing their own and others' needs, and the results indicate that thanks to this trait they can resolve conflicts in a healthy and productive way (Yarnell, Neff, 2013).

When defining self-compassion, it is worth looking at the more general concept of compassion since these terms are directly related to each other (Neff, 2003a, b; 2004; Pommier, 2011). Compassion appears when a person notices the suffering of another person, is not indifferent to the situation, therefore does not avoid it, but shows kindness towards the person and the desire to alleviate their suffering (Wispe, 1991). Compassion for others is underpinned by three dimensions: kindness, reflectivity, and communion with humanity (Pommier 2011). Research on compassion shows that it is an important element of professional life (Atkins, Parker, 2012, Lilius, et al., 2008, Frost et al., 2006). Received compassion among employees supports organizations during critical moments, contributes to the increase of employee commitment, and thus improves organizational performance (Lilius, et al., 2008). Compassion-related behaviors in organizations are accompanied by an increase in helpful behaviors, trust, support towards others and cooperation. Individuals who experience compassion in the workplace cope better in difficult circumstances, manage problematic situations better and are able to overcome them (Lilius et al., 2011). Thanks to acts of compassion, organizational relational resources, shared values and beliefs of employees, and interpersonal skills are created, which can create the ability to cooperate in the organization (Dutton et al., 2007). Compassion shown to colleagues at work can strengthen emotional bonds and increase employees' ability to be effective (Dutton, Frost, Worline, Lilius, Kanove, 2002, Frost, Dutton, Worline, Wilson, 2000).

The sense of self-efficacy (competence) is an image of a person's competences, providing them with the means to carry out designated activities (Bandura, 1997, after: Juczyński, 2000). The stronger the beliefs regarding self-efficacy, the higher the goals set, the stronger the commitment to the intended action, even in the face of failures (Locke, Latham, 1990, as cited in: Juczyński, 2000). Self-efficacy influences the choice of a situation, that is, its rejection or acceptance, depending on the expected consequences. At the same time, the competence attributed to oneself determines the strength of involvement in a given activity as well as perseverance in pursuing the chosen goal (Nagody-Mrozowicz, 2023).

Hope for success, i.e. the belief in the possibility of achieving goals, the certainty that if the goal appears, all actions will be taken to achieve it (Snyder, 1994, after: Martowska, 2012). Its function refers to social activity and its goals, which may include, for example, establishing contacts or cooperation (Zięba, Łąguna, Trzebiński, 2005). The hope for

success is related to effort, which, together with perseverance, contributes to success in the area entrepreneurial activities (Markman, Baron, Balkin, 2005). In a manager's work, an important function is related to reformulating the meaning of difficult situations into challenges (Porzak, Sagan, 2013). It determines greater social competences and better social functioning (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005).

Social competences are understood as skills that determine the efficiency of self-management and the effectiveness of coping with social situations, i.e. those which other people are involved in. They are related to the ability to communicate with others, cooperate, and exert influence (Smółka, 2008, Matczak, 2001, 2007, Martowska, Matczak, 2013a, b). Martowska and Matczak (2013a, b) distinguished, among others, assertive, cooperative and sociable competences. The first one is useful for people in managerial positions. The second ones are related to highly developed interpersonal skills, the ability to care for others, provide them with support and help, mitigate conflicts, and cooperate effectively with others. The third one is related to the ability to initiate and maintain informal contacts.

Interpersonal conflicts are related to the perceived divergence of interests as a result of the conflict of two motives: maximizing one's own interest and the partner's interest (Thomas, Kilmann, 1974). Depending on how far an individual takes into account their own and their partner's interests, five styles of dealing with a conflict situation can be distinguished: competition, cooperation, adaptation, avoidance, compromise. Competition is related to maximizing one's own interest while minimizing the partner's interest. Winning is the goal, relationships with others do not matter. Cooperation related to simultaneous maximization of one's own and the partner's interests. The result is placed on an equal footing with the relationship by both sides of the conflict. Adaptation is related to maximizing the partner's interest while minimizing one's own interest. A one-time result doesn't matter, what matters is maintaining proper relationships with others. Avoidance associated with minimizing one's own and the partner's interests. Both sides ignore mutual relations and the tasks assigned, because they are not important enough to engage in the conflict. Compromise means partially taking into account your own interest and that of your partner. Goals and relationships are important to both sides of the conflict to some extent. The presented strategies are not evaluative in nature, each style may be useful in a manager's work (Blake et al., 1964, after: Kłusek-Wojciszke, 2009; Thomas, 1992; Balawajder, 1992).

Self-compassion can play an important role in the ability to effectively balance one's own needs and the needs of others (Yarnell, Neff, 2013). Balancing needs is often perceived as crucial for healthy mental development (Bowlby, 1988, cited in: Yarnell, Neff, 2013), and for the ability to function in healthy interpersonal relationships (Grotevant, Cooper, 1986, cited in: Yarnell, Neff, 2013). Self-compassion enables good contact with the world of one's own emotions, understanding emotions is an important regulator in interpersonal contacts.

A review of research results regarding self-compassionate people and other dimensions of personality, emotional functioning (cf. Dzwonkowska, 2013) and social functioning (cf. Dzwonkowska, Żak-Łykus, 2015) indicates their positive attitude towards themselves and the surrounding world. Compassion appears to be an important factor organizing people's functioning in the workplace and allowing them to effectively cope with difficult situations (Atkins, Parker, 2012; Lilius, et al., 2008; Frost et al., 2006). The style of conduct in a conflict situation is an important element of relationships with others (Klinger, 1977; Argyle, 1988; Argyle, Henderson, 1985, as cited in: Balawajder, 1992), and solving this

situation requires making a balance and choosing between the needs of others and one's own (Thomas, Kilmann, 1974). Effective functioning at work requires highly developed social competences as their lack is related to social maladjustment (Martowska, Matczak, 2013a, b). The question arises: What is the relationship between managers' self-compassion and their attitudes towards others: compassion towards others, social competences, conflict resolution styles in the work environment?

In the review of research on self-compassion, no studies were found that directly related to the social functioning of managers. Research in the Turkish work environment has shown a relationship between self-compassion and higher job satisfaction (Abaci, Arda, 2013). Compassion for others in the organization was measured as the perceived level of compassion given (Dutton, Frost, Worline, Lilius, Kanove, 2002; Frost, Dutton, Worline, Wilson, 2000), no research was found that would examine compassion for others as understood by Neff in the workplace. The only research examining the relationship between self-compassion and styles of orientation towards oneself or others in a conflict situation concerned close relationships and showed a relationship between variables conditioned by the closeness of this relationship (Yarnell, Neff, 2013). Research has shown that people with high self-compassion are generally more socially competent in all indicators of social competence: in close interpersonal contact, in situations of social exposure and in situations requiring assertiveness (Dzwonkowska, Żak-Łykus, 2014).

Managers who have effective relationships with themselves are able to create effective relationships with co-workers (Drucker, 1994). The higher the position in the organization, the more important interpersonal competences are (Kaźmierczak, 2004). The competencies that distinguish the best directors in Asia, the Americas and Europe are intellectual advantages, personal emotional competences and social skills (Spencer et al., 1993, cited in: Goleman, 1999). Giving encouragement, developing conflicts, and communicating frequently with employees, clients, and partners is related to understanding others (Kaźmierczak, 2004). Strategies of conduct, goals set, actions taken, and building interpersonal relationships are related to the way we think about ourselves and the environment. A positive attitude towards oneself contributes to success and coping with difficult situations (Łaguna, 2010). Compassion is treated as a means not only of healing, but also of building the quality of interpersonal relationships between employees (Dutton, Lilius, Kanov, 2007).

When making risky decisions, the direction in which self-compassion can lead decision-makers is unclear. The assumption that self-compassion inhibits risk-taking may be justified in several ways, starting with reference to other personality correlates of self-compassion (Bailis et al., 2022). Research has shown that self-compassion is positively associated with self-esteem, conscientiousness and emotional intelligence, and negatively associated with impulsivity, avoidance-oriented coping, general risk of psychopathology, and in particular with the risk of substance abuse (Barnard and Curry, 2011; Mantzios, 2014; Phelps et al., 2018). With the exception of self-esteem, which may promote confidence in risky situations (Baumeister et al., 1989; Brunell, Buelow, 2017; Cameron, Granger, 2019), most of these correlated personality traits promote less risky decision making. By the same token, if self-compassion opens people's minds to the possibility of making a mistake, maintains their affective balance, and reduces their need to regain their standing after loss, it should also inhibit the risk-taking that results from opposing states. Crocker and Park's (2004) research shows that high, secure self-esteem, which builds positive self-esteem, minimizes engaging in risky behaviors; the individual does not perform activities that would generate unnecessary emotional costs.

Najavits' pilot study (Najavits et al., 2013) on self-compassion related directly to gambling. Over the 6 months from admission to the end of the cognitive behavioral therapy process, participants demonstrated increased self-compassion and reduced gambling-related cognitive distortions. These findings may suggest that increasing self-compassion is associated with reducing gambling risk. However, the pilot study was small (with 7 participants) and did not include a control group, or examine correlations between measures of self-compassion and gambling. Bailis et al. (2021) measured self-compassion and tested casino gambling decisions among 240 customers aged (18–85). This study found that higher self-compassion was associated with less risky decision-making, in an environment where problem gambling was common and gambling behavior could also occur.

Self-compassion has been linked to self-regulation outcomes with putative probabilistic decision-making in domains other than gambling. With respect to the concept of reduced defensiveness, several studies have positively associated self-compassion with admitting and correcting mistakes among people who are conscientious or motivated in building and maintaining social relationships (Baker, McNulty, Citation 2011; Neff, Beretvas, 2013, cited in: Bailis et al., 2021).

On the other hand, people with higher levels of self-compassion may demonstrate greater risk-taking tendencies to the extent that self-compassion reduces self-criticism or negative self-talk when making decisions that would otherwise help inhibit risk-taking. Regarding the concept of reduced self-criticism, research on the related phenomenon of self-forgiveness supports its association with prolonged and increased risk. Squires' et al. (2012) study of Canadian college students who had at least 1 symptom of problem gambling on the DSM-IV checklist found that those with more symptoms expressed greater willingness to change their behavior away from gambling - but the relationship this was mediated by the relative lack of self-forgiveness in the more symptomatic group. In relation to self-compassion, self-forgiveness more strongly emphasizes the process of accepting responsibility for one's own harmful behaviors and thus eliminates self-condemnation for them. Nevertheless, as analyzed by Wohl et al. (2017), self-compassion and self-forgiveness may be functionally similar in maintaining these problematic behaviors if the appropriate process is engaged while these behaviors are still ongoing.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the conducted systematic analysis, which was based on a detailed analysis of the results of empirical research exploring theoretically and methodologically diverse correlates of the attitude of *self-forgiveness*, several noticeable regularities were found. Their role in the decision-making process, based on multiple domains of rationality determined by the personality traits of the decision-maker (manager, supervisor, chief, commander, etc.), influences the quality of shaping the effectiveness of leadership behaviors and the leadership process.

Praxeological leadership, anchored in the pragmatic layer of managerial action, is subject to the influence and impact of the analyzed, variable – *self-forgiveness*. Implicitly, a "praxeological leader" has a mature and coherent personality, which is characterized by well-developed emotional intelligence and social competences, which, as exemplary personality traits, are exemplified by the disposition to forgive oneself.

A *praxeological leader* has a realistic, stable self-esteem and is goal-oriented, pursuing it in an empathetic way with a sense of mission and responsibility for others. It is the

quintessential antithesis of Lowney, who, after many years of experience in the Jesuit order, states that: "What is often considered leadership today is in fact a cheap and shallow technique - a substitute for real substance" (Lowney, 2011). The Jesuits prepared their novices for success by shaping them into leaders who: understood their strengths and weaknesses, values and worldviews, courageously innovated and adapted to meet the changes taking place in the world, attracted others with a positive and loving attitude, added themselves and others by awakening heroic ambitions (Lowney, 2011).

The analogy of inferring the rational basis of leadership is undoubted, although the paths to reaching this implication were different. In the case of the authors of the article, they led to visualizing the relationship between the rationality of decision-making processes and self-forgiveness, while in the case of the cited author of the concept of "heroic leadership", they were the result of the experimental method and participant observation (Lowney, 2011).

The coherence of conclusions is also reflected in Krzyżanowski concept, which defines the differences between the factors defining management, leadership and true leadership (Krzyżanowski, 1999). With regard to the effectiveness of managerial activities, which generally refer to the effectiveness of controlling social systems of various types of organizations, several management determinants can be indicated, which include: the basis of power, the title to management and types of management (Krzyżanowski, 1999). A decision-maker with a high level of developing the disposition to forgive oneself (Neff, 2004, etc.), making decisions in the conditions of subjective and objective rationality (Morawiec, 2014), has potential conditions and predispositions to develop "heroic leadership", which Krzyżanowski defines, as true leadership (Krzyżanowski, 1999). It is the result of improving one's own personality and character traits, such as: openness, courage, commitment, decision-making, then self-awareness and the ability to communicate and communicate with others, team management, building a good team, and then the desired work atmosphere, up to difficult skills of coping with difficult employees and resolving conflicts (Gierczak, 2021).

REFERENCES

- Abaci, R., Arda, D. (2013). *Relationship between self-compassion and job satisfaction in white collar workers*. "Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences", 106.
- Ajdukiewicz, K. (2004). *Zagadnienia i kierunki filozofii. Teoria poznania. Metafizyka*. Kety–Warszawa: Antyk-Aletheia.
- Allen, A.B., Goldwasser, E.R., Leary, M.R. (2012). *Self-compassion and well-being among older adults*. "Self and Identity", 11.
- Amsterdamski, S. (1994). *Refleksje o nauce i racjonalności [In:] Tertium non datur?*. Warszawa.
- Atkins, P.W., Parker, S.K. (2012). *Understanding Individual Compassion in Organizations: The Role of Appraisals and Psychological Flexibility*. "Academy of Management Review", 37, 4.
- Baer, R.A., Lykins, E.L.B., Peters, J.R. (2012). *Mindfulness and self-compassion as predictors of psychological wellbeing in long-term meditators and matched nonmeditators*. "Journal of Positive Psychology", 7, 3.
- Bailis, D.S., Single, A.N., Brais, N.J.J.R., Schellenberg, B.J.I. (2022). *Going for broke: Self-compassion, risky decision-making, and differences in problem gambling severity among undergraduates*. "Self and Identity", Vol. 22, 2023, Issue 3.

- Balawajder, K. (1992). *Konflikty interpersonalne: analiza psychologiczna*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Barnard, L.K., Curry, J.F. (2011). *Self-Compassion: Conceptualizations, Correlates, & Interventions*. "Review of General Psychology", 15, 4.
- Bombik, M. (2001). *Typy racjonalności*. "Studia Philosophiae Christianae", 37/1.
- Breines, J.G., Chen, S. (2013). *Activating the inner caregiver: The role of support-giving schemas in increasing state self-compassion*. "Journal of Experimental Social Psychology", 49.
- Bronk, A. (2009). *Podstawy nauk o religii*. Lublin: KUL.
- Brunell, A.B., Buelow, M.T. (2017). *Narcissism and performance on behavioral decision-making tasks*. "Journal of Behavioral Decision Making", 30(1).
- Cameron, J.J., Granger, S. (2019). *Does self-esteem have an interpersonal imprint beyond self-reports? A meta-analysis of self-esteem and objective interpersonal indicators*. "Personality and Social Psychology Review", 23(1).
- Crocker, J., Park, L.E. (2004). *The Costly Pursuit of Self-Esteem*. "Psychological Bulletin", 130(3).
- Draskovic, M., Bauk, S., Delibasic, M. (2016). *Testing the Level and Factors of Institutional Rationality in Montenegro, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina*, "Economics & Sociology", No. 2.
- Drucker, P.F. (1994). *Menadżer skuteczny*. Kraków: Nowoczesność.
- Dutton, J.E., Frost, P.J., Worline, M.C., Lilius, J.M., Kanov, J. (2002). *Leading in times of trauma*. "Harvard Business Review", January.
- Dutton, J., Lilius, J.M., Kanov, J. (2007). *The transformative potential of compassion at work* [In:] Piderit, S.K., Cooperrider, D.L., Fry, R.E., eds., *Handbook of transformative cooperation: New designs and dynamics* (pp. 107–126). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dzwonkowska, I. (2011). *Współczucie wobec samego siebie (self-compassion) jako moderator wpływu samooceny globalnej na afektywne funkcjonowanie ludzi*. „Psychologia Społeczna”, 1.
- (2013). *Współczucie wobec samego siebie a inne wymiary osobowości oraz emocjonalne funkcjonowanie ludzi*. „Czasopismo Psychologiczne”, 19, 2.
- Dzwonkowska, I., Błońska, K. (2008). *Wstępna wersja polskiej adaptacji Skali Współczującej Postawy wobec Samego Siebie (Self-compassion) Kristin Neff*. Unpublished data.
- Dzwonkowska, I., Żak-Łykus, A. (2014). *The role of Self-compassion and Self-esteem in a disposition to interpersonal aggression and empathy*. Unpublished data.
- (2015). *Self-compassion and social functioning of people – research review*. "Polish Psychological Bulletin", 46, 1.
- Encyklopedia PWN*. Access on the internet: <https://encyklopedia.pwn.pl/haslo/definicja-klasyczna;3922714.html>.
- Frost, P.J., Dutton, J.E., Maitlis, S., Lilius, J.M., Kanov, J.M., Worline, M.C. (2006). *Seeing organizations differently: Three lenses on compassion* [In:] Hardy, C., Clegg, S., Lawrence, T., Nord, W., eds., *Handbook of organization studies*. 2nd ed. (pp. 843–866). London: Sage.
- Frost, P.J., Dutton, J.E., Worline, M.C., Wilson, A. (2000). *Narratives of compassion in organizations* [In:] Fineman, S., ed., *Emotion in organizations*. 2nd ed. (p. 25–45). London: Sage.

- Gawronski, B., Bodenhausen, G.V. (2006). *Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change*. "Psychological Bulletin", 132(5).
- Gierczak, A., (2021). *Można wybrać status quo, można ruszyć z posad bryłę świata. O przywództwie z perspektywy psychosomatycznej i kompetencyjnej dla liderów sektora publicznego*. Rzeszów: Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Rzeszowskiej.
- Goleman, D. (1999). *Inteligencja emocjonalna w praktyce*. Poznań: Media Rodzina.
- Greenwald, A.G., Banaji, M.R. (1995). *Utajone poznanie społeczne: postawy, wartościowanie siebie i stereotypy*. „Przegląd Psychologiczny”, 38(1).
- Greenwald, A.G., Farnham, S.D. (2000). *Using the Implicit Association Test to measure self-esteem and self-concept*. "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 79.
- Haus, B. (2005). *Czy racjonalne działania zapewniają efektywność?*. „Prace Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej we Wrocławiu”, nr 1060. Efektywność – rozważania nad istotą i pomiarem.
- Herbut, J. (1997). *Racja* [In:] Herbut, J., ed., *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*. Lublin.
- Jankowska-Mihułowicz, M. (2012). *Metoda oceny racjonalności metodologicznej menedżerów*. „Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu”, No. 260. Zarządzanie strategiczne w praktyce i teorii.
- Jasiński, K. (2022). *Racjonalność religii jako forma jej apologii*. NURT SVD 1.
- Jokić, G. (2017). *Problemy z racjonalnością w zarządzaniu projektami*. „Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu”, No. 499. Nauki ekonomiczne w XXI wieku – wyzwania, dylematy, perspektywy. Ekonomia, finanse, nauki o zarządzaniu.
- Juczyński, Z. (2000). *Poczucie własnej skuteczności. Teoria i pomiar*. „Acta Universitatis Lodzensis Folia Psychologica”, 4.
- (2009). *Skala Uogólnionej Własnej Skuteczności* [In:] *Narzędzia pomiaru w promocji i psychologii zdrowia*, wyd. 2. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.
- Kalinowski, M. (2014). *Ekonomiczne meandry racjonalności*. „Studia Ekonomiczne”. Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Katowicach, No. 180, part 1. *Dokonania współczesnej myśli ekonomicznej: racjonalność – efektywność – etyka*. cz. 1, Problemy teoretyczne
- Kaźmierczak, M. (2004). *Empatia w strukturach organizacyjnych*, „Roczniki Psychologiczne”, VII, 2.
- Kernis, M.H., Paradise, A.W., Whitaker, D.J., Wheatman, S.R., Goldman, B.N. (2000). *Master of one's psychological domain? Not likely if one's self-esteem is unstable*. "Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin", 26(10).
- Kleszcz, R. (1998). *O racjonalności. Studium epistemologicznohistoryczne*. Łódź: UŁ.
- (2003). *O racjonalności i jej granicach*. „Roczniki Filozoficzne”, No. 1.
- Kłusek-Wojciszke, B. (2009). *Osobowość jako determinanta wyboru stylu rozwiązywania konfliktów*. „Organizacja i kierowanie. Organization and Management”, 1, 135. Warszawa: Komitet Nauk Organizacji i Zarządzania Polskiej Akademii Nauk i Szkoła Główna Handlowa w Warszawie.
- Kłusek, B. (2009). *Kwestionariusz stylów rozwiązywania konfliktów*. „Czasopismo Psychologiczne”, 15, 1/2009.
- Kotlarek, P. (2014). *Racjonalność w ujęciu ekonomii behawioralnej*, „Studia Ekonomiczne”. Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Katowicach, No. 180, part 1. *Dokonania współczesnej myśli ekonomicznej: racjonalność – efektywność – etyka*, part 1, Problemy teoretyczne.

- Krzyżanowski, L. (1999). *O podstawach kierowania organizacjami inaczej: paradygmaty, filozofia, dylematy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Leary, M.R., Tate, E.B., Adams, C.E., Batts Allen, A., Hancock, J. (2007). *Self-compassion and reactions to unpleasant self-relevant events: The implications of treating oneself kindly*. "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 92.
- Lilius, J.M., Worline, M.C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J. (2008). *The Contours and Consequences of compassion at work*. "Journal of Organizational Behavior", 29(2).
- Lilius, J.M., KanoV, J., Dutton, J.E., Worline, M.C. (2011). *Compassion Revealed: What we know about compassion at work (and where we need to know more)*. ResearchGate, January.
- Lisak, A. (2016). *Adam Smith – pięć razy o racjonalności w ekonomii. (Z okazji 240 rocznicy ukazania się „Bogactwa Narodów”)*, „Studia Ekonomiczne”, No. 3(90).
- Lowney, Ch. (2011). *Heroiczne przywództwo*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Łaguna, M. (2010). *Przekonania na własny temat i aktywność celowa. Badania nad przedsiębiorczością*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Łukaszynski, J. (2002). *Dwie koncepcje racjonalności współdziałań*. „Prace Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej we Wrocławiu. Nauki Humanistyczne”, 7, No. 937.
- Mantzios, M. (2014). *Exploring the relationship between worry and impulsivity in military recruits: The role of mindfulness and self-compassion as potential mediators*. "Stress and Health", 30(5).
- Markman, G.D., Baron, R.A., Balkin, D.B. (2005). *Are perseverance and self-efficacy costless? Assessing entrepreneurs regretful thinking*. "Journal of Organization Behavior", 26, 1.
- Martowska, K. (2012). *Psychologiczne uwarunkowania kompetencji społecznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo: Liberi Libri.
- Maruszewski, T. (1983). *Analiza procesów poznawczych jednostki w świetle idealizacyjnej teorii nauki [An analysis of the cognitive processes of an individual in the light of the idealizational theory of science]*. Uniwersytet Im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu: Seria Psychologia i Pedagogika, 57.
- (2017). *Psychologia poznania. Umysł i świat*. Gdańsk: GWP.
- Masiukiewicz, P. (2018). *Sprawność zarządzania w ujęciu prakseologicznym*. „Ekonomika i Organizacja Przedsiębiorstwa”, No. 4.
- Matczak, A., Martowska, K. (2013a). *Pomiar kompetencji społecznych – prezentacja nowego narzędzia diagnostycznego*. „Psychologia Jakości Życia. Psychology of Quality of Life”, 12, 1.
- (2013b). *Profil Kompetencji Społecznych PROKOS. Podręcznik*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.
- Matczak, A. (2001). *Kwestionariusz Kompetencji Społecznych KKS. Podręcznik*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.
- (2007). *Kwestionariusz Kompetencji Społecznych KKS. Podręcznik*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.
- Morawiec, E. (2014). *Wybrane filozoficzne koncepcje rozumu ludzkiego i racjonalność*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Liberi Libri.
- Nagody-Mrozowicz, K. (2021). *Strach i przywództwo. Człowiek. Kultura. Adiutinizm*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe AWL.
- (2023). *Przywództwo zdeterminowane osobowościowo w świetle badania poczucia własnej skuteczności*, „Pedagogika Katolicka”.

- Najavits, L.M., Smylie, D., Johnson, K., Lung, J., Gallop, R.J., Classen, C.C. (2013). *Seeking safety therapy for pathological gambling and PTSD: A pilot outcome study*. "Journal of Psychoactive Drugs", 45(1).
- Neely, M.E., Schallert, D.L., Mohammed, S.S., Roberts, R.M., Chen, Y. (2009). *Self-Kindness when facing stress; The role of self-compassion, goal regulation, and suport in college students' well-being*. "Motivation and Emotion", 33.
- Neff, K.D. (2003a). *Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself*. "Self and Identity", 2.
- (2003b). *The Development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion*. "Self and Identity", 2.
- (2004). *Self-compassion and psychological well-being*. "Constructivism in the Human Sciences", 9.
- Neff, K.D., Pommier, E. (2012). *The relationship between self-compassion and other-focused concern among college undergraduates, community adults, and practicing meditators*. "Self and Identity", 12, 2.
- Neff, K.D., Hsieh, Y., Dejithirat, K. (2005). *Self-compassion, achievement goals, and coping with academic failure*. "Self and Identity", 4
- Neff, K.D., Pisitsungkagarn, K., Hsieh, Y. (2008). *Self-compassion and self-construal in the United States, Thailand, and Taiwan*. "Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology", 39.
- Neff, K.D., Dahm, K.A. (in print). *Self-Compassion: What it is, what it does, and how it relates to mindfulness* [In:] Robinson, M., Meier, B., Ostafin, B., eds., *Mindfulness and Self-Regulation*. New York: Springer.
- Neff, K.D., Hsieh, Y., Dejitterat, K. (2005). *Self-compassion, achievement goals, and coping with academic failure*. "Self and identity", 4.
- Neff, K.D., Costigan, A.P. (2014). *Self-Compassion, Wellbeing, and Happiness*. "Psychologie in Osterreich", 114-117.
- Neff, K.D., Rude, S.S., Kirkpatrick, K. (2007). *An examination of self-compassion in relations to positive psychological functioning and personality traits*. "Journal of Research in Personality", 41.
- Nęcka, E., Orzechowski, J., Szymura, B., Wichary, Sz. (2020). *Psychologia poznawcza*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Niemczuk, A. (2019). *Practical Rationality – Its Nature and Operation*. "Studia Humana", 8(2).
- Nogal, P. (2014). *Racjonalność ekonomiczna w kontekście teorii użyteczności*. „Studia Ekonomiczne”, Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Katowicach, nr 180, cz. 1, *Dokonania współczesnej myśli ekonomicznej: racjonalność – efektywność – etyka*. cz. 1, Problemy teoretyczne.
- Pawłowski, T. (1986). *Tworzenie pojęć w naukach humanistycznych*. Warszawa.
- Phelps, C.L., Paniagua, S.M., Willcockson, I.U., Potter, J.S. (2018). *The relationship between self-compassion and the risk for substance use disorder*. "Drug & Alcohol Dependence", 183 (February).
- Piaseczny, J. (2005). *Pułapki krótkookresowej racjonalności*. „Master of Business Administration”, No. 6(77).
- Pommier, E.A. (2011). *The compassion scale*. "Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences", 72.
- Porzak, R., Sagan, M. (2013). *Nadzieja i przedsiębiorczość – psychologiczne aspekty zarządzania*. „Zeszyty Naukowe WSEI”, seria EKONOMIA, 6, 1.

- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smółka, P. (2008). *Kompetencje społeczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wolters Kluwer.
- Strelau, J., Doliński, D. [ed.] (2015). *Psychologia akademicka. Podręcznik*. Vol. 1, 2. Gdańsk: GWP.
- Stróżewski, W. (2005). *Istnienie i sens*. Kraków: Znak.
- Squires, E.C., Sztainert, T., Gillen, N.R., Caouette, J., Wohl, M.J.A. (2012). *The problem with self-forgiveness: Forgiving the self deters readiness to change among gamblers*. "Journal of Gambling Studies", 28(3).
- Sztajer, S. (2009). *Racjonalność religii wobec niektórych współczesnych prób jej naturalizacji* [In:] Drozdowicz, Z., Melosik, Z., Sztajer, S., ed., *O racjonalności w nauce i w życiu społecznym*, (p. 273–289). Poznań: UAM.
- Tałasiewicz, M. (1995). *O pojęciu „racjonalności” (I)*. „Filozofia Nauki” 3(1995), 1–2.
- Thomas, K.W., Kilmann, R.H. (1974), *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*, XICOM, Inc.
- Thomas, K.W. (1992). *Conflict and Conflict Management: Reflections and Update*. "Journal of Organizational Behavior", 13.
- Tischner, J. (2000). *Myślenie według wartości*, Kraków: Znak.
- Wei, M., Liao, K., Ku, T., Shaffer, P.A. (2011). *Attachment, self-compassion, empathy, and subjective well-being among college students and community adults*. "Journal of Personality", 79.
- Wispe, L. (1991). *The psychology of sympathy*. New York: Plenum.
- Wohl, M.J.A., Salmon, M.M., Hollingshead, S.J., Lidstone, S.K., Tabri, N. et al. (2017). *The dark side of self-forgiveness: Forgiving the self can impede change for ongoing, harmful behavior* [In:] Woodyatt, L., ed., *Handbook of the psychology of self-forgiveness* (p. 147–159). Berlin: Springer.
- Wojewoda, M. (2010). *Pluralizm aksjologiczny i jego implikacje we współczesnej filozofii religii*. Katowice: UŚ.
- Yarnell, L.M., Neff, K.D. (2013). *Self-compassion, interpersonal conflict resolutions, and well-being*, *Self and Identity*. 2:2, 146-159.
- Życiński, J. (1983). *Rodzaje i warunki racjonalności poznawczej*. „Zagadnienia Filozoficzne w Nauce”, No. 5.
- (1985). *Teizm i filozofia analityczna*, t. 1. Kraków: Znak.