

# Security of Organisations and Methodological Rationality of Their Members

Jan Franciszek Jacko

*Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Faculty of Management and Social Communication,  
Institute of Economics, Finance and Management, Chair of Negotiations  
University of Security in Poznan, Faculty of Social Studies*

This paper specifies competences and skills of methodologically rational decision making and their impact on security of organisations. The study indicates some reasons for developing the competencies and skills in education, professional development and taking them into account in the recruitment. It is the practical aim of this paper. Its scientific aim is to formulate and to partly justify general hypotheses concerning the impact of methodologically rational and irrational attitudes of members of organisations on their security. We apply the method of ideal types of Max Weber and phenomenological analyses, which concern intentionality of methodologically rational and irrational mental attitudes.

**Keywords:** management education, praxiology, organisation, rational action, security

## Introduction

The article makes a contribution to the ongoing discussion concerning the role of attitudes and virtues in organisation management (Dyck, Neubert, 2008; Rego, Cunha, Clegg, 2012; van Hooft, 2013). The paper presents relationships between methodologically rational or irrational attitudes of the organisation's members and its security. The scientific purpose of the study is to formulate and partly justify some research hypotheses concerning the relationships. The practical objective of the study is to indicate some reasons for developing competences and abilities of methodologically rational decision-making process and taking them into account in recruitment of new organisation's members.

Notions such as “organisation”, “security”, “methodological rationality” are these days ambiguous, yet, discussing divergent ways of defining the notions is not the focal point of the paper. Their meaning will be determined by means of regulatory definitions. Further the study applies the ideal types method, developed among others, by Max Weber (2011, 2012). It consists of a thinking experiment. Two idealized and opposite situations are compared with each other (referred to as “models”): Model A, in which decision makers make methodologically rational decisions in line with Model B, in which they tend to take methodologically irrational decisions. The analysis and comparison of the two models will allow to formulate some research hypotheses concerning the impact of methodologically rational and irrational attitude of members of an organisation on its security.

The method is accompanied by phenomenological analysis (Smith, 2013) of intentionality of rational and irrational attitudes. The analysis can partly justify the above hypotheses, however, it does not prove them. The hypotheses are of supposition-like nature (partly justifiable) that streamline further empirical researches to examine them and theoretical researches, which may lead towards more detailed and specific hypotheses concerning particular contexts and aspects of organisational activities.

In the text “organisation” means an organised and structured system of elements, that (as a whole) performs specified functions in a self-specific way and whose elements are, among others, people (called “members of organisation”). Considering the above, such an institution as, for example, a state, corporation, firm, chain organisation, family and alike are an organisation (Greenwald, 2008).

Because of the difference between existential (structural) and functional aspect of an organisation (Arbib, Érdi, Szentagothai, 1998; Haimes, 2015; Koźmiński, Latusek-Jurczak, 2011; Wrench, Punyanunt-Carter, 2012), its existential (structural) and functional security are distinguished. Existential security of organisations consists in the likelihood of their existence. The larger the likelihood is, the more secure the organisation is. Any threat to the security reduces the chances for the organisation to further exist. This type of security is determined by prerequisites and preconditions to its existence. For instance, loss of liquidity poses a threat to the existential security of a firm operating in free market economy.

It is assumed that each organisation has its own specific objective or set of operational objectives, i.e. such ones that determine its ontological identity (nature, specificity) (Greenwald, 2008; Richmond, McCroskey, McCroskey, 2004). Functional security of an organisation translates into its ability to reach these

objectives. If there is a factor threatening its functional security, the very factor makes the functioning of the organisation less effective or less efficient (economical) while reaching the target set, than it could be if the factor did not occur. For instance, corruption is a threat to efficient organisational functioning. In majority of cases functional threats are also existential ones. Functional security of an organisation is determined by its specific operational objectives that could be varied. For example, they might include meeting the needs of the organisation's members (e.g. owner, employees) and other people (e.g. stakeholders, customers). If their needs are well satisfied, the organisation is secure in the personal aspect. (Carroll, Arkin, Wichman, 2015).

Existential and functional security of an organisation has objective and subjective aspects (Webb, Wills-Herrera, 2012). Within the objective aspect (objective security of an organisation), the organisation is secure in both existential and functional terms. The organisation is subjectively secure when its members are convinced that it is objectively secure (Loranty, 2012; Tang, 2010). This article focuses solely on the objective security of an organisation.

Verbs used in the article demoting the impact of attitudes upon security of an organisation, such as: "facilitates", "reduces risk", "limits opportunity", "impedes" mean likelihood. The statement that "x facilitates y" means that y is more likely, when x occurs than when x does not exist at all. Yet, the statement "x reduces the risk of y", "x limits opportunity y" or "x impedes y" means that y is less likely when x occurs than in case of x being not existent.

The hypotheses included in the article concern decision makers within an organisation, proportionally to their influence on its shape and operations. For instance, security of democratic states depends to a larger extent on their citizens than in case of states with no civic participation. In both cases there is a group of people (leaders, managers, citizens, etc.) having influence on the shape and operations of their organisation, and it's the group that the hypotheses put forward in the article refer to.

In case of the models presented in the article it is assumed that members of an organisation do not aim at destroying it (e.g. sabotage). Yet, in reality such kind of possibility should not be excluded. Therefore, the assumption is that in the examined models decision makers value the security of their organisation and/or set such objectives that contribute to its security (e.g. is someone works for a company only to earn a lot but doing so fulfills the responsibilities well and in this way she/he contributes to the security of the organisation).

## Methodological rationality of decisions and attitudes

Methodological rationality is a feature of attitudes and decisions<sup>1</sup>. According to Tadeusz Kotarbiński, while taking a rationally methodological decision, (i.e. in a methodologically rational way), its subject “...acts in line with the knowledge gained, and the knowledge gained should be understood as the overall information acquired by an individual which – considering the way the information is justified – could be likely and realistic enough to treat it and act as if the information was true” (Kotarbiński, 1973, p. 123).

It is assumed (regulatory definition) that there are 3 necessary conditions (whose conjunction is a sufficient condition) for methodologically rational decisions: Their subject

- (x) examines **justification** of his/her beliefs,
- (y) tries to consider **all** possible solutions,
- (z) from amongst all possible solutions chooses **the best** justified one against the background of the knowledge gained.

Therefore, “methodologically rational” decisions are those that meet the three conditions above. The definition by Kotarbiński concerns directly the last (z) of them, yet, it implies the assumed remaining conditions (x) and (y). They have been enlisted as there are likely cases when an entity while taking a decision satisfying condition (z) does not investigate the justification of his beliefs (condition x is not fulfilled) or unjustifiably rules out some opportunities to take action (condition y is not fulfilled). The former option presented is elaborated on by, i.a. Józef Maria Bocheński (1987) and is associated with kind of superstition (prejudice), whereas the latter one (in the context of the choice of scientific hypotheses) is discussed by, i.a. Karl Rajmund Popper (1999, pp. 211–212).

Terms such as “better justified” or “the best justified” are conceptualised in this article in the way they are used in the writings by the representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw School represented by Kotarbiński: “Better justified” means “more likely” and the “best justified” – “the most likely” (Kotarbiński, 1986, pp. 226–227). It is assumed that not only beliefs and statements (condition x) but also decisions

---

<sup>1</sup> Attitude is called here the human inclination to a particular method of fulfilling acts. Attitude is a system of emotional cognitive and behavioural factors: One of the attitude's elements is the emotional component, that is your emotional reactions to the subject of attitude (e.g. another person or social problem), cognitive component, that is your thoughts and beliefs about the object of the attitude and behavioural component – your actions, that is observable behaviour towards the subject of attitude (Aronson et al., 1997, p. 314).

(condition z) might be worse or better justified. The justification of a decision consists in proving the likelihood that the action that decision triggers is going to be both effective and efficient. The larger the likelihood is, the better justified the decision is.

Rational beliefs satisfy the condition (x). (Bortolotti, 2010, p. 11). They result from rational assertion within which its subject is sure of his/her beliefs proportionally to their justification – the subject is more certain of those that are better justified, than of the ones that are justified worse. Irrational assertion comes down to the fact that subject is sure of the beliefs independently of their justification, therefore the subject could be more certain of (depending on the knowledge gained) worse justified beliefs than those that are justified in a better way (Bortolotti, 2010; Jacko, 2016). In the contemporary literature the inclination to methodologically rational assertion is referred to as “rational assertiveness”. Irrational assertiveness is then, referred to as the tendency to irrational assertion (Alberti, Emmons, 2001; Jacko, 2016; Paris, Casey, 1979; Robinson, 1982).

Excessively detailed examination of justification of beliefs (condition x) might impede the way of acting, for instance the case of someone defaulting on decision making process at the right time, which might result from spending too much time and using too much energy on examining forecast. The above is an example of lack of assertiveness which is a drawback to any kind of decisions, including methodologically rational ones. The methodologically rational attitude should be associated with rational assertiveness, the idea of which is, i.e.: that its subject acts in a way that is the most effective and efficient in the subject’s opinion, thus it aims to minimise a risk. However, the risk may be taken if defaulting on acting is riskier to the best of the subject’s knowledge than taking the very risk (Alberti, Emmons, 2001; Paris, Casey, 1979; Robinson, 1982).

Therefore, the methodologically rational attitude (see footnote 1) will be used to denote the inclination, rooted in the acting person, to making a methodologically rational decision (satisfying the conditions x, y, z). Thanks to such attitude the person is willing to take decisions of this kind despite endogenous (e.g. being fearful, afraid, or attacked) or exogenous (e.g. adverse circumstances, social stereotypes, environment pressure) determinants. The ancient men of wisdom referred to this attitude in their concept of right reason (gr. ὀρθὸς λόγος) and virtue (gr. ἀρετή). As indicated by i.a. Plato and Aristotle, the two qualities stem from both seeking and respecting the truth as well as the inclination to taking decisions in line with what the truth requires (Jaeger, 1964; Veath, 2003). Such a concept was also discussed by the philosophers of the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Enlightenment as well as the contemporary ones (Gomez, 2014). Despite the fact that the above presented discussion on methodologically rational decisions and attitudes embedded in philosophy, their above definition is

of a regulatory nature – the methodological rationality of decisions and attitudes may be described either in the way similar to the one presented in the article or in a much different way (Abell, 1991; Auspitz et al., 1992; Ciesielski, 2012; Coleman, Fararo, 1992; Dennis, 2012; Gerrard, 1993; Hey, 1993; Kleszcz, 1998; Kosiorowski, 2005; Krasnodębski, 1991; Popa, 1992; Veatch, 2003; Zafirowski, 2003; Zey, 1997).

The article refers to the methodologically rational person as to the one who takes methodologically rational decision or has displayed methodologically rational attitude. Decisions that are methodologically irrational do not fulfill one or some of the presented conditions (x, y, z). And the methodologically irrational attitude is the inclination of the acting person to making such decisions. Their source is irrational assertiveness – the inclination to irrational assertion.

A distinction should be made between methodologically rational decisions and factually rational actions. In the article it is assumed that factually rational actions are effective and efficient (economical) – their objective is reached in a way that is the most efficient (economical, generating as insignificant losses as possible) (Dennis, 2012; Hey, 1993, Kotarbiński, 1973, pp. 109, 123, 433). Factual rationality of acting might be referred to as “economical” rationality (Hey, 1993, p. 12), “formal” one (Kleszcz, 1998, p. 73). Factually irrational action does not fulfill the above conditions – does not accomplish the objective set (is ineffective) and/or is inefficient (results in more damage than other, the same or more effective, ways of achieving the objective).

Methodological and factual rationally (of decisions or actions) are linked to each other intentionally and bear the characteristics of cause-effect relation. Factually rational acts are what rationally methodological decisions aim at (intentional relationship). A methodologically rational subject makes use of available sources of knowledge to take the acts that are effective and efficient. Therefore, for instance, the Kotarbiński concept of rational acting is based on an assumption that methodologically rational attitudes facilitate factually rational actions (cause-effect relation). The assumption is indisputable since the factually rational action is not an indispensable aftermath of methodologically rational decisions, and the factually irrational action is not a necessary aftermath of methodologically irrational decisions. The above assumption concerns a tendency that allows exceptions so as to circumstances under which an act takes place. This refers to an idealised situation in which a subject is fully knowledgeable about circumstances relevant to the subject’s effectiveness and efficiency, and has control over himself/herself. However, real situation might be not alike. It could occur that a decision is methodologically rational since it correctly (in line with conditions x, y, z) specifies the plan of acting. Yet, it is not factually rational due

to its own consequences, e.g., when – as a result of unpredictable circumstances or exogenous determinants – as well (methodologically rationally) planned act turns out to be ineffective and inefficient. In such situation methodologically rational decision leads to a factually irrational act. However, a reverse situation might occur – circumstances under which methodologically irrational decisions and attitudes lead to factually rational actions (e.g. decisions of Nikodem Dyzma in *Kariera Nikodyma Dyzmy* by Tadeusz Dołęga-Mostowicz). Moreover, effective and efficient may be also the acts that do not result from any decisions (Ciesielski, 2012; Simon, 1982).

The empirical study on the assumption may come down to comparing the effectiveness and efficiency of acts triggered by methodologically rational decisions with the ones not having this particular source.

Referring to the decision makers who value the security of their organisation and/or set such objectives that contribute to its security, the assumption could be formulated in the following way:

- a. Hypothesis: Methodologically rational attitudes of members of an organisation impact positively its security.

The hypothesis has been partly proved by the researches within the theory of collective rationality, the example of which could be the concept of “invisible hand of market” by Adam Smith, concerning the cases in which members of an organisation striving to reach their own objectives contribute to security and welfare of the society, the members of which they are (Kosiorowski, 2005; Olson, 1965). The hypothesis describes a tendency, but does not exclude exceptions. For instance, there could occur specific circumstances under which a methodologically irrational commitment of the organisation’s members to their superiors contributes to the security of the organisation more than their methodologically rational decisions. However, in this case the methodological rationality of the superiors acts in favour of its security, which the hypothesis states. The hypothesis may be tested by comparing the security of the organisation when its decision makers take methodologically rational decisions and when they make decisions in methodologically irrational way. Further in the article the thesis will be investigated by the method of comparison between the model A and the model B. Because of the method, the above hypothesis can be limited in the following way:

- b. Hypothesis: Methodologically rational attitudes of members of an organisation contribute to its security more than their methodologically irrational attitudes.

The concept of methodologically irrational attitudes concerns either lack of the rational assertiveness indispensable for effective and efficient acting or irrational assertiveness, within which its subject regardless of his/her knowledge

is persistent in accomplishment of the action planned as well as in beliefs even though, what the subject might be aware of, they could be worse justified than any alternative acts (Bortolotti, 2010, p. 11). Such an attitude might be reflected in varied ways. In the article three examples will be considered: wishful thinking, superstitious attitude and ideological thinking in some areas and cases of management.

## Management of security

Wishful thinking as considered in the article (regulatory definition) occurs when a subject determines the truth or false, certainty or likelihood, justification of lack of justification of the subject's beliefs in line with the subject's wishes, considering what he/she would prefer. Wishful thinking is an advantageous phenomenon as it protects the human psyche from stress and might be socially approved (e.g. in case of motivation). Yet, it might also lead to pathology and be socially detrimental (Fotopoulou, Solms, Turnbull, 2004). Such a situation might occur, among others, when influenced by wishful thinking an individual or a team disregard threats since they generate stress. Thus, instead of taking actions to prevent or counteract the threats, they streamline their efforts to create illusions of their security (Williams, 2004).

If self-awareness of threats and counteracting them is stressful, which might be the case, then in groups engulfed in wishful thinking it is difficult to reach a consensus regarding taking appropriate measures to ensure security of their organisation. Members of such groups either avoid stress by disregarding threats, or believe that the threats could be prevented in a stress less way. In such a situation their decisions (about the threats) might be postponed until it is already too late to start acting.

In order to retain support of society, those who manage wishfully thinking communities have to dedicate a major part of their activity to minimise stress among the organisation's members, for instance, through launching temporary solutions and discussing "substitute issues", that are associated with the real problem to be resolved and through bringing about the problem illusionary solution, not being the solution itself. If the above results in a misleading sense of security, it could be and usually is in sheer contradiction to a well perceived social interest. Such a state of affairs entails sluggishness of the processes aimed at security of an organisation and might even undermine it.

In the light of the above discussions 3 suppositions should be considered:

- a. Hypothesis: As a result of wishful thinking a subject (an individual or a group), impacted by it, partly or completely abandon the control over their security.
- b. Hypothesis: Wishful thinking of an organisation's members is an impediment to taking effective actions aimed at its security.

Methodologically rational attitudes do not induce the threats that the above hypotheses (a, b) indicate, as the attitudes are streamlined towards the well-adjusted diagnosis of the situation and the acts are in line with the very situation. Therefore, they facilitate the identification of threats and acts that could effectively prevent or manage the threats:

- c. Hypothesis: Wishful thinking exposes the subject (an individual or a group) to threats that could be avoided thanks to adapting methodologically rational attitude.

## Management of conflict

In the article unnecessary conflicts are considered those that might be avoided and that do more damage to the one who triggers them than preventing or solving them. Methodologically irrational attitude promotes (facilitates) the emergence and escalation of such conflicts, both intra- and inter- organisations ones, i.a. due to four reasons. Firstly, within the methodologically irrational attitude it is possible to wishfully predict the aftermath of the conflict and prematurely consider it beneficial (needed). For instance, someone driven by desire of retorsion or punishment, as a result of wishful thinking may not take into consideration a risk factor and carry out a vendetta, which is not the best perceived interest of the someone. Secondly, in such an attitude false positive features could be attributed to a conflict, thus triggering the conflict and enhancing it. For instance, while reactive in suitable way to breaching the terms of an agreement by party, the party could be encouraged to maintaining the agreement terms. Wishful thinking of negotiators could undermine such an opportunity, notably when they associate the agreement – breaching party to have qualities like honesty, good-faith acting, which are known to be non-existent. This way threats are ignored and threat-preventive acts are postponed until unspecified future. This might result in provoking in other party to escalating their demands and enforcing actions, thus entailing a situation when the conflict in its least desired shape is becoming increasingly of little likelihood or unlikely to be avoided. The conflict would be avoided if steps countering the occurred situation would have been taken early enough.

Wishful thinking might be linked to fear of checking or hostility against checking the justification of beliefs. When the fear and the hostility are stay permanent within a subject, this is a case of an attitude that, according to Bocheński (1987) is called “superstitious” and the beliefs within the attitude “superstitions” (“prejudices”). The superstitious attitude should be distinguished from religious faith as the faith may but does not have to be connected with the superstitious attitude (Bocheński, 1993, pp. 325–467). Even the true and rightly justified theories and the noblest ideologies could be a superstitious if they reflect a superstitious attitude. Already in the remote past Socrates and Plato indicated its social detriment. Nowadays, among others representatives of analytical philosophy, e.g. Bocheński (1987; Jacko, 2013) and Popper (1996) have discussed some contemporary superstitions.

As it has already been considered, the subject having such a superstitious attitude is unwilling to examine the justification of her/his superstitions and the subject can react with hostility to any attempts of questioning or investigating the grounds for the superstition. Therefore, the subject rather fights the opponents and forces them to change their approach to the issue than gets involved in exchanging opinions. Therefore-thirdly- the superstitious attitude significantly limits the possibility of a conclusive dialogue and hinders finding the grounds for reaching a consensus in the areas that the superstition involves.

The risk presented above was detected already by the Enlightenment scholars, who – to prevent it – developed a tolerance tactics that imposes on parties to the social dialogue a requirement of avoiding disputes over beliefs that cannot be resolved by any other means than using force (Eagleton, 1991, pp. 63–91). However, the idea of tolerance is sometimes approved and embedded in the superstitious attitude, hence, becoming a source of unnecessary conflicts (Bocheński, 1987, p. 109).

The superstitious attitude may result in a phenomenon that will be called “ideologising of thinking” (or “thinking in line with ideology”, “ideologised thinking”, “superstitious attitude towards ideology”), the concept of which is that:

- somebody (an individual or a group) superstitiously believes in some ideology,
- and people, who do not act like this, are perceived by the somebody as hostile individuals, only because they are not followers (worshippers) of the ideology.

The above mentioned circumstances are a prerequisite and when combined, they provide a precondition of the ideologised thinking attitude. Therefore, it – fourthly – leads to unnecessary ideological conflicts since it does not provide any basis to a conclusive dialogue concerning ideology-determined issues.

Wishful thinking, superstitious attitude and ideological thinking are the examples of irrational assertiveness. Therefore, the above observations might be generalised in the following hypotheses:

- a. Hypothesis: Methodologically irrational attitudes of members of an organisation might trigger unnecessary intra- and inter- organisation conflicts and escalate them.
- b. Hypothesis: Methodologically irrational attitudes of members of an organisation might impede consensus reaching.

If unnecessary conflicts arise between methodologically rational subjects, they do not result from methodologically rational attitudes. Admittedly, as a result of mistake or internal determination (e.g. anger) a rationally methodological subject may fuel the unwanted conflict, yet, such an act is not factually rational. Thus, it is not in line with the intention specific for a methodologically rational attitude.

A subject who tends to be rationally assertive (methodologically rational) avoids wishfulness while appraising people and predicted aftermath of the subject's decisions. Such an appraisal is based on available knowledge that allows to determine the likelihood of the subject's beliefs. The subject will then intend to get involved in disputes and discussions while seeking justification of the acts taken, which facilitates a rational discourse with no elements of fear and hostility that are typical for a superstitious attitude and ideologised thinking.

Ideology is associated with a set of notions, assumptions and values that are a driving force for the subject's thinking and acting, that are a pattern to base on the thinking and acting processes (Eagleton, 1991, pp. 1–31). A methodologically rational subject may and should be some ideology driven since the subject needs both ontological and axiological criteria, i.a. to set a primary purpose of the subject's acts, evaluate both efficiency and effectiveness of the acts. The subject also needs patterns of acting and thinking in order to improve them. Methodologically rational attitudes or decisions do not depend on abandoning the ideology. Their specificity is all about the methods the ideology is taken advantage of. The methodologically rational subjects distinguish between what they know from what they do not know; are able to differentiate between what they are sure of and what they suppose. The methodologically rational subject evaluates the likelihood and justification of their beliefs preferring those better justified in the light of his/her knowledge. Moreover, the subject considers all possible scenarios of acting, selecting the ones that optimise the pursuit of values preferred by the subject. The subject also examines the unexpected aftermath of a conflict, choosing such solutions to the conflict that are least detrimental in the light of the subject's knowledge and adopted taxonomy of resources. The subject is able to question some elements of his/her ideology or interpret them if they are outside his/her knowledge. The subject knows well that some solutions based on the ideology he/she pursues have no proof and are a matter of the subject's faith. Therefore, the subject would tend to avoid unnecessary conflicts since they are not

in the subject's interest and when they are avoidable. The subject would investigate reasons of his/her beliefs and decisions, which facilitates a rational dialogue concerning ideological issues, and helps avoid and ease disputes that are unlikely to be resolved (Fisher, Ury, Patton, 1991; Robinson, 1982; Olson, 1965; Ury, 2007).

The above observation might be generalised with the supposition that:

- a. Hypothesis: Methodologically rational attitudes of members of an organisation facilitates prevention and easing of unnecessary intra- and inter- organisation conflicts.

The exception to the above rule might be situations in which a methodologically rational subject reckons that a conflict is either inevitable or advantageous. This possibility is not contradictory to the above hypothesis as it concerns solely the unnecessary conflicts in the assumed meaning.

## Management of change

Groundbreaking innovations reveal the hitherto unknown way of reaching the objectives set. They require a change to the accepted methods of thinking and acting. The superstitious attitude hinders revolutionary innovations in the fields it concerns (although it does not have to be so in other fields). For instance, if members of an organisation superstitiously believe that its hitherto shape and way of operating have to be the only possible or the best one, they will be fearful of and hostile towards any changes in the organisation, even if the changes optimise the accomplishment of its specific objectives. Such changes can be wrongly perceived as "betrayal" of the organisation, although the realm is much different (Koźmiński, Latusek-Jurczak, 2011, pp. 76–83, 95–101). When such an attitude is typical for the organisation's decision-makers, it could lead to the abandonment of necessary changes and result in stagnation within the organisation, which may pose a threat to its existential and functional security (Bicchieri, 1997; Dixit, Nalebuff, 1991; Koons, 2009; Mintzberg, 1994).

A superstitious attitude may motivate to creating evolutionary innovations at the expense of revolutionary ones. A good example in this context is dogmatic resistance of astronomers to accepting the heliocentric system in times of disputes over the structure of the solar system. Such an attitude motivated them to mathematical evolutionary innovations while calculating and predicting the movement of celestial bodies which in the geocentric model had extremely complicated trajectories, although they were aware of the fact that the heliocentric models allows much simpler calculations, which was then proved by, i.a. Mikołaj Kopernik. Not only in the field of science, but also in social praxis there are abundant

examples of how the superstitions attitude facilitates evolutionary innovations at the expense of much needed revolutionary ones. For instance, “wrong legalism” is a superstition of being fearful of change to the law that is unjust and socially detrimental since it does not consider specific or new circumstances (Fletcher, 1966, pp. 18–22). Legalists may display their large inventiveness while adjusting the law to requirements of justice instead of questioning it and amending it in such a way that it is free of the above imperfections. A similar situation occurs when superstitiously cultivated ideological motives lead to improvements to the methods of staging a war, at the expense working on and making use of safer, cheaper and the same effective (in long term) possibilities of reaching the war objectives using peaceful methods, e.g. would, however, require a more radical change to the way of thinking and acting. In such cases irrational assertiveness hinders changes aimed at enhancing security of an organisation, e.g. fear of heliocentrism impeded the development of astronomy, wrong legalism threatens efficient functioning of state and law institutions, and the above case of superstitions belief in war ideology lead to squandering resources of society and poses unnecessary threats to the society itself.

When a social group has a superstitious attitude to ideology (is engulfed by ideologised thinking), its members might rejected the fact that actions taken in the name of the ideology do not result in achieving its ideal, as it was the case in the event of such social revolutions that despite their being successful failed to reach their purpose, although the proponents of the revolutions claimed that the purpose had been achieved. Reluctance, proved by superstitious attitude, to examine the nature of the superstition might lead to duplicating ways of thinking and acting, already known to be ineffective, inefficient and counter-productive. For instance, such an attitude could be useful while combating social inequalities in the way that is already known for deepening the inequalities (the same or new and even worse ones), fighting social injustice in the way that leads to not less significant injustice, promoting universal human rights in the way that leads to violating them.

The hazards indicated in this section stem from irrational assertiveness, typical for methodologically irrational attitudes. Therefore, the above observations might be generalised using the following hypothesis:

- a. Hypothesis: Methodologically rational attitudes of members of an organisation might impede the launch of ground-breaking innovations aimed at enhancing its security.

Questioning of superstition requires a change to perception of reality. This is possible only within a methodologically rational attitude that includes the investigation into and methodologically rational choice of solutions, making use

of available sources of knowledge, following the rule of efficient acting. Such an attitude facilitates innovation and rationalization of acting that enhance improvement to security of an organisation:

- b. Hypothesis: Methodologically rational attitudes facilitate innovation and rationalization of acting that enhance improvement to security of an organisation.

## Conclusions and some perspectives of researching and action taking

The objective of the analyses presented in the article is a relationship occurring between methodologically rational or irrational attitudes of members of an organisation and its security. The theoretical aim of the article has been reached through a detailed discussion on the relationship based on hypotheses and their partial justification. Although the hypotheses might seem obvious, they should be further tested and examined as their presentation is incomplete and does not meet requirements of a scientific proof. Yes, putting the hypotheses forward, opens up the prospects for further theoretical and empirical researches.

Proving the hypothesis included in the article might consist in comparing cases within which members of an organisation take methodologically rational decision with the ones in which their decisions are methodologically irrational, both options, however, concern specific aspects and analogical situations regarding security of the organisation. If in majority of the cases compared, they state the above hypotheses, then (partly, proportionally to the research findings) the hypothesis will be proved right.

Indicating the cases, in which the hypotheses cannot be proved, may not be sufficient to falsify them as they refer to tendencies and have been formulated in a way that allows exceptions. The exceptions might be determined, i.a. for two reasons: Firstly, in reality and due to the factors not considered in the models discussed, organisations, where methodologically irrational attitudes dominate, might be more secure than the ones dominated by methodologically rational attitudes. Secondly, security is an aspect – like feature of an organisation – it may enhance in one aspect, and fade in the others. Therefore, both rational and irrational attitudes of an organisation members might impact its security in one aspect, with no impact on another. Thus, exceptions to the rules determined by the hypotheses raised in the article do not provide the proof that the hypotheses are false. Exception of that kind should be investigated, though, in order to identify more detailed interdependencies determined by the hypotheses basing on

the question: *What situations and aspects, what factors and why result in the fact that either methodologically rational attitudes of members of organisation do not enhance its security, or methodologically irrational attitudes do not pose a threat to it?*

Proving the presented hypotheses false might concern, i.a., the fact that under identical circumstances for organisation that differ only in terms of methodological rationality or irrationality of its decision-makers and in the long term, either the differentiation does not impact the security of the organisation in all the security aspects, or in the set security aspect methodologically irrational attitudes of the decision-makers serve its security better than methodologically rational attitudes. However, identifying or creating (through an experiment) of such identical situations might be difficult, but not impossible.

The article presents the method of explaining and predicting the connection between the attitudes and the organisation's security through comparing the ideal types and phenomenological analysis. Further researches into this connection can apply this method through comparing other models in other aspects than those included in the analyses conducted in the article in order to determine, formulate and examine more detailed research hypotheses, or in case analysis. For instance, it cannot be excluded, that a decline in methodologically rational attitudes might provide an explanation to some threats that the contemporary organisations, including states and international organisations are striving with.

The article does not discuss all the aspects of rational acting, e.g., those indicated in the concept of rational communication (Habermas, 2002), distinction between axiological and instrumental, or formal from material (Gellner, 1992; Weber, 1985, p. 565) rationality of acting, and others. These could be accomplished through further analyses, the basis for which could be theoretical research undertaken in the article.

The paper accomplishes its practical objective by presenting some reasons to develop the skills and competences of methodologically rational decision – making and to consider them the recruitment. As shown, they have a significant impact on security of organisations. This conclusion is nothing new. Already ancient philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle, claimed that the “right reason” and virtue facilitates performing civic and managerial roles. They identified the factors and methods of selecting people managing an organisation (e.g. ruling a state) in terms of their competences and skills (Jaeger, 1964). Nowadays these findings are implemented, i.a., in the theory of virtues in management (Dyck, Neubert, 2008; Rego, Cunha, Clegg, 2012; van Hooft, 2013) and in conflict management (Bickmore, 2003).

The article does not address a practical question: *How to develop and examine these competences and skills of rational decision making?*, since it has not been its

objective. The answer is included in the literature on this field. For instance, the antique concept of developing a virtue includes tactics and techniques of developing, what in the article has been referred to as methodological rationality of decisions and attitudes, since in this respect the virtue is reflected in rational decision-making (Jaeger 1964). Further theories of rationality develop the antique concept (Gomez, 2014). Nowadays, there is a heated debate concerning the question of whether university can and should develop competences and skills of making decisions in a methodologically rational way. Concepts of how to teach such skills are being formulated (e.g. Newman, 1978, 1990; Ortega y Gasset, 1978). For instance, the idea of skills and competences on the fifth and higher level of education included in *The European Qualifications Framework for Life Long Learning* (n.d.) determines the aspects of what, in the article, is referred to as methodological rationality and how to implement and develop it (Palomba, 2008). The methods of determining whether someone is predisposed to methodologically rational decision making are developed, i.a. in psychology (e.g. Bortolotti, 2010; Fotopoulou, Solms, Turnbull, 2004; Williams, 2004), psychological psychometrics (Simon, Härter, 2007) or mathematical game theory (e.g. Kelly, 2003).

## References

- Abell, P. (1991). *Rational Choice Theory*. Hants, Brookfield: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Alberti, R.E., & Emmons, M.L. (2001). *Your Perfect Right: Assertiveness and Equality in Your Life and Relationships* (9. issue.). Atascadero, Calif.: Impact Publishers.
- Arbib, M.A., Érdi, P., Szentagothai, J. (1998). *Neural Organization: Structure, Function, and Dynamics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: MIT Press.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T.D., Akert, R.M. (1997). Postawy i zmiany postaw: wpływ na myśli u uczucia. Spostrzeganie społeczne: jak dochodzimy do rozumienia innych ludzi. W: *Psychologia społeczna. Serce i umysł*. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka, 309–353.
- Bicchieri, C. (1997). *Rationality and Coordination*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Bickmore, K. (2003). Conflict Resolution Education. In: W.J. Pammer, J. Killian (Eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Management*. New York, Basel: CRC Press, 3–31.
- Bocheński, J.M. (1987). *Sto zabobonów: krótki filozoficzny słownik zabobonów*. Paryż: Instytut Literacki.
- Bocheński, J.M. (1993). *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bortolotti, L. (2010). *Delusions and Other Irrational Beliefs*. Oxford, New York: OUP Oxford.

- Carroll, P.J., Arkin, R.M., Wichman, A.L. (Eds.) (2015). *Handbook of Personal Security*. New York, London: Psychology Press.
- Ciesielski, M. (2012). *Zagadnienie ograniczeń racjonalnego modelu działań ludzkich. Próba ujęcia działania nawykowo-racjonalnego*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Coleman, J.S., Fararo, T.J. (Eds.) (1992). *Rational Choice Theory. Advocacy and Critique*. London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Dennis, K. (Eds.) (2012). *Rationality in Economics: Alternative Perspectives*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Dixit, A., Nalebuff, B.J. (1991). *Thinking Strategically*. New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Dyck, B., Neubert, M. (2008). *Management: Current Practices and New Directions*. Boston, New York: Cengage Learning.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London, New York: Verso.
- The European Qualifications Framework for Life Long Learning*. (n.d.) Online: <[https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/sites/eac-eqf/files/leaflet\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/sites/eac-eqf/files/leaflet_en.pdf)>
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving in* (2. ed.). Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Fletcher, J. F. (1966). *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Fotopoulou, A., Solms, M., Turnbull, O. (2004). Wishful Reality Distortions in Confabulation: A Case Report. *Neuropsychologia*, 42(6), 727–744.
- Gellner, E. (1992). *Reason and Culture*. Oxford, Cambridge: Wiley.
- Gerrard, B. (Eds.) (1993). *The Economics of Rationality*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Gomez, V.G. (2014). Rationality and Method. In: J. Malpas, H.-H. Gander (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Hermeneutics*. Oxon, New York: Routledge, 251–266.
- Greenwald, H.P. (2008). *Organizations: Management Without Control*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- Habermas, J. (2002). *Racjonalność działania a racjonalność społeczna* (T. 2). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Haimes, Y.Y. (2015). *Risk Modeling, Assessment, and Management*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hey, J.D. (1993). Rationality Is as Rationality Does. In: B. Gerrard (Eds.), *The Economics of Rationality*. London, New York: Routledge, 4–14.
- Jacko, J.F. (2013). O naturze filozoficznego zabobonu według Innocentego Józefa Marii Bocheńskiego. *Filo-Sofija*, 21(2), 135–150.
- Jacko, J.F. (2016). Rational informative assertiveness in management communication. *Jagiellonian Journal of Management*, 2, 35–44.
- Jaeger, W. (1964) *Paideia*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Kelly, A. (2003). *Decision Making Using Game Theory: An Introduction for Managers*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town: Cambridge University Press.

- Kim, S. (2006). Moral Realism. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/moralrea/>
- Kleszcz, R. (1998). *O racjonalności: studium epistemologiczno-metodologiczne*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Koons, R.C. (2009). *Paradoxes of Belief and Strategic Rationality*. Cambridge, New York, Porst Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- Kosiorowski, D. (2005). Individual Rationality Versus Group Rationality in Statistical Modelling Issues. In: D. Baier, K.D. Wernecke (Eds.), *Innovations in Classification, Data Science, and Information Systems*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 239–248.
- Kotarbiński, T. (1958). Zasady etyki niezależnej. *Studia Filozoficzne*, (1), 3–13.
- Kotarbiński, T. (1973). *Traktat o dobrej robocie*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Kotarbiński, T. (1986). *Elementy teorii poznania, logiki formalnej i metodologii nauk*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Koźmiński, A.K., Latusek-Jurczak, D. (2011). *Rozwój teorii organizacji*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Krasnodębski, Z.M. (1991). Działanie i jego racjonalność w perspektywie prakseologicznej i socjologicznej. *Prakseologia*, (1–2), 27–43.
- Loranty, K. (2012). Percepcja zagrożeń. *Zeszyty Naukowe AON*, 3(88), 11–18.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. New York: Free Press.
- Newman, J.H. (1978) Idea uniwersytetu. Przeł. J. Fijaś, H. Bortnowska. *Znak*, 288(6), 696–711.
- Newman, J. H. (1990) *Idea uniwersytetu*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1978) *Misja uniwersytetu*. *Znak*, 288(6), 712–731
- Palomba, D. (2008). *Changing Universities in Europe and the Bologna Process: A Seven Country Study*. Roma: Aracne.
- Paris, C., Casey, B. (1979). *Project, You: A Manual of Rational Assertiveness Training*. Portland: Bridges Press.
- Popa, C. (1992). Praxiology, Logic of Action and Rationality of Human Activity. In: J.L. Auspitz, W. Gasparski, M. Mlicki, K. Szaniawski (Eds.), *Praxiologies and the Philosophy of Economics*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 25–42.
- Popper, K.R. (1996). *The Myth of the Framework: In Defence of Science and Rationality* (New Ed edition). London; New York: Routledge.
- Popper, K.R. (1999). *Droga do wiedzy. Domysły i refutacje*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Rego, A., Cunha, M.P. e, Clegg, S.R. (2012). *The Virtues of Leadership: Contemporary Challenges for Global Managers*. Oxford: OUP Oxford.
- Richmond, V.P., McCroskey, J.C., McCroskey, L.L. (2004). *Organizational Communication for Survival: Making Work, Work*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

- Robinson, R. (1982). *Assertiveness and Rational Thinking*. Carlton: Social Biology Resources Centre.
- Sayre-McCord, G. (2011). Moral Realism. In: E.N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2011). <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/moral-realism/>
- Simon, H.A. (1992). Methodological foundations of economics. In: J.L. Auspitz, W. Gasparski, M. Mlicki, K. Szaniawski (Eds.), *Praxiologies and the Philosophy of Economics*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 25–42.
- Simon, D., Loh, A., Härter, M. (2007). Measuring (Shared) Decision-Making – A Review of Psychometric Instruments. *Zeitschrift Für Ärztliche Fortbildung Und Qualitätssicherung*, 101(4), 259–267.
- Smith, D.W. (2013). Phenomenology. In: E.N. Zalta (Eds.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2013). Pobrano z <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2013/entries/phenomenology/>
- Szostek, A. (1971). Etyka jako nauka empiryczna w ujęciu T. Czeżowskiego i T. Kotarbińskiego. *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, 19(2), 43–57.
- Tang, S. (2010). *A Theory of Security Strategy for Our Time: Defensive Realism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tatarkiewicz, W. (1919). *O bezwzględności dobra*. Warszawa: Gebether i Wolf.
- Ury, W. (2007). *The Power of a Positive No: How to Say No and Still Get to Yes*. New York: Random House Publishing Group.
- van Hooft, S. (2013). *The Handbook of Virtue Ethics*. Durham: Acumen Publishing.
- Veatch, H.B. (2003). *Rational Man: A Modern Interpretation of Aristotelian Ethics*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Weber, M. (1985). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Weber, M. (2011). *Methodology of Social Sciences*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Weber, M. (2012). *Max Weber: Collected Methodological Writings*. (S. Whimster, H.H. Bruun, Eds., H.H. Bruun, Tłum.) London, New Yourk: Routledge.
- Williams, B. (2004). *Truth and Truthfulness: An Essay in Genealogy*. New Yersey, Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.
- Woleński, J. (2006). Naturalistyczne uzasadnienie etyki niezależnej (spolegliwego opiekuna). *Etyka*, 39, 7–14.
- Wrench, J.S., Punyanunt-Carter, N. (2012). *What is an Organization?* <http://2012books.lardbucket.org/books/an-introduction-to-organizational-communication/s03-01-what-is-an-organization.html>
- Zafirovski, M. (2003). Human Rational Behavior and Economic Rationality. *Electronic Journal of Sociology* 7(2). [http://www.sociology.org/content/vol7.2/02\\_zafirovski.html](http://www.sociology.org/content/vol7.2/02_zafirovski.html)
- Zey, M. (1997). *Rational Choice Theory and Organizational Theory: A Critique*. London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

## **Jan Franciszek Jacko, PhD**

Doctorate in philosophy, habilitation in management. Scientific researcher and lecturer at the *Jagiellonian University* (Kraków, Poland) and the *University of Security* (Poznań, Poland), co-editor of *Prospettiva Persona. Trimestrale di cultura etica e politica* (Teramo, Italy). Previously – a lecturer at *The International Academy for Philosophy at the Principality of Liechtenstein*. His current research interest is in rational choice theory. He also works in games theory, semiotics, management ethics and cross-cultural communication. In his recent monograph (*Negotiation tactics in the context of proxemics*) he discusses the ways in which physical space and human intentionality are mutually related to each other and shows how negotiating tactics can benefit from knowledge of spatial intentionality of human acts.