



© 2024 Ignatowski. This is an open access article
licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International
License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

Journal of Intercultural
Management

Vol. **16** | No. **3** | **2024**

pp. **58–77**

DOI **10.2478/joim-2024-0011**

Grzegorz Ignatowski

University of Social Sciences, Lodz, Poland

gignatowski@san.edu.pl

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4432-8476

Use of Eristics by Polish Managers

ABSTRACT

Objective: The aim of this article is to find out to what extent and for what reasons managers use unethical eristic tricks to persuade their employees.

Methodology: The research used qualitative methods, in-depth interviews with eleven managers, which were conducted in May and June 2024. The selection of respondents was purposive, allowing for a deeper understanding of the issue.

Findings: Managers know and use eristic tricks in their professional work and their use is driven by effectiveness, regardless of the fact that they are considered unethical.

Value added: The use of eristic tricks in management is not widely discussed in the literature and, in the long term, their use negatively affects the functioning of any organisation.

Recommendations: The results of the research and the negative effects of eristic behaviour in organisational management should be of interest to managers, creators of codes of ethics in organisations and trainers of the art of persuasion. Eristic behaviour should be avoided in communication with staff and in the management of organisations.

Kew words: manager, management, eristics, persuasion, ethics

Jel codes: I28, J58, J81, J83, M12

Introduction

The attitude and performance of a manager is one of the essential elements affecting the good functioning of an organisation. An effective manager with the right leadership competences can positively persuade the staff they manage to pursue a goal and influence the development of the organisation, without forgetting the needs of subordinates and good internal relations (Kuzior & Balahurovska, 2022, p. 174). The management style they have developed and the means of persuasion should change depending on the situation in which the team under his leadership finds itself. An effective manager should not only strive for good business results at all costs, but their task should be to create a culture in which people are empowered and inspired by a common goal (DuBois et al., 2015).

Studies on managerial effectiveness focus on many levels, including communication and persuasion. Among the traits that have a destructive effect on manager's actions and on the organisation are overconfidence and narcissism. On the positive side, openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and innovativeness are important (Maier, 2014, pp. 1116–1117; Jedrych, 2015; Luring et al., 2019, pp. 1011–1012). The way in which managers expand their knowledge is also significant (Li, & Armstrong, 2015, p. 423). There is some controversy about a manager's over-optimism about their actions and set goals. Research from experimental psychology shows that managerial optimism does not always coincide with hard market rules (Hackbarth, 2008, pp. 843–844). There are a number of publications dealing with the issue of the manager's influence in specific areas, such as project management, for example, or in particular professions (De Moura et al., 2019; Masood et al., 2018; Alan & Baykal, 2021). In general, the question of the effective manager was addressed depending on the specific cultural area (Beheshtifar et al., 2012).

Communication occupies an important place in research on the effectiveness of the manager. Practice shows that the priority goals set by the manager and communicated to staff do not necessarily coincide. Management will bring tangible benefits when cooperation and communication is

based on partnership and not arbitrarily and institutionally imposed (Drucker, 2018, pp. 66–72). Neither will it be effective in the long term when it is based on the use of non-optical persuasive measures. The positive ability to influence staff and their beliefs has become an important management trait in view of the changing demands of the staff environment. The positive way in which a manager interacts with staff translates into the effective work of the entire team (Fisher & Gonzalez, 2013, p. 1). Conversely, when the manager uses unethical means of persuasion, which include eristic tricks, the organisation will not achieve its goals in the long run. This brings us to the core of the problem addressed in this article. Namely, the aim of the article and the research undertaken is the question of whether, to what extent and for what reasons managers use eristic means of persuasion that do not have the best reputation.

The concept of eristics and the most commonly used eristic tricks

Much of the success of managers depends on the skills and tools at their disposal to influence organisational members (Cable & Judge, 2003, p. 197). In general, among the means to influence the work team, there are rational, and therefore logical, means and arguments, and irrational means and arguments, known as oppressive means. The latter are known as hard measures and include eristic tricks such as, for example, firm demands, threats and even intimidation (Bunner et al., 2020, pp. 383–384). At the same time, the term ‘eristic’ is used to describe many other actions and verbal statements that are based on more subtle but always suspicious from an ethical point of view forms of reasoning. The literature on the subject shows that eristic arguments do not aim at pursuing the truth, but are concerned with achieving success, pursuing a set agenda without respect for the opponent (Van Laar, 2010, p. 389; Kurdoglu et al., 2023, p. 2).

The literature on the subject shows that there is a need to clearly distinguish between two ways of defining eristics, the classical (Aristotelian/

Platonic) and the new, modified, political and public. It should be stressed that this division is neither historical nor visible in all environments. The term ‘eristic’ comes from the Greek word ἐρίζω, which means: ‘I fight’. It is the art of fighting by means of words, in which it is always in discussion that the opponent is defeated. Thus, we are dealing with fighting and defeating the opponent. We can translate the Greek term ἐριστικός as ‘fond of arguing’. In ancient thought, whether eristics was considered in the context of rhetoric or dialectics, it never had a good reputation. According to Aristotle, eristics is a dishonest form of verbal combat. Its purpose was not to seek the truth, but to accept arguments, whether we believe them to be right or wrong (Budzyńska-Daca, 2013, pp. 7–20). In modern times, the revival of eristics can be traced back to a work published by Arthur Schopenhauer around 1830 entitled *Die eristische Dialektik* (Biržietienė & Gabrėnaitė, 2014, p. 193). The small work was published four years after the famous philosopher’s death, and in Poland it is published under the notable title “Eristics or the art of conducting disputes”. In the contemporary sense, knowledge of eristics can be considered in terms of art and protection against those who want to be right by dishonest means (Lemanski, 2022, pp. 151–162). In other words, the attacked person’s knowledge of eristic tricks allows them to avoid oppression. Nevertheless, eristic argumentation is characterised by the assumption that the discussion is a winnable challenge, that the arguing erist systematically seeks to defeat his opponents by all means, without caring about the veracity of the views they express (Dufour, 2014).

The fact that eristic arguers do not attach much importance to truth and morality can have severe consequences not only ethically, but also destructively affect the functioning of the organisation. Among the most well-known and recognisable eristic tricks are:

- The argument of threats (argumentum ad baculum) is considered an extremely harmful form of argumentation, regardless of the existing context (Yu & Zenker, 2023, pp. 527–528). While it is difficult to encounter the aggressive threat of dismissing a person from his or her job and the further consequences related to his or her fate outside the organisation *expressis verbis*, we may encounter mild forms of pressure such as “I would like to remind you that

we have received three competing offers for your position". In the case of a fixed-term employee, it might be an indication of the final date of the signed contract.

- A derivative argument to scare is to lure, usually financially, an opponent by presenting them with material benefits for performing a given task (*argumentum ad crumenam*). Another form of persuading an opponent to perform a task by means of baiting is to float the prospect of a quick promotion, a performance bonus or an intriguing training trip, as well as the resulting prospects of a brilliant development.

- The argument from authority, which has had many opponents in the long history of logic, this argument resorts to using some opinion or person to support one's claim, rather than pointing to a range of more objective evidence to support the thesis one is proclaiming. Furthermore, a person may claim to have expertise on a particular subject. In reality, it turns out that they have little more knowledge and competence in a given field than any other person. An authority in one field is not necessarily an authority in another (Cummings, 2015, pp. 67–68). Invoking authority can take many forms. It involves referring to a particular person with a reputation, to certain opinions proclaimed by prominent people, or referring to an expert (Walton & Koszowy, 2014). Of course, when invoking an authority, one needs to know whether the person, opinion or expert is recognised by the adversary. To invoke an authority without turning one's attention to whether it is recognised or not is sometimes called *argumentum ad vercundiam* (argument from modesty).

- An appeal to the views, beliefs or opinions of some wider social group, is called *argumentum ad populum*. The literature of the subject emphasises that common knowledge is taken as the basis of acceptability for a given claim, whereas an appeal to popular opinion no longer has such persuasive power. However, research shows that an appeal to common knowledge alone is not sufficient and an appeal to opinion is also needed (Godden, 2008, p. 101; Herman & Oswald, 2021, pp. 305–309). The appeal to common knowledge occupies an important place in many areas of professional and social life, for example in sociology, legal sciences and, of course, in economics and

management (Macagno & Walton, 2005, pp. 1–2). Those who use this argument in their statements appeal to attitudes, collective feelings and even prevailing superstitions (Budzyńska & Reed, 2023). In practice, the argument takes various forms, such as: “Everyone knows that.....” or “According to common and well-known opinion....”. In terms of attitudes, the argument takes the form: “Everyone has already decided that you should petition the authorities about.....” or “Actually, everyone has already taken a position and we are still waiting for your opinion”. When dealing with feelings, we will encounter the sentence: “Everyone believes that such an action will be successful”.

- One well-known eristic ploy is to appeal to the opponent’s ignorance. In the literature it is sometimes referred to as an appeal to ignorance or *argumentum ad ignorantiam*. The person using this argument assumes that the opponent will not be willing to admit that they do not have knowledge of the topic in question, which would imply a lack of competence to lead the organisation (Hinton, 2018, pp. 184–185). Naturally, what is needed is knowledge of what the opponent knows and does not know (Wagemans, 2003, pp. 149–151). In practice, the argument takes various forms. From a positive statement: “You are a manager, you probably know all this well”. In another form: “You are a competent manager, I don’t need to remind you of all this”. In yet another form: “Since you occupy such a high position, you should know all this well”.

- Since ancient times, human haughtiness, and thus indulging in flattery, has been negatively judged from a moral point of view (Van der Geest, 2021, p. 92). It turns out, however, that by using kind, appreciative and value-enhancing words, it is easy to persuade a person to act. This is the context in which we speak of *argumentum ad vanitatem*. A variant of such an action is *argumentum ad misericordiam*, i.e. evoking pity or compassion in the recipient (Aberdein, 2016, pp. 413–422). Several patterns of such action illustrate well the possibilities of using it in professional relationships. In a situation where we need a person to stay after hours at work, it is possible to say, “You are the only person I can trust to do this task” or “You are the only person who will do this task reliably”. In the form of an appeal to pity, the person being made redundant may state that they will be left destitute or will not have enough money to buy basic products for their children.

- With a view to undermining certain opinions or persuading a person to act, it is not at all necessary to find significant content in the views they proclaim. It is sufficient to attack the person by focusing on their flaws or other beliefs. When we attack the unethical character traits or flaws of a disputant, we speak of *argumentum ad personam*. When the object of the polemic is challenged other views we speak of *argumentum ad hominem* (Walton, 2001, pp. 208–210; Walton, 2004, pp. 361–362). The *ad hominem* attack can take the form of: “Your project is interesting, but how could it have been well developed by a person who is addicted to alcohol”. An attack on views will take the form: “I would agree with these proposals were it not for the fact that your past ideas have been debunked in the literature and discredited by colleagues”.

We realise that the arguments and tricks cited above do not exhaust the entire issue. Nevertheless, we encounter them directly or indirectly in social and professional life. The question must therefore be asked to what extent they are used in managerial activities.

Methodology of the research

In this research, we address the question of the use of eristic persuasion in managerial work. The fundamental question is whether, to what extent and for what reasons, managers use eristic means of persuasion that do not have the best moral reputation. A qualitative research was carried out to achieve the stated aim, and an individual in-depth interview was used. Before proceeding with the research, three following research problems were selected:

1. Which eristic procedures are known to the managers surveyed?
2. Which eristic arguments do managers consider unethical?
3. Which eristic procedures do the surveyed managers use and why?

The collection of the necessary data was based on an in-depth semi-structured interview. The pre-prepared dispositions for the interviews constituted

the initial interview schedule. Thus, it was not adhered to exactly, allowing the exploration of relevant issues, on a case-by-case basis. Indeed, during the interviews, there was an opportunity to deepen emerging issues, to ask respondents complementary questions. All of this allowed the research issues to be made more specific. Before the research was conducted, the dispositions were consulted with two external experts dealing with communication problems within the organisation as well as two personnel managers in a public service organisation. Interviews were conducted between early May and mid-June 2024.

The selection of respondents was purposive and allowed for specific cases to be reached, providing an opportunity to delve deeper into the specifics of the issues under investigation (Bryman, 2016; Creswell, 2017; Saunders et al., 2019). The search process for respondents did not seek individuals who should provide answers to unfitting assumptions. In selecting respondents, the aim was to have individuals who lead teams of employees as well as those familiar with the issue of persuasion. A total of eleven interviews were conducted with lower and higher level managers. Interviews were also completed by webmail, telephone calls as well as social media. More than thirty pages of notes were produced. All participants agreed to participate in the interviews, which lasted between less than an hour and two hours. Invivo software was used for the analysis in the paper. A summary of the respondents taking part in the research is presented in the table below.

Table 1. Respondents to the survey

Respondent code	Place of activity	Number of members of the organisation	Length of service	Industry	Managerial level
M1	Village	87	8	Processing	Lower
M2	Village	20	15	Breeding	Lower
M3	Town between 10,000 and 50,000	37	10	Telecommunications and modern media	Higher
M4	Town up to 7,000	29	17	Food	Lower

M5	City between 50,000 and 100,000	49	5	Police	Higher
M6	City between 100,000 and 500,000	120	12	Hospitality	Higher
M7	City between 50,000 and 100,000	58	11	Banking	Lower
M8	City between 30,000 and 50,000	18	5	Catering	Lower
M9	City over 750,000	20	9	Temporary employment agency	Lower
M10	Village	45	7	Raw material logistics	Lower
M11	City over 750,000	57	8	Transport	Higher

Source: Own elaboration.

Findings and discussion

The research showed that managers are familiar with eristic procedures and have been introduced to them in various training courses. M1 stated that he was familiar with “the technique of appealing to authority or making false objections”, “attacks on disputants and appeals to ignorance”. M2 acknowledged that he was familiar with “argumentum ad baculum”. M3 is familiar with “fear-based argumentation (threat of negative consequences including dismissal or loss of additional bonuses) if employees do not follow certain guidelines”. He is no stranger to “the power of authority, the appeal to pity and the power of false flattery used by a manager to manipulate employees”. M4 has learnt in training about such harrowing tools as “overtures, accusation with questions, precipitating, pressure, irony, appeal to authority, personal attacks”. For M5, one variation of invoking authority “would be to appeal to

the law or to its regulations". M6 recalled 'appeal to general opinion' or to 'the beliefs of an authority'. M7 is familiar with "attacks on a participant in a debate, because of appearance, education, past mistakes, being forced to lose the thread in discussions or suggesting side threads, or even criticising gender and nationality". M8 became acquainted with practices such as "ridiculing ignorance, presenting extreme and dramatic visions should the organisation adopt a colleague's point of view, appealing to vanity and to the general public, using carrots and sticks" while participating in online training. It is possible to discredit opponents by recalling "their problems with alcohol". The M11 was urged to stay after hours by stating: "everyone can stay after hours at work, can't you?" or by reference to vanity "no one can do it better than you". M9 knows "ad hominem, ad auctoritatem, ad baculum and ad crumenam". According to M10, appeals to "argument, flattery and mild forms of intimidation were used against him".

The research showed that, according to the respondents, eristic tricks are non-optimal. M2, M4, M9 did not specifically mention any of the techniques. M2 acknowledged that in his "opinion all treatments are unethical to some extent". M4 pointed out that "where reason is consciously not used, but only emotional arguments, there is no ethics". Moral judgements are influenced by "psychological factors, situational factors, the condition of the person at the bottom, the experiences he or she has had and many others". For M1, it is most unethical to "attack the person of the interlocutor, without the intention to face his argumentation". For M3, it is impossible to practice "threatening sanctions or painful consecrations". According to M3, it is immoral to "attacking the views of the person presenting a valid opinion by undermining their competence" or as M6 points out "avoiding rational argumentation". It will also be unethical to "promise a promotion or a raise without actually intending to fulfil the promise". According to M11, arguments "designed to induce fear, a pay cut or loss of bonus" must be stigmatised, as "inducing fear for the sake of standing your ground is extremely manipulative". M5 believes that "it is unethical to use threatening, intimidating arguments to force obedience". M7 stressed that it is unethical to "engage in bullying behaviour" and therefore "ridicule, by showing ignorance, personal attacks, especially those that are unheard of at

work and concern family life, gender, membership of social groups". According to M8, the most unethical are *ad baculum* and *ad verecundiam*. M10 acknowledged that "appeals to authority carry a load of potential abuse" and "it is also unethical to threaten".

Regarding the use of eristic tricks, M3 stated that "certain eristic techniques can be used naturally, unconsciously, while it can happen that they are used with full deliberation and are not always ethical behaviour". According to M8, "over time we may unknowingly use a given argument, which forces managers to be vigilant".

On the use of eristic treatments, M2 believes that the thing does not "only apply to authorities, but experts or celebrities can also be invoked". "Although unethical, *argumentum ad baculum* is effective". M3 stated that eristic procedures "are used to convince others of one's reasons regardless of ethics and truth". For example, "in a situation of appealing to public opinion". M6 believes that "if the majority considers something to be good, there is no reason not to use this argument, just as there is no reason not to use an appeal to authority". M4 is unconsciously able to "appeal to fear" or "incentives that have no basis in reality". He is also no stranger to "creating fear among managed staff". M7 appeals to the argument that "everyone is happy to buy this product" or "everyone in my family is happy with this product". According to M11, the use of a given argument depends on the circumstances and knowledge of the opponent. Namely, "there is no method that is more or less effective, but what is needed is the ability to assess which tools we should apply to the employee in question". "If a person is working under pressure, you need to resort to the stick". "If the person is constantly undervalued, a method appealing to vanity will be the most effective". M7 and M11 use methods that "bring the most effective benefits". M8 considers "flattery, *ad populum* and *ad baculum*" to be the most effective. Although he tries to "avoid them, that does not change the fact that he may unknowingly apply them". M9 does not generally use eristic arguments, which does not "change the fact that he would resort to *ad autoritatem* if necessary".

As part of the discussion, it should be emphasised that the managers surveyed are familiar with eristic tricks. However, knowledge of an issue is not

automatically translated into concrete action. We must therefore ask what is the relationship between knowledge and action. According to the standard approach to the issue, such a link does not exist. This is because rational action is the result of social expectations, credibility and maximisation of the demands made. The subjective approach from the issue plays a decisive role for taking action. On the other hand, there is a strong suggestion that there is a close relationship between knowledge and human action. The value of knowledge stems in part from the role played by knowledge of moral norms. Their knowledge should influence the moral value of an act (Hawthorne & Stanley, 2008, pp. 571–590). For example, well-established knowledge (rather than superficial knowledge) about sustainable development contributes to actions to promote this very idea (Van Kerkhoff & Lebel, 2006, p. 445, 473). If there were no link between knowledge and practice, it would be difficult to justify continuous training, upskilling and pro-health programmes. Which does not change the fact that knowledge of one's own health status should be complemented by social action (Obeagu & Obeagu, 2023, p. 42). It is difficult to imagine a situation where managers do not participate in systematic training on modern management trends (Gielnik et al., 2015, pp. 69–70). In spite of all this, there is a need for ongoing research on the transfer of vision into specific fields of action. Indeed, there is no simple link between knowledge and action for specific ideas (Ward et al., 2009, pp. 1–6). Similar conclusions can be drawn from the research conducted. This is because they have shown that managers are well aware that many eristic tricks do not meet moral standards, they are simply unethical. The same is shown in the literature, emphasising that eristic argumentation is ethically problematic. By knowing and using eristics, managers can avoid responsibility for the defectiveness of manufactured products or the mistreatment of employees (Kurdoglu & Ateş, 2022, p. 520). However, the literature on the subject pays increasing attention to ethics in managerial activities (Helms, 2021, pp. 362–363).

The research also showed that managers, despite realising that eristic tricks are not ethical, continue to use them. Some claimed to do it in a 'clueless' way as they acquired managerial practice, while others claimed to do it in a more rational way. The reason would be their effectiveness. It is worth

pointing out, therefore, that the most typical characteristic of eristics is the pursuit of victory by any means (Dufour, 2014). In this case, we would be dealing with a form of Machiavellianism in management.

By many The term Machiavellianism, whose roots can be found in the work of the Renaissance thinker Niccolò di Bernardo dei Machiavelli, was used in the field of politics and philosophy. It was not until the 1970s that the concept of Machiavellianism was linked to interpersonal relationships. Machiavelli claimed that any unethical way of achieving an objective could be applied in practice (Tsirimokou et al., 2023, pp. 233–234). Contemporary scientific work makes it possible to calculate the Machiavellianism scale in personality studies. Psychologists have also distinguished the characteristics of a Machiavellian leader who can effectively control colleagues. These include a relative lack of feelings in interpersonal relations, a lack of attachment to established moral norms, resistance to psychological disturbances and low ideological commitment (Serenko & Choo, 2020, p. 2303; Dahling et al., 2009, pp. 219–220). Despite the negative connotation of Machiavellianism, Machiavellians are found in all types of organisations, such as, for example, universities, hospitals, in the private and medical sectors, in the police, the legal profession and among athletes. Machiavellians do not hesitate to resort to influence tactics, including resorting to threats (Rehman & Shahnawaz, 2021, pp. 79–80; Collins, 2014, pp. 324–325).

Finally, it is important to note that, despite existing codes of ethics and procedures, managers in many organisations have a great deal of latitude in how they resolve conflicts and how to argue their case. Where they do use eristic tools, they expose organisations to large and long-lasting losses, despite the short-term benefits. Indeed, eristic arguments pose a serious ethical challenge in any organisation (Kurdoglu & Ateş, 2022; Kurdoglu, 2020).

Conclusions and limitations

Effective persuasion and the art of communicating with staff is one of the key competences of any manager, whether they are coordinating a university,

managing the staff of a medical clinic or the staff team of a company (Em, 2023). Research has shown that managers use eristic tricks that are not entirely ethical when communicating with staff. However, it should be noted that the research was only qualitative, conducted on a small sample of respondents. The problem of using eristic tricks within social communication has been known in the literature for a long time. Even the ancient thinkers were not enthusiastic about them. Current acceptance of eristic treatments may be influenced by cultural factors and the ethical beliefs of managers. Further research is therefore needed in this area, if only from a social capital perspective. It would be worthwhile to verify the acceptance of eristics according to the professed ethics of a given Christian denomination, as has been done in the perspective of other moral problems (Arruñada, 2010; Nelson, 2012; Ignatowski et al., 2020).

We encounter many eristic procedures in our everyday lives, and we deal with many in our social and professional lives. Eristics can only be successful in the short term. The literature shows that eristic argumentation does not solve problems, but in fact generates them. Organisational members therefore expect sound decisions and logical explanations, not eristic treatments, especially when these decisions are controversial (Rupp et al., 2017, p. 919; Kurdoglu et al., 2023, p. 764).

References

- Aberdein, A. (2016).** The Vices of Argument. *Topoi*, 35(2), 413–422. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-015-9346-z>.
- Alan, H., & Baykal, Ü. (2021).** Personality traits of nurse managers and evaluation of their traits by their subordinates. *Florence Nightingale Journal of Nursing*, 29(3), 379–388. <https://doi.org/10.5152/FNJV.2021.20112>.
- Arruñada, B. (2010).** Protestants and Catholics: Similar Work Ethic, Different Social Ethic. *The Economic Journal*, 120(547), 890–918. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2009.02325.x>.

- Beheshtifar, M., Motahari, J., & Moghadam, M. N. (2012).** Relation between Managers' Traits with their Assessment of the Successful Criterion in Iran. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(9), 207–221.
- Biržietienė, S., & Gabrėnaitė, E. (2014).** Eristic argumentation in advertising: the case of Lithuanian ads. *Respectus Philologicus*, 26(31), 190–202.
- Bryman, A. (2016).** *Social Research Methods*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Budzyńska-Daca, A. (2013).** Eristic and dispute-applications and interpretations. *Forum Artis Rhetoricae*, 2(25), 7–20.
- Budzyńska, K., & Reed, C. (2023).** Argumentum Ad Alia: argument structure of arguing about what others have said. *Synthese*, 201(3), 91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-023-04058-w>.
- Bunner, J., Prem, R., & Korunka, C. (2020).** How do safety engineers improve their job performance? The roles of influence tactics, expert power, and management support. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 42(2), 381–397. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2018-0120>.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (2003).** Managers' upward influence tactic strategies: The role of manager personality and supervisor leadership style. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(2), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.183>.
- Collins, S. K. (2014).** Machiavellianism in health care explored: differences in aspiring managers and patient care professionals. *The Health Care Manager*, 33(4), 324–327. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HCM.0000000000000023>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2017).** *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Cummings, L. (2015).** Argument from Authority. In Cummings, L. (Ed.), *Reasoning and Public Health: New Ways of Coping with Uncertainty* (pp. 67–92). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15013-0_4.
- Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., & Levy, P. E. (2009).** The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 219–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308318618>.
- De Moura, R. L., Carneiro, T. C. J., de Lemos Dias, T., & Oliveira, B. S. (2019).** Personality traits of project managers: Differences in knowledge, experience, and business sector. *Revista de Administração da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria*, 12(4), 767–784. <https://doi.org/10.5902/1983465922096>.

- Drucker, P. (2018).** *The effective executive*. London: Routledge.
- DuBois, M., Hanlon, J., Koch, J., Nyatuga, B., & Kerr, N. (2015).** Leadership styles of effective project managers: Techniques and traits to lead high performance teams. *Journal of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance, and Marketing*, 7(1), 30–46.
- Dufour, M. (2014).** ISSA Proceedings 2014: Dialectic and eristic. *Rozenberg Quarterly. The Magazine*. <https://rozenbergquarterly.com/issa-proceedings-2014-dialectic-and-eristic>. Access: 22.07.2024.
- Em, S. (2023).** A review of different ideas concerning the characteristics of a good leader and shaping new ideas of an effective 21st century leader. *Journal of General Education and Humanities*, 2(1), 13–34. <https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v2i1.53>.
- Fisher, E., & Gonzalez, Y. S. (2013).** The Art of Influencing and Persuasion: How Managers Can Put ‘Square Pegs’ into ‘Round Holes’. *Journal of Management Research*, 5(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v5i4.3971>.
- Gielnik, M. M., Frese, M., Kahara-Kawuki, A., Wasswa Katono, I., Kyejjusa, S., Ngoma, M., ..., & Dlugosch, T. J. (2015).** Action and action-regulation in entrepreneurship: Evaluating a student training for promoting entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(1), 69–94. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0107>.
- Hackbarth, D. (2008).** Managerial traits and capital structure decisions. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 43(4), 843–881.
- Godden, D. (2008).** On common knowledge and ad populum: Acceptance as grounds for acceptability. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 41(2), 101–129. <https://doi.org/10.1353/par.0.0000>.
- Hawthorne, J., & Stanley, J. (2008).** Knowledge and Action, *The Journal of Philosophy*, 105(10), 571–590.
- Helms, M. M. (2021).** *Encyclopedia of Management*. Detroit, New York: Thomson.
- Herman, T., & Oswald, S. (2021).** Everybody Knows that There Is Something Odd About Ad Populum Arguments. In Boogaart, R., Jansen, H., & van Leeuwen, M. (Eds). *The Language of Argumentation. Argumentation Library*, vol. 36 (pp. 305–323). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52907-9_16.
- Hinton, M. D. (2018).** On arguments from ignorance. *Informal Logic*, 38(2), 184–212. <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v38i2.4697>.
- Ignatowski, G., Sułkowski, Ł., & Stopczyński, B. (2020).** *The perception of organisational nepotism depending on the membership in selected Christian churches*. *Religions*, 11(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11010047>.

Jędrych, E. (2015). *Personal Innovation in Organizations Issues for Managers*. Warsaw: Vis-tula Academy of Finance and Business.

Kurdoglu, R. S., & Ateş, N. Y. (2022). Arguing to defeat: eristic argumentation and irrationality in resolving moral concerns. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 175(3), 519–535. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04659-2>.

Kurdoglu, R. S., Ates, N. Y., & Lerner, D. A. (2023). Decision-making under extreme uncertainty: eristic rather than heuristic. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 29(3), 763–782. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-07-2022-0587>.

Kurdoglu, R. S., Jekel, M., & Ateş, N. Y. (2023). Eristic reasoning: Adaptation to extreme uncertainty. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1004031. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1004031>.

Kurdoglu, R. S. (2020). The Mirage of Procedural Justice and the Primacy of Interactional Justice in Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167(3), 495–512. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04166-z>.

Kurdoglu, R. S., & Islam, G. (2024). Eristic Legitimation of Controversial Managerial Decisions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 61(3), 627–685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.13008>.

Kuzior A., & Balahurovska, I. (2022). Interaction between the manager and the hidden informal leader. *Scientific Papers of Silesian University of Technology, Organization & Management*, 165, 173–181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2022.165.12>.

Lauring, J., Selmer, J., & Kubovcikova, A. (2019). Personality in context: Effective traits for expatriate managers at different levels. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(6), 1010–1035. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1381137>.

Lemanski, J. (2022). Discourse ethics and eristic. *The Polish Journal of Aesthetics*, 63(3), 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.19205/62.21.7>.

Li, M., & Armstrong, S. J. (2015). The relationship between Kolb’s experiential learning styles and Big Five personality traits in international managers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 86, 422–426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.07.001>.

Macagno, F., & Walton, D. (2005). Common Knowledge and Argumentation Schemes. *Studies in Communication Sciences*, 5(2), 1–22.

Maier, M. A. (2014). What innovation managers really do-An empirical study about tasks, skills and traits of innovation managers in Germany. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management* (pp. 1116–1120). <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEM.2014.7058812>.

- Masood, M., Khan, R. A., & Shaikh, S. (2018).** Impact of personality traits of project manager on project success. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 12(1), 21–44. [https://doi.org/10.29270/JbS.2018.12.1\(23\)](https://doi.org/10.29270/JbS.2018.12.1(23)).
- Nelson, R. H. (2012).** Is Max Weber Newly Relevant? The Protestant-Catholic Divide in Europe Today. *Finnish Journal of Theology*, 5(2), 420–445.
- Obeagu, E. I., & Obeagu, G. U. (2023).** From Awareness to Action: Encouraging Adolescent Engagement in Sickle Cell Disease Prevention. *Elite Journal of Public Health*, 1(1), 42–50.
- Rehman, U., & Shah Nawaz, M. G. (2021).** Machiavellianism and task-oriented leadership: moderating effect of job autonomy. *Leadership, Education, Personality: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 3(2), 79–85. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s42681-021-00024-7>.
- Rupp, D. E., Shapiro, D. L., Folger, R., Skarlicki, D. P., & Shao, R. (2017).** A critical analysis of the conceptualization and measurement of organizational justice: Is it time for reassessment? *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 919–959. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0051>.
- Serenko, A., & Choo, C. W. (2020).** Knowledge sabotage as an extreme form of counterproductive knowledge behavior: the role of narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and competitiveness. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(9), 2299–2325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2020-0416>.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019).** *Research Methods for Business Students*. Edinburgh: Pearson Educational Limited.
- Tsirimokou, C., Richardson, C., & Palaskas, T. (2023).** A Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Machiavellian Personality Scale in Greek Family Business's Stakeholders (GR-MPS). *Trends in Psychology*, 31(2), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43076-022-00147-w>.
- Van der Geest, S. (2021).** Vanity in Anthropology. *Ethnofoor*, 33(1), 91–106.
- Van Laar, J. A. (2010).** Argumentative bluff in eristic discussion: An analysis and evaluation. *Argumentation*, 24(3), 383–398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-010-9184-5>.
- Van Kerkhoff, L., & Lebel, L. (2006).** Linking knowledge and action for sustainable development. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 31(1), 445–477. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.31.102405.170850>.
- Wagemans, J. H. M. (2003).** Conceptualizing fallacies: The informal logic and pragmatist-alethic approaches to the argumentum ad ignorantiam. In van Eemeren, F. H., Blair, J. A., Willard, C. A., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1049–1051). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Walton, D. N. (2004). Argumentation schemes and historical origins of the circumstantial ad hominem argument. *Argumentation*, 18(3), 359–368. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:ARGU.0000046706.45919.83>.

Walton, D., & Koszowy, M. (2014). *Two Kinds of Arguments from Authority in the Ad Verecundiam Fallacy*. <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/crrarpub/17/>. Access: 23.07.2024.

Walton, D. N. (2001). Searching for the roots of the circumstantial ad hominem. *Argumentation*, 15(2), 207–221. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011120100277>.

Ward, V. L., House, A. O., & Hamer, S. (2009). Knowledge brokering: exploring the process of transferring knowledge into action. *BMC Health Services Research*, 9, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-9-12>.

Yu, S., & Zenker, F. (2023). A Scheme and Critical Questions for the argumentum ad baculum. *Topoi*, 42(2), 527–541. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11245-023-09904-7>.