



## “Hard-boiled” and/or “soft-boiled” pedagogy?

**ABSTRACT:** Bogusław Śliwerski, *“Hard-boiled” and/or “soft-boiled” pedagogy?* Interdisciplinary Contexts of Special Pedagogy, No. 16, Poznań 2017. Pp. 13-28. Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISSN 2300-391X

The article elaborates on the condition of partial moral anomy in the academic environment, in Poland that not only weakens the ethical causal power of scientific staff, but also results in weakening social capital and also in pathologies in the process of scientific promotion. The narration has been subject to a metaphor of eggs (equivalent of types of scientific publications or a contradiction thereof) and their hatching in various types of hens breeding (scientific or pseudo-academic schools) in order to sharpen the conditions and results of academic dishonesty and dysfunction and to notice problems in reviewing scientific degrees and titles' dissertations.

**KEY WORDS:** science, logology, reviews, scientific publications, pathologies, academic dishonesty, scientists

The Republic of Poland's post-socialist transformation period brings pathologies in various areas of life, including academic. In the years 2002-2015, I participated in the accreditation of academic universities and higher vocational schools and thus, I had the opportunity to closely observe operation thereof and to initially assess their activity. For almost two years I have not been included in the accreditation team, probably due to the publicly formulated criti-

cism of the body, whose authorities manipulate the assessment of units providing education at faculties and employ for related tasks persons of low scientific credibility, including, among others: owners of Slovak postdoctoral academic titles.

One of the most alarming activities of some universities in the Republic of Poland's political transformation era, comprises simulation of something that would prove the existence of significant educational or scientific processes, whereas, in reality, we are faced with a simulation thereof. For the purposes of the analysis of pathological phenomena occurring in some public and non-public academic institutions, the anomy theory can be used, which allows drawing attention to moral and adaptive problems of individuals employed or studying therein and generated by conflict and pressures within organisational structures thereof. This theory also extends our cognitive abilities in researching individual and group problems occurring in those units. Sociologists themselves specify that the social condition of anomy has been an inherent attribute of organisation and re-organisation of human collectivities, by indicating a lack of norms, a collapse of norms and a breakdown of order and therefore, an occurrence of pejorative phenomena. Scientists even write about a specific character of anomy in the Polish academic reality as distinctive in comparison with its different, Western origins.

### **Moral anomy of some academic environments**

What is anomy? It is a condition of recently binding in the society axionormative structures' breakdown, inducing a phenomenon of a significant number of individuals' lack of integration with socially ingrained cultural patterns and atrophy of motivation to perform related activities as well as a crisis of trust to hitherto links of social integration.<sup>1</sup> Society's moral instability, a lack and a feeling

---

<sup>1</sup> K. Szafraniec, *Człowiek wobec zmian społecznych*, Warsaw: PWN 1990.

of a lack of clear rules of behaviour, mass popularisation of behaviours and phenomena until recently considered as deviant, relationships' breakdown leading to society's atomisation – those are the most typical symptoms of social life, where anomy is developing. A symptom of anomy in academic institutions comprises a weakening of social control mechanisms therein, a crisis of trust to the management and a lack of authorities in management environments.

In the interpersonal relationships' zone one can observe an increased mutual mistrust, hostility, competition, denunciation and intrigues, instrumentalism, cynicism and pathological symptoms of domination and constraint, which are accompanied with a withdrawal of the best employees and replacing them with mediocre, yet, loyal to the authorities, ones who are subject to familiarisation processes. An inherent attribute of management in such universities constitutes standardisation of activities, introduction of procedures, bureaucracy and overcontrol. Pathology normalisation results from the situation of the so-called “utmost necessity”, typical irony or arrogance towards idealists who do not agree to the infringement of human dignity, symptoms of hypocrisy, disharmony, cynicism or unethical approaches.

Ethical norm – “accept status quo and be moral” in the conditions of deep social anomy is a logical absurd that deletes from the personality of students or academic teachers their ability to self-regulate and follow own conscience. If, in the society, there are people without cultural roots, moral helms, with a weakened feeling of bond and solidarity, without the need to decide about themselves, untaught to read their own situation as constraint, they are always vulnerable to manipulation. No wonder that persons who can properly read and question this abnormal reality and do not agree to the simulation thereof as well as pathologies, are alone since their approach is not only surprising to the environment, but also seems senseless, as it infringes the existing, though, shameful system of falsehood and appearances.

Persons opposing the aforementioned phenomena are met with hostility of those, who benefit from this pathology the most (in the

case of students – they do not have to learn, come to classes, independently prepare assignments or dissertations and in the case of academics – they do not have to, since they cannot, do scientific research, write scientific dissertations, publish them, organise conferences etc.). Furthermore such persons are not understood and often do not have support from those who this opposition benefits the most: persons who are unreliably assessed, unjustly treated, persecuted or marginalised and who have academic achievements or are authentically interested in studying. Sooner or later it turns out that the proverbial king is naked, anyways. According to Michał Januszkiewicz, whose approach I used herein: *However, one cannot indicate any “first” or “then”, since between understanding, ethics and identity there is no causal or resultative relation. One should rather discuss here structural co-belonging and co-dependency of those three elements. The concept of understanding is of a relational character. (...) Understanding constitutes a dialogue situation: what is understood inquires the person who understands, interprets them.*<sup>2</sup> I was in a way thrown into the world whose reality and processes unveiling therein allowed better and better understanding of facts without the necessity to determine any zero point for occurrence thereof; therefore, as of the moment when everything started.

I have learned about so many pathologies in the documentation to scientific promotion and annexes thereto in a form of publications that there is nothing left, but to use a metaphor to analyse them from a little different perspective. A metaphor of an egg and its hatching in the post-holiday atmosphere ideally matches the analysis of a rotten egg corresponding with fundamental errors in pedagogical research. Just as a rotten egg originates from non-fertilised eggs during incubation or as a result of time, a scientific work resulting from a lack of fertilising it through the agency of the humanistic and/or social sciences research methodology is unacceptable. It happens more and more often that not only postdoctoral disserta-

---

<sup>2</sup> M. Januszkiewicz, *Kim jestem Ja, Kim jesteś Ty. Etyka, tożsamość, rozumienie*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie 2012, p. 10.

tions, but also other publications are submitted to the postdoctoral procedure as a result of time, before rotation, based on the principle that maybe it will be successful and no one notices that something stinks. Such a case is described by the reviewer:

The majority of attached articles written by the Candidate constitute scientific journalism: a few or several pages of quotations, paraphrases, obvious generalisations and idle recommendations. Since those articles fall within a narrow thematic scope, a reader has an impression of continuously reading the same text. The Candidate has only two quasi-research reports for the purposes of scientific independence; “quasi”, as they are deprived of important features of the genre: a review of earlier research and information on the method of selecting studied persons and collecting data.<sup>3</sup>

I analysed all documents from postdoctoral procedures in Section 1, Humanities and Social Sciences of the Central Commission for Academic Degrees and Titles in the following scientific disciplines: pedagogy, psychology, political sciences and sociology, published until the end of March 2017. I was interested in the conclusions that should have ended with a resolution on giving or refusing to give a postdoctoral degree from a specific discipline, but the procedure was not completed. Of course, the Central Commission does not inform about reasons for this status, as it also does not know them. The postdoctoral procedure is initiated upon a request of an interested person and can be by such person, also upon their request, discontinued. It can be, but does not have to be. Upon appointing by the Central Commission members of the postdoctoral commission, the role of this institution basically ends in the life of a doctor interested in postdoctoral degree.

However, there is an exception to this rule, that is, when the whole course of the procedure ends with a resolution of the Faculty Council or the Institute’s Scientific Council (with entitlements) on a refusal to give a post-doctoral degree, and the postdoctoral stu-

---

<sup>3</sup> Review fragments are anonymised. Source: author’s archives.

dent does not agree therewith and appeals to the Central Commission (through the agency of the Council of the aforementioned unit). Then, full documentation from the procedure that must be studied in technical terms is forwarded to the Central Commission: Has the administrative mode been infringed in this procedure? And also substantially: Do the achievements of the postdoctoral student subject to reviews and opinions of the postdoctoral commission members meet the requirements of the Act on Academic Degrees and Academic Titles? At this stage, it may be revealed, if the egg was completely or only partially bad. Therefore, I will start my analysis not with what should be done to boil an egg hard or soft, but I will search for an answer to the question, why some eggs are not fresh, rotten (bad eggs)<sup>4</sup>, and, proceed as Rev. Janusz Tarnowski, who wanted to answer the question what is upbringing and started with what it, in its essence, is not, despite the fact that it commonly seems to be just that.

## **Hens breeding as a contribution to the analysis of university scientific schools, that is, how to recognise a rotten egg**

*(...) from a scientific rooster interested predominantly in own development, I became a hen bringing up chicks<sup>5</sup>*

A rotten egg can completely destroy taste of a meal, but can also cause unpleasant stomach upset, starting from a non-dangerous stomach ache and ending with a dangerous poisoning with salmonella bacteria. Similarly, a badly selected source of knowledge to solve a research problem can destroy the value of a theoretic analysis of a phenomenon we are interested in. Consciously or unconsciously reaching for a book that has not been accepted in the scien-

---

<sup>4</sup> Rotten egg, <https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbuk> reading date: 10.03.2017.

<sup>5</sup> A. Nalaskowski, *Edukacja. Korzenie - źródła - narracje*, Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls" 2017, p. 5.

tific environment as a dissertation, since it turned out to be a methodological, application, popular, publicist etc. publication or included fundamental substantive and methodological errors in the research part, we are on a position of a client buying already bad or expired eggs. Just as the method of hen breeding influences the quality and taste of eggs, the situation is similar with the publications of allegedly scientific character.

Eggs are better marked than scientific publications. They have in fact a stamp with a code of the following configuration: X-YY – ZZZZZZZZ, where X means a method of hens breeding, YY – country of origin, and ZZZZZZZZ – veterinary identification number of the producer. While purchasing eggs, one should pay attention to the code number of the first symbol (X). It can have a number between 0 to 3, where 0 means an organic hen breeding, 1 – free range, 2 – barn and 3 – cage.<sup>6</sup> Young scientists are in a more difficult situation than persons buying eggs, since books on the topic interesting for them despite having ISBN number, and magazines – ISSN number, do not provide any knowledge on the type of hen breeding they come from. Whereas, they should be given relevant symbols so that it is known, if referred dissertation is of a strictly scientific, non-scientific, popular or journalistic character (a guide, a course book, a script, a memoir, a report, a biography, an essay etc.). Furthermore, such a marking should be given after postdoctoral procedure, if the dissertation constituted the doctoral student’s main achievement, since the result of conducted assessments can be, and often is, different from the conclusion made by a publishing reviewer. More and more often I come across a situation as a result of which a publishing reviewer states: *“(...) This dissertation is characterised with a high cognitive value and is at a high substantive and methodological level. It contributes new elements to the knowledge on such an important analytical category, (...).*

Whereas, the reviewer in the postdoctoral procedure provides a negative conclusion justified as follows: *(...) It is surprising that*

---

<sup>6</sup> R. Targosz, Jaja – jak rozpoznawać świeżość i jak przechowywać, [in:] <http://artkulinaria.pl/magia-gotowania/porady/jajka-porady> read on 11.04.2017.

*neither the monograph's publishing reviewer, nor the editor were stricken with the inadequacy of the title with regard to the contents thereof. (...) Three first chapters attempt to fulfil a role of a theoretical introduction – unsuccessfully, as they do not present any theory that could constitute a source of hypotheses or research questions. (...) It could have been a fascinating essay on the concept's history, yet, it is only a chaotic collection of quotes and paraphrases that do not end with any definitions, not to mention hypotheses. (...) Contents' analysis is supposed to constitute a research methodology. The aim and the method are stipulated falsely – in the sense that the objective announces something that is not provided by the research and the data analysis is not executed in accordance with the adopted method. (...) Methodological characteristics of the research first requires stipulation of its scheme. However, the contents' analysis is not a scheme, but one of detailed methods of "coding" text, that is, transforming meaning into numbers.*

Should the persons studying the subject literature know the types of dissertations (eggs) they deal with? If those are postdoctoral monographies in the meaning of a full or non-full version of previously defended doctoral dissertation, then, they should be aware of the fact that they were not written independently, but under a supervision of a specific professor. Therefore, the finding included therein cannot be attributed only to the author, but also to the supervisor. Therefore, such a book should have a **symbol of 3 – cage work**, as a work written in an academic "cage" limiting full liberty of action. Such an egg is partially bad and it happens that it is also genetically burdened.

It happens that the produced egg (doctoral dissertation) has a bad form, therefore, the life of a hen (author) can turn out awful, as described by Jan Brzechwa.<sup>7</sup> If, a young doctor does not take to heart critical comments of reviewers or friendly persons from own environment and will not understand own errors, they will reproduce such errors in following dissertations with a conviction

---

<sup>7</sup> Gdyby jajko miało inną formę, życie kury byłoby potworne. Julian Tuwim, *Przebłyśki genialności*, "Cyrulik Warszawski" 1932.

that everything is all right. Then, we are left with a poem by Jan Brzechwa:

Once upon a time there was an egg smarter than a hen.  
The hen tries again and again,  
Asks, pleads, persuades: “Be more foolish!”  
Yet, what can you do, if someone does not want to be foolish?<sup>8</sup>

What can be done, if a supervised doctor insists in their confidence that they have nothing more to learn, they have a patent on wisdom, all given critical comments, even the kindest, have a deep meaning? It happens that until the moment of postdoctoral graduation, doctors are bred as cage hens. It provides a high level of safety, if standards of those cages are adequate to scientific norms in a given field and discipline. This phenomenon has two sides that on the part of the perpetrator seem to be positive and noble. The first one being seemingly positive dependence of the postdoctoral student on the so-called: Master, the authority, which burdens the narration style of the academic work and deprives from self-reflection on the product of own work. The manner of analysing the contents is in a way “following the path” and not an independent discovery of regularities or establishment of categorial framework for scientific analysis. In one of the postdoctoral dissertations of approximately 300 pages, over 100 thereof comprise author’s quotes of their Master’s statements and texts. The most serious error made by such a scientist is not using primary, original sources and only continuously referencing them from the so-called second hand, quoting the Master. It is a lack of the ability to read and interpret dissertations that are thoughtlessly referred to by quoting the author’s authority. However, this also means they have a problem with own scientific identity.

In the second case, the situation is worse, when caged hens are managed by an incompetent professor and they do sometimes work

---

<sup>8</sup> J. Brzechwa, Jajko, <https://pl.wikiquote.org/wiki/Jajko> read on 10.04.2017.

at our universities. Then, a self-satisfied, certified (e.g. in Slovakia) owner of the henhouse counts on a task-specific contract for supervising another ignorant and nothing stinks for him, yet, the egg is bad. It is worth remembering that (...) *barn hen breeding exposes birds to a significantly lower stress than cage hen breeding. Birds kept in cages very often attack each other, therefore, usually it is necessary to cut their beaks and claws in order to prevent injuries. It certainly raises ethical doubts.*<sup>9</sup> And how is it at our universities? Are the beaks cut off smartasses, loudmouths, the excessively nosy who rebel against observed insipidness and mediocrity? Do we not have to deal with continuous intrigues, denunciation of one another, when most frequently the former are those who do not feel like doing much or cannot do something and thus, they have to attack those thinking differently and working?

Scientific publications **from aviary breeding** should be marked with **symbol 2**, which assumes breeding in the whole available area. Just as in the barn breeding, old buildings are modified *by removing one wall of the cage, adding hen roosts, ladders and nests in order to establish a free range system, which involves joining the floor-barn system with access to the range*<sup>10</sup>, also in a well-managed academic school, walls between institutes and departments should be demolished at the university, roosts of new disciplines should be added so that a young scientist is bred and developed in a free range, yet, on proper and healthy grounds. To increase “fertility”, department or institute funds can be provided that will encourage and reinforce the researcher in further and more intensive and authentic creative activities. Just as hens have to be given something to their feed, a young scientist should receive “vitamins in ecological feed”, that is: grants, specific encouragement to cooperate internationally, devote more time to sit at the university or home library.

---

<sup>9</sup> B. Kolska, Chów ściółkowy kur – wady i zalety [in:] <http://www.firmokracja.pl/chow-sciolkowy-kur-wady-zalety/> read on 10.04.2017.

<sup>10</sup> Ibidem.

Obviously, eggs marked with a **digit 1**, which were laid by **free range hens**, are of the highest quality. However, some professors do not like such free runners who think fast, work a lot and, God forbid, write faster and publish, since some would like to get rid of a hen that lays “golden eggs” so that stains on their own eggs are not visible. In the recent years, consumers’ awareness of goods in the academic market is growing, as they begin searching for products of better quality. Breeders of laying hens know that the method of breeding is one of the most important factors influencing eggs’ quality. Nevertheless, the above is not enough by itself, since, if we establish too liberal conditions for those, who cannot use them to the benefit of the science, as they will always remember to take care of themselves efficiently, it does not mean obtaining eggs (publications) of the highest quality. So what if we search for eggs from free range hens believing that this is the best and most ecological method of eggs production, if hens bred that way might not have been given ecological feed. In other words, even at the best faculty or department in the country, if young scientists do not receive the best feed, such signboard is not enough to ensure producing the best works.

Many a time I have been astonished with pathogenic scientific works the contents of which did not meet even the minimal level of dissertations of second cycle students, not to mention a level of postdoctoral dissertations. The hen breeders are right when they say that (...) *barn breeding allows joining high productiveness and automatization of the breeding with a care for good conditions of birds.*<sup>11</sup> It is similar in academic schools of masters, where one obtained grant generates three other and those another six ones and one has only to wonder which to resign from or who to employ so as to achieve the highest quality. Then, the situation is the same as in the case of the barn breeding – high quality of the product. Now, I will move on to the eggs, that is, scientific works.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem.

## **Eggs are a source of wholesome protein, that is, the case of wholesome dissertations**

*I consider writing a dissertation for the purposes of postdoctoral graduation as bad and even unethical in principle. A young scientist should work for their love of knowledge, for deep affection, internal, spiritual need.<sup>12</sup>*

As eggs mainly provide a source of wholesome protein easily absorbed by the body, very good dissertations become a model “protein” for pedagogy, which includes all methodological “amino acids”. It is true that yolk – which in dissertations should be a reliably written theoretical part – is a true cholesterol bomb, yet, on the other hand, it delivers lecithin, that is, in the case of empirical research dissertations – relevant variable models and their indexes or, as in the case of qualitative research, a category to decode and interpret data, preventing depositing thereof on “blood vessels’ walls” of solved research problem. The egg white can be eaten without limitations, yet, it very often causes allergy. It is similar with some opinions, ideas, conceptions that we refer to in our dissertations and which can cause a reviewer’s allergic reaction, as they will get a rash as a result of the contents thereof. The same happens in science. Fortunately, according to Jeane Hersch:

Scientists should accept the fact that not everybody will agree with one another. The thought itself that the unanimity or compatibility of opinions is necessary is an excessive claim. We are in fact too big individualists and have too different life paths to find a common ground. This ground is stipulated negatively, by limiting and setting boundaries. Maybe it would be good to try and determine the minimum on which we can all agree. It includes e.g. recognition, yet, we are never, ever in the possession of whole truth.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> J. Nusbaum-Hilarowicz, *Uczeni i uczniowie*, Lviv: Edited by Księgarnia H. Altenberga 1910, p. 101.

<sup>13</sup> Andrzej Szostkiewicz interview with Jeanne Hersch, *Tygodnik Powszechny* 1992, no. 13, p. 3.

If we know that a high temperature (as in the case of whipping) destroys the proteins' structure, it is better to eat a hard-boiled egg than soft-boiled one. We should take a similar approach to the project of own scientific research. To solve the problem we should not be motivated with alleged “easiness” of a qualitative research paradigm, since such an egg can be less digestible, especially if we do it with an omission of procedures relevant for each method, than a soft-boiled egg, in the case of which on a condition of a well-conducted research procedure in the quantitative paradigm and used plethora of statistical methods, we can be assured of the lightness. The egg white acidifies the body, therefore, it is better to mix it with alkaline vegetables, e.g. with chives. It is similar in the case of analysing numerical data. If we use methods of statistical research, then, the “after-taste” of thus obtained knowledge will be much better. Therefore, there is no point in arguing what is better in an egg: egg white or yolk? Just as it is pointless to argue that the quantitative approach is scientifically better than the qualitative approach, since each of them should be properly conducted. Similarly, as we eat not only egg white, but also yolk, according to many reviewers, a scientist should be able to conduct research in each of those paradigms. An egg cannot be a little fresh and a little bad.

To conclude, I would like to point out two “egg” issues, the first one related with tossing “a cuckoo egg” and the second one – with “making a fool of someone”. A cuckoo egg refers to the decision makers' appointing as a reviewer or a commission member someone who is in a conflict or hostile relations with the supervisor of the dissertation or the postdoctoral student in order to ensure the conclusion of a review written by them. Then, a doctoral or postdoctoral student becomes a subject of personal conflicts in the scientific environment. Sometimes the motivation is different. For instance, the postdoctoral student does not have proper scientific achievements and the unit's management wants to get rid of them at this occasion. Then, they entrust the review to someone to resolve the issue on behalf of the unit's management and get rid of such an employee. In the logology literature I came across a description of an event that indicates another use of the “cuckoo egg” method in order to get rid of

a non-popular professor. One of the assistants was adding to his experimental samples unknown substance so that the professor obtained results that he could in no way explain. Therefore, he resigned from the work at the university and started a flower shop.

Whereas, “making a fool of someone” refers to the part of applications for discontinuance of a postdoctoral procedure that has a character of an intentional infringement of social welfare. The postdoctoral student knows their scientific achievements do not meet statutory requirements, yet, they start the procedure hoping “it will work out”. Thus, a hide and seek starts. I wrote about it last year, yet, as it seems, this practice becomes more and more popular, since the representatives of the Citizens of Academia’s body reacted to it and named it as mentioned above. According to them: *Children like playing hide and seek. One is hiding and the other tries to find the former. The former appears in various places and then disappears. I notice an analogy between this children play and discontinuing a postdoctoral procedure. Postdoctoral students apply and then, withdraw the application when things are moving in wrong direction (...) Postdoctoral students refer to Article 105 of the Code of Administrative Proceedings that stipulates as follows:*

1. *Where a procedure has become redundant in full or in part for whatever reason, the public administration body shall issue a decision on discontinuance of the procedure in full or in part, respectively.*
2. *The public administration body may discontinue procedure if requested to do so by the party at whose demand the procedure was commenced and such request is not contested by any other party and is not contrary to the public interest.*

*The provision of par. 2 is used by would-be independent employees, usually after two negative reviews come in. They do not always take this decision on their own. Sometimes, an application for discontinuance is filed after a meeting of a postdoctoral commission and theoretically, it can happen that a postdoctoral student brings an application to the Faculty Council and the Dean supplements the agenda with a relevant point.<sup>14</sup>*

---

<sup>14</sup> Zabawa w chowanego, czyli o umarzaniu postępowań habilitacyjnych [in:] <http://obywatelenauki.pl/2017/04/zabawa-w-chowanego-czyli-o-umarzaniu-postepowan-habilitacyjnych/> read on 12.04.2017.

Thus, members of units’ councils and of the Central Commission have a problem when they receive an application for the discontinuance of a postdoctoral procedure, if they recognise in this action prerequisites for “making a fool of the council or the commission”. In 2016, Jerzy Kisielnicki and Stanisław Piątek calculated that approximately 120 postdoctoral applications are discontinued annually, which, with regard to the number of applications, amounts to approximately 7 percent.<sup>15</sup> However, it is pointless to investigate, whether it is a lot or not, since the legislator created a loophole in the law and thus, it is not surprising that applicants benefit from it. There is one more type of “making a fool of” a publishing reviewer, when their critical comments are not taken into consideration at all and a dissertation full of substantial errors is published with an annotation of their name as allegedly fully positive opinion of an expert.

Over one hundred years ago, Professor Józef Nussbaum-Hilarowicz published a book in which he demanded ethos education of young scientists. They should be especially taken care of so that they want to contribute to the further development of knowledge and culture. *It is crucial to select for a beginner young scientist such topics of dissertations so that, as a result, they learn the research methodology and at the same time enter the temple of creative work more effectively. A professor must carefully and extremely delicately look after them and be careful not to insult them with improper behaviour and not to hurt the youth’s tender and sensitive soul. At the beginning of scientific work, the youth are continuously threatened with obstacles and difficulties, they can get discouraged, distrust own strength and feel humiliated, and that would be extremely destructive for them.*<sup>16</sup>

If anyone thinks that the approach of J. Nussbaum-Hilarowicz to young scientific disciples is too romantic and obsolete, as in the

---

<sup>15</sup> J. Kisielnicki, S. Piątek, Umorzenie postępowania habilitacyjnego, Forum Akademickie 2016 no. 7-8 [in:] <https://prenumeruj.forumakademickie.pl/fa/2016/07-08/umorzenie-postepowania-habilitacyjnego/> read on 12.04.2017.

<sup>16</sup> J. Nussbaum-Hilarowicz, *Uczniowie*, Lviv: Edited by Księgarnia H. Altenberga 1910, p. 87.

present times one must be prepared for ruthless competition, I will end this text with an analogy to hen breeding, but with a consideration of contemporary tendencies in managing a large and innovative IT company. A founder of a technological company Kyocera, which now employs over 70 thousand persons, as well as a former president of the Japan Airlines, Kazuo Inamori, followed the above principle in work organisation. He believed that if we want eggs, we have to take care of the hen. It is similar in the market competition (...) *a key to success is to take care of the employees' interest. If they are content, they will work more efficiently. He describes it with an example of a hen. He claims that, if someone threatens it or leads to its death, they will not achieve anything. Therefore, it must be healthy.*<sup>17</sup> Thus, the academic staff's education should take into consideration this philosophy of life to the benefit of developing social capital that will result in a high quality of scientific and research projects.

---

<sup>17</sup> K. Sztandera, 83-letni miliarder daje złotą zasadę traktowania pracowników. I doprowadza tym innych do szału [in:] <http://innpoland.pl/122791,83-letni-miliarder-jesli-chcesz-jajek-to-dbaj-o-kure-tajemnice-jego-sukcesu-standowi-troska-o-interesy-pracownikow> read on 14.04.2017.