

THE PERSONALITY MATURITY OF MANAGERS AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS IN PERFORMING THEIR ROLE

Magdalena KRACZLA

WSB University in Poznan; magdalena.kraczla@chorzow.wsb.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-9382-4249

Purpose: The purpose of this article is to present the relationship between the level of a manager's maturity and their effectiveness in performing their role.

Design/methodology/approach: This article is an overview that presents a new perspective in the perception and assessment of managers' effectiveness, namely managers' personality maturity.

Findings: The conducted considerations show that the maturity of a manager's personality determines the maturity level of their personal behaviour, which creates space for effective managerial activities.

Research limitations/implications: It is recommended to continue empirical investigations using strong diagnostic tools, including personality diagnostics in a large research group of managers.

Practical implications: The relationship presented in this article between the level of managers' maturity and their ability to perform effective managerial behaviours at the organizational level creates a research area for determining the relationship between personality predispositions and their usefulness in the effective achievement of the tasks entrusted to managers. As a result, it is possible to shape the desired self-development conditions that are conducive to building and strengthening a mature personality.

Social implications: If introduced as a permanent category in assessing managers' effectiveness, *personality maturity*, understood as the ability to assume responsibility for one's personal self-development, can significantly incentivise organizations to create space for managers' psychological responsibility for the development of themselves and their employees.

Originality/value: A close relationship has been identified between personality traits and their development and managers' efficiency and effectiveness in achieving assumed goals. It is shown that a manager's mature personality increases their chances of fulfilling expectations regarding the ever-increasing and more complex demands of their role.

Keywords: maturity, personality, personality maturity, manager, effectiveness.

Category of the paper: review.

1. Introduction

A manager's work may be analysed from a number of different perspectives. This article suggests taking a closer look at maturity as an important – if not the most important – criterion in assessing managers. In this approach, maturity is understood as not only one's ability to assume responsibility for delivering tasks at work, but also the ability to go beyond one's own limits and manage subordinates so that they can develop in a favourable social environment and, ultimately, achieve their life goals with a sense of meaningfulness and complete self-fulfilment. Such a perception of a manager requires a very comprehensive description of this role; thus, we are forced to describe it as a whole. It is impossible to disregard managers' personality and its influence on the way they perform their managerial roles. This subject is described in more detail in the first chapter.

Managers' maturity must also manifest itself par excellence not only in the effective achievement of their core professional goals but also in the 'soft' objectives which are an essential part of a managerial role, such as management of a subordinate team, conflict resolution, or motivating people to develop. Efficiency in carrying out these tasks has always been regarded as essential for managers, and for years it has been considered the most basic criterion of their assessment. This point will be elaborated on more comprehensively in the second chapter of this article.

According to our approach, however, even a combination of these two areas of competence may not be sufficient to judge a manager's maturity. To do this, it is necessary to integrate their individual skills from the different activity areas mentioned above into a coherent whole that is consistent with their philosophy of life and the goals arising from this philosophy. Despite its enormous diversity, complexity, and changeability over time, this combination must then be harmoniously integrated into a coherent picture that is manifested in the activities of a mature manager. This is what the third part of the article deals with.

2. Effectiveness in a managerial role

The managerial profession did not appear until the end of the 19th century, which is why it still does not have an unambiguous and precisely defined position among other professions. Researchers of organization and management sciences treat the work of a manager as an art, a science, or a freelance profession (Pietruszka-Ortyl, Gach, 2005). Regardless of the preferred approach, however, the management process and its effects (understood as the implementation of organizational tasks and goals) require managers to have a good command of the roles assigned to this profession and the related skills (Penc, 2005).

Undoubtedly, **the development of enterprises depends to a large extent on the quality of fulfilment of managerial roles** (cf. Bacon, 2013; Blanchard, 2013; Kaplan, 2013). Thus, the actions of a modern manager must take the form of well-thought-out and conscious activity in order to intentionally and effectively influence the behaviour of their subordinates (Terelak, 1999).

The psychological concept of management defines a manager as a subject of a managerial situation conditioned by a number of factors (Bartkowiak, 1994):

- other people,
- tasks to be delivered (goals to be achieved),
- defined principles of cooperation,
- the organisation for which the manager works.

When functioning in this kind of framework, a manager must influence their subordinates in a way which will incentivise them to take actions that allow the organisation's goals to be achieved (Zieleniewski, 1978). Since achieving results is usually associated with a great team effort, of which the manager is obviously an integral part, success depends to a large extent on the manager's ability to activate employees' potential, which, as mentioned above, must be seen as a manager's basic resource. Managers are responsible for all of their organisation's resources and their effective use. Therefore, managers must be fully aware of their role, duties and powers (Stoner, Wankel, 1992).

The changeability, ambiguity, complexity and uncertainty of the situations in which managers operate require them to boast a wide repertoire of managerial skills that allow them to manage effectively. There is no doubt that "in order for a manager to be effective, they must master the roles assigned to their profession and possess the skills that determine this process" (Penc, 2005, p. 63). What should be understood by *managerial roles* is, to put it briefly, "organized sets of behaviours" (Griffin, 1998). A more complex definition of this role is suggested by Drucker, who assumes that "the role of a manager is primarily people management based on the cooperation of many people in a way which makes it possible to neutralize their weaknesses and make the best use of their talents and strengths" (Drucker, 1976, p. 76). In his opinion, managerial roles are most evident during the implementation of tasks in five basic areas of managerial activity: setting goals, organizing, motivating and informing, measuring and developing people (Drucker, 1994).

Another classification of managerial roles was put forward by Mintzberg (1973), whose juxtaposition is still quite valid and is the most frequently cited typology of roles. In his opinion, the functioning of managers boils down to three basic roles or, in other words, areas of activity:

- **Interpersonal roles** – activities related to the creation of interpersonal relations within the organization and with the external environment.
- **Informational roles** – activities related to processing, searching, analysis, transmission and dissemination of information.
- **Decisional roles** – activities related to making management decisions, resolving conflicts, negotiating, determining priorities and resources.

In all of these main areas, Mintzberg distinguishes ten specific roles that managers share in their leadership practice. They are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Basic management roles according to H. Mintzberg

CATEGORY	ROLE	TASK EXAMPLES
Interpersonal	figurehead	participation in a gala; opening of a new plant
	leader	encouraging subordinates to increase their productivity
	liaison	coordination of activities of two project groups
Informational	monitor	monitoring industry reports to keep up with the latest developments
	disseminator	sending out memos; presenting new organisational initiatives
	spokesperson	giving a speech; presenting growth plans
Decisional	entrepreneur	developing new and innovative ideas
	disturbance handler	resolving conflicts between subordinates
	resource allocator	reviewing and revising budget requests
	negotiator	negotiating an agreement with a key supplier or trade union

Source: Griffin, R.W. (1998). *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*. Warszawa: PWN.

The roles played by managers in an organization are conditioned by many factors, one of the most important of which is their place in the vertical structure of the organization. The three organizational levels most commonly distinguished in the literature on the subject are low, middle, and high. These levels have an important impact on the functioning of managers and largely determine the roles they play in their management practice (Hodgetts, 1977). The scopes of responsibility associated with these three levels are as follows:

- managers of the first (lowest) level are responsible for the work of line employees, and they are accountable for the effects of their work,
- middle-level managers are responsible for first-level managers (sometimes also for line employees) and report to senior (high) management
- high-level (senior) managers are responsible for the overall management of the organization, definition of its strategy, plus planning, organizing, and supervising the organization's relations with the external environment.

It transpires from the above that the position of managers in an organisation's vertical structure and the related scope of influence and responsibility make it possible to define the competences necessary for the effective fulfilment of their managerial functions. This relationship is presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Competencies determining effective functioning at various management levels

SENIOR MANAGERS	conceptual skills		
MIDDLE-LEVEL MANAGERS		human skills	
LOW-LEVEL MANAGERS			technical skills

Source: Stoner, J.A.F., Freeman, R.E., Gilbert, D.R. (1997). *Kierowanie*. Warszawa: PWE.

As implied by the above considerations, the managerial roles that are most common at the lowest levels of an organisation's structures are largely associated with broader knowledge and technical skills; in contrast, the higher the management level is, the greater the importance of conceptual competences. On the other hand, middle management roles are characterised by a more significant component of human and interpersonal skills. Therefore, it can be assumed that it is human and interpersonal competences that constitute a bracket that binds together an organisation's management structure.

The above-presented concept of differentiating between the essence of managerial roles depending on the level in the organizational structure is consistent with the proposal of Katz, one of the most prominent management theorists. In his view, every manager should have three basic types of skills (after Łukasiewicz, 1998; Pietrasiński, 1994; Stoner, Freeman, Gilbert, 1997; Wajda, 1999):

- technical skills,
- human skills,
- conceptual skills.

According to Katz, every manager requires all three types of competence in their management practice, regardless of their management level, because in their everyday work they might have to perform tasks "at various *levels* of the organization and in various *areas* of its activity" (Stoner, Freeman, Gilbert, 1997, p. 31).

Summing up, these comments on managerial roles clearly indicate that people performing managerial functions should be characterized, above all, by great flexibility and versatility with regard to the range of roles they perform and how they fulfil them. On the one hand, what researchers particularly underline is the importance of work effectiveness and maximizing its efficiency (Sajkiewicz, A., Sajkiewicz, Ł., 2002). On the other hand, there is also an emphasis on the increasing role of interpersonal "soft" competences, the possession of which determines the achievement of the economic and technical goals of the enterprise.

In order to focus on managerial effectiveness, it should be noted that broadly understood effectiveness is usually defined in three areas:

- in economic terms, as the ratio of input versus achieved results,
- in terms of goal fulfilment, as the degree of the achievement of the assumed organizational goals,
- from a systemic perspective, as the extent of utilizing organizational resources and the quality of relations with the environment (Ziębicki, 2007).

The literature on the subject increasingly emphasizes the fact that *efficiency*, in its narrow, economic sense that is manifested in the profit generated by the organization, although very important, is no longer an absolute criterion. It turns out that it is much more advantageous to define the *efficiency* of an organization by means of systemic categories, as this approach allows for a more comprehensive and modern definition. As Kozusznik emphasizes, in the

contemporary market it is not profit that should be the sole criterion for assessing the effectiveness of an organization's operations, but rather the organisation's ability to adapt to changing market conditions and survive in these dynamic conditions. Considering the enormous dynamics of modern markets, a focus on short-term profit maximization may, if continued for a longer period of time, result in the abandonment of innovative and adaptive activities, thus ultimately eliminating the organization from the market in the long run (Kozusznik, 2002). Borowiecki and Jaki also emphasise the need for systemic changes. These authors emphasise that the development of enterprises in the current global reality requires systemic changes and modernization, in particular the reconstruction of management structures, the breaking of stereotypes, the implementation of innovative solutions, and new production and management methods (Borowiecki, Jaki, 2015). The required impulses and sources of energy for such changes and system innovations in modern and extremely complex organizations should be found in the internal resources of the organization (primarily employees of the company) or the external environment of the company (Zbiegień-Maciąg, 2008).

While performing their duties, managers face a fundamental dilemma of the right choice of efficiency model, as well as the correct determination of the criteria that will be used to measure the level of organizational effectiveness (Bratnicki, Kulikowaska-Pawlak, 2013). Zieleniewski points out that effectiveness is sometimes equated with notions such as economy, profitability, or efficacy, but it can also be understood as efficiency in a very universal sense (Zieleniewski, 1966; after Smolbim-Jęczmień, 1999). Due to the complexity and multifaceted nature of business processes, market dynamics and the internal organisational structures, it seems that such a universal approach is becoming increasingly important as it emphasizes the multitude of aspects and perspectives of looking at and measuring effectiveness. What is more, efficiency criteria based solely on the assessment of employees' performance should be considered severely lacking. What is becoming increasingly obvious is the necessity of studies concerning the conditions that influence the obtained effects, as well as multi-faceted cause-and-effect analyses of the changing factors that affect organisations and their human resources (Smolbim-Jęczmień, 1999). It is also worth emphasizing the impact of psychological (often referred to as 'soft') factors on the effects of work, understood here as emotions experienced at work, the workplace atmosphere, employees' personality traits, and their ability to deal with stress. These are important criteria for assessing work efficiency and should receive more attention in effective management models (Morgeson et al., 2007; after Nieckarz, 2014). An approach to effectiveness which takes into account both the economic and social aspects requires taking relevant action within organizational structures and the division of tasks and competences (Nogalski, 2009). The socio-economic nature of efficiency relates to the entire organization and the entities that can be distinguished within its structure. For an enterprise, these aspects may be increased profitability, improved competitiveness, higher quality of manufactured products or, for example, reduction of employee absenteeism. For employees, it may be improved remuneration, increased job satisfaction, or the possibility of professional and personal

development (Smolbikm-Jęczmień, 1999). For a manager, this may mean fulfilment of their aspirations, better managerial or personal competences, or achievement of their operational goals through personal effectiveness in management (Kraczla, 2013).

A very important factor influencing a manager's work efficiency is the stress experienced at work. As indicated by many authors, one of the greatest stressors is managers' responsibility for their subordinates (cf. Hallowell, 2011; Poczowski, 2003; Schultz, D.P., Schultz, S.E., 2006). According to Davenport and Harding (2012), this factor alone, i.e., the burden of responsibility for others, is why many people do not want to be in a managerial role. The unpredictability of the reactions of others, the lack of a full sense of control, and the uncertainty of achieving set goals all create an excessive emotional burden for many people.

The effectiveness of a manager's work is defined differently from the perspective of their employees, who might emphasize the importance of their managers in building up the commitment, energy and creativity of employees and focusing the team on success through a clear division of tasks and a precise definition of goals, as well as adapting these goals to the skills and personality predispositions of particular employees (Global Workforce Study Report, 2012; after Nieckarz, 2014). In this approach, the effectiveness of managerial work depends on the manager's ability to engage all their team members to achieve a common goal in a way that corresponds to their needs, aspirations and motivations (Poczowski, 2008). Moreover, it is now commonly emphasized that the effectiveness of a manager's work manifests itself not only in their own individual effectiveness but also in the entire team's. Only a combination of these two perspectives allows the organization's economic targets and social results in terms of employee satisfaction to be achieved (Kozak, 2007). Knowing the enormous influence of employee satisfaction on the effects of their work, managers must be aware of their subordinates' individual and group needs and expectations and address them in their daily team management practice. "They must be able to control not only their own stress, but also help their colleagues overcome their stress even if it is not always fully justified (...)" (Penc, 2000, p. 231).

It is also worth noting that effective performance of a managerial role requires continuous development of managers and their adaptation to constant social, cultural, organizational and technological changes (Penc, 2005). This, in turn, is possible only if managers have the right psychological conditions and are ready to develop and go beyond stereotypical or traditional behaviours.

The role of a manager's full engagement and self-fulfilment in assessing their professional effectiveness is also underlined by Strużyna. In his opinion, "today's image of organizations requires recognition of all employees' possibility of and right to full engagement, not only managers or leaders" (Strużyna, 2013, p. 46). This means that many organizations with a highly petrified hierarchical structure will have to introduce a number of changes aimed at increasing the subjectivity of their employees and shifting the burden of responsibility for the market situation of the organization, including its economic results, from the managerial staff to all the

employees (Strużyna, 2013). According to Juchnowicz (2001, p. 135), “the company of the future should be considered as a joint venture that brings benefits to contractors (...) employed by the company, who should be treated as co-owners, not as hired power”.

Therefore, managers’ effectiveness in the contemporary globalized labour market depends on their ability to manage subordinates in a way that guarantees their subjectivity and allows them to fulfil their individual goals and aspirations. This requires them to have a number of ‘modern’ competences which, when used in the course of team or organization management, would result in their subordinates’ active participation in decision-making and taking responsibility for the organization (Kraczlá, 2013). Expanding employee participation is a process that increases the socio-economic effectiveness of an organization and its competitiveness in the contemporary, dynamic, and extremely demanding global market (Juchnowicz, 2001). The most desirable managerial competences include creativity, independence, initiative, communication skills, emotional stability, change management, ability to take risks, ability to resolve conflicts, and focus on development. Additionally, other useful traits include adequate self-esteem, high morale, self-efficacy, a genuine ability to develop and support the development of subordinates, and the ability to develop a good work-life of both managers themselves and their subordinates (cf. Bacon, 2013; Kozak, 2011; Lewicka, 2010; Schultz, D.P., Schultz, S.E., 2006; Penc, 2000; Penc, 2005). What is more, the progressing globalization of economic processes forces managers to possess the knowledge and skills that are required to manage teams that are frequently culturally diverse. The complexity of economic projects and their increasingly global scale make the creation of international teams a necessity. The effective management of such teams requires specific, non-traditional competences that are related to the cultural differences that are reflected in people’s professed values, beliefs, and behaviour patterns, such as methods of communication. Professional management of such a team is associated with the need for different forms of communication, motivation, or control of people from different cultural backgrounds (Kostera, Śliwa, 2012).

It can therefore be said that the role of psychological factors in the efficient delivery of a managerial role, or more broadly, in the efficient management of an organization, is not only a postulate expressed by psychologists who take a specific perspective on the functioning of organizations. Increasingly, the importance of social competences is also emphasized by theoreticians and practitioners of organisational and management sciences, and even by representatives of economic sciences. All these groups agree that achieving an organization’s goals, including in the organizational, technological or economic dimensions, is impossible without strong interpersonal and social competences of managerial staff.

3. Personality potential

In psychological literature, *personality* is defined in many different ways, depending on the author's research perspective, beliefs or theoretical assumptions (Cervone, Pervin, 2011). Research into this subject conducted by G. Allport allowed him to distinguish over 50 definitions of personality (1937). Based on his analysis, G. Allport prepared his own interpretation, which is considered to be a classic definition of personality that has been described as "a dynamic organization of those psycho-physical systems of an individual that determine their way of adapting to the environment" (from Siek, 1982, p. 19). Following from this definition, personality should be thought of as "the range of ways in which a person reacts to and interacts with others" (Robbins, Judge, 2012, p. 44). Contemporary definitions of personality refer more precisely to its constituent elements. L.A. Pervin, for example, points out that "personality is a complex totality of thoughts, emotions and behaviours that gives direction and pattern (coherence) to human life" (Pervin, 2002, p. 416).

It is worth noting here that both the classic and contemporary definitions emphasize the integrating function of personality and expose its dynamic structure and holistic complexity (Oleś, 2003).

Much of the interest in personality psychology comes from the fact that it provides a basis for understanding human emotions, ways of thinking, and above all, behaviour. Usually, the area of research is centred around (1) what is common to all people, (2) differences between individuals, and (3) individual uniqueness. **"All personality psychologists use the term personality to refer to the psychological characteristics that contribute to the [relatively] persistent and distinctive patterns of feeling, thinking, and behaviour"** (Cervone, Pervin, 2011, p. 10). Personality can also be understood as the reason for characteristic human behaviours in various and often very diverse situations. McAdams and Pals (2006, after Zimbardo et al., 2010) put forward a definition of personality as the "default settings" of an individual's behaviour and reactions. In this approach, **personality** is perceived as the **"psychological properties that determine the continuity of an individual's behaviour in different situations and at different times"** (Zimbardo et al., 2010, p. 25).

As Argyle (2002) points out, people react differently to social life situations and differ in terms of their social behaviour style, and these differences can be accurately described and explained by means of people's personality traits. Personality traits are relatively constant psychological properties that determine the unique personality structure of an individual: they determine their social functioning and make up its uniqueness (Cervone, Pervin, 2011). Therefore, upon examination of one's personality traits, it is possible to predict the dynamics of the development of the entire psychological system of a given individual and determine the mechanisms that shape their behaviour and predispositions (Robbins, Judge, 2012). Although the concept of a personality trait is not defined unequivocally in the literature on the subject,

and heated discussions are still taking place around it, it is widely recognized that the pragmatic nature of the personality trait concept is so great that it is worth using it to analyse and describe people's personalities (Pervin, 2002).

Personality traits can serve as indicators for the description and analysis of one's personality, and they constitute certain constant dimensions that are unique for every individual. Therefore, they are a practical measure that makes it possible to describe people's behavioural tendencies as well as the intensity of these behaviours (Cervone, Pervin, 2011).

According to Siek (1986), psychological features are the foundations for the development of larger structures, referred to as personality types or personality dimensions. This notion is well described in the literature; it will not be the subject of broader analysis in this article as it seems that the concept of personality traits as basic indicators describing personality structure and development is sufficient on its own for the study of the personality correlates revealed in managers' behaviours.

The concept of personality is based on the assumption that personality is a relatively constant whole, which means "an individual's configuration of traits remains unchanged" (Pervin, 2002, p. 69). Of course, modern researchers also notice the variability of personality, its constituent traits, and the resulting variability displayed in one's behaviour in different situations and different periods of life. Therefore, it seems more important to determine "to what extent one's personality is stable or variable", and what level of intensity and constancy of a given trait should be assumed in order to claim that it underpins a given person's psychological structure and determines their behaviour (Pervin, 2002). This contrast between personality traits' stability and development over time is most often presented in two aspects. The first is personality stability, which is determined by the invariability of specific personality traits over time; the other is personality consistency, i.e., the fact that the same features are revealed in different situations (Pervin, 2002). In the subject literature, many studies indicate the stability of personality and its features even over the course of several decades (cf. Fraley, 2002; McCrae, Costa, 1994).

A lot more ambiguity, however, can be found in research results concerning personality consistency, i.e., expectations of the same reactions in different social situations. The difficulty of identifying identical or even similar reactions in different situational contexts led researchers to formulate the principle of aggregation, which claims that "a given personality trait is not expressed in a specific behaviour in a given situation but in various behaviours in various situations" (Pervin, 2002, p. 71).

In the light of the above considerations, it should be concluded that the most justified position is to acknowledge that a person's personality is relatively constant and stable, but this does not necessarily determine a full description of their behaviours as these can be either stable (the same) or variable. It should be also assumed that, apart from personality traits, the revealed behaviours are also influenced to a large extent by situational conditions, which may significantly affect people's behaviour in specific situations (Pervin, 2002). Factors specific to

a given situation may be a catalyst for the disclosure of a specific personality trait. If, on the other hand, no specific factors dominate in a given situation and do not determine it, it is one's personality traits that will directly influence one's behaviour (Chabris, Simons, 2011). It is also worth noting that people are not only passive objects influenced by situations, but they always contribute somehow to the creation of a given situation through their inevitable influence as a participant in it (Makin et al., 2000).

In general, contemporary personality psychologists agree that the theory of personality traits well describes a person's personality and its structure in a static sense. This approach makes it possible to describe a person's behaviour in terms of tendencies towards behaviours that are typical of this person. However, this theory does not describe their personality in a dynamic approach with regard to changeable situations and the resulting determinants of one's behaviour (Oleś, 2003).

When considering the question of personality in analysing a manager's functioning in their professional role, which is the core subject of these considerations, it should be assumed that a manager's personality is a factor which significantly influences their decisions and actions, even if the manager themselves is not at all aware of this. Apart from personality, the other factors influencing the manner and effectiveness of management include the features, behaviours and expectations of the manager's superior; the characteristics and behaviour of their subordinates; the behaviour and expectations of other managers; or their organisation's culture (Stoner, Wankel, 1995). Although this list (which is not exhaustive) shows that the functioning of a manager is conditioned by many dimensions, it is personality that is the basic determinant that correlates and provides dispositions that shape their behaviour, therefore it determines success or failure in the effective achievement of goals and people management (Smoleński, 1990). Actually, it seems that understanding managerial behaviour is even impossible without referring to their personality as the basic factor determining their functioning within the organisation (cf. Hughes et al., 1996). This is due to the fact that **personality influences the entire spectrum of dispositions in terms of thinking, feeling and behaviour** (Roberts, 2006). Analysis of a manager's personality traits and their interaction with the organisation's external environment allows the explanation and understanding of their preferred behaviours towards subordinates (Kozusznik, 1994).

About 30 years ago, organisations began to pay more attention to their employees' personalities and their role in the functioning of the organisation. Recruitment procedures started to use psychometric tools that allow, more or less professionally, to analyse employees' personality, especially managers, in order for an organisation to make good hiring decisions. Initially, the main focus was on the proper matching of an employee's personality to their future job position. However, it was quickly noticed that narrowing the scope of analysis of the prospective employee's personality to only the workplace is far from sufficient and does not explain a number of issues that are important from the point of view of the entire organisation. Therefore, the area of this research was expanded to include how an employee adapts their

personality to the organisation's structure and culture. Analysis of managers' behaviour in the context of their personality predispositions requires a good understanding of many dimensions of the managerial role. A manager's direct influence on their subordinates is commonly taken into account as the most obvious area of influence and an important dimension characterizing the managerial role. However, this approach seems to be oversimplified and an excessive focus on this element may pose the risk of overlooking other extremely important areas that are influenced by managers' personality, such as their relationships with other managers or their organisation's culture (Robbins, Judge, 2012). Nowadays, many authors even believe that a "manager's task in their organisation is to build culture, i.e., organizational identity, understood as common assumptions, norms, patterns of behaviour, and values (expressed through needs) that are universal and have a humanistic character" (Kozak, 2007, p. 142).

The role of a manager's personality in creating the value of the organisation is raised by many authors. A manager's behaviour, which is determined by their personality, shapes the cultural norms of the organization, its work standards, and the patterns that are followed, all of which are reflected in interpersonal relations (Adamska-Chudzińska, 2007, 2008; Kozak, 2007). Attention should be paid in particular to the personality determinants of managerial attitudes such as social responsibility and pro-social behaviour. These two attitudes, as "relatively constant elements of one's personality, are highly active in judgement processes and are visible as a motivation to act in a particular way" (Kozak, 2007, p. 277). Therefore, it is not a coincidence that many scientific studies raise the issue of managerial maturity, which refers not to managers' substantive (competence) maturity but to their personality maturity. As Banaszak (2007) points out, managers who are responsible for the launch, course and effects of all organizational processes have a key impact on shaping the work environment and the forms and levels of interpersonal cooperation. These processes can progress with mutual respect and recognition, which will lead to the development of the organisation. Unfortunately, they can also trigger pathological phenomena and, in some cases, even lead to the collapse of the organization. The key issue is that managers, and in fact their personal personality potentials, determine the course of the development of not only the competence but also the personality of the entire organization. Thus, a modern, conscious manager is expected to be a mature person who is focused on development and change.

4. Managerial maturity in the personality context

Currently, modern science assumes that managerial behaviour results from the mutual interaction between the organisational situation and the manager's personality. This interaction determines the end result of actions taken by the manager to achieve organizational plans and intentions (Gliszczynska, 1991, Osborne, 2015). For this reason, the manager's business and

organizational effectiveness is now understood as the effect of their expertise, skills, their own personality, their subordinates' personality and qualifications, and the situational variables that define the space for the management process (Jadwiga, 2008).

Nowadays, it is widely known that in order for a manager to achieve success, even their thorough technical knowledge or expertise is not enough. Most of all, an effective manager needs to be a mature person who, by means of their attitude and behaviour in everyday interactions with subordinates, is able to develop them, motivate them, and achieve organisational goals, and it is the manager who is ultimately responsible for this. This is not possible without a properly functioning and mature personality, which cannot be replaced by a large intellectual or knowledge potential.

Striving for a mature personality requires its development. This process may take place through changes resulting from the internal potential of the individual, or through changes originating from the outside world. One's internal development happens when, by the force of their will or through internal motivation, one tries to get rid of one's unfavourable features that cause ineffectiveness or lack of satisfaction with life. Personality changes that originate outside the individual are caused by their environment and cause changes in their value system and relationships with other people. Of course, in the real world, these two ways of development do not exist in their pure forms. And, even if they did, this would not be fully beneficial as people's internal development without a link with their external environment would mean improvement of only their psychological features. Such development would become an autotelic goal that is not connected with people's existential situation and does not make it possible to determine whether personality changes are going in the right direction. On the other hand, personality development that attempts to achieve maturity under the influence of external factors only without being grounded in psychological features might be very short-lived and would not give the individual a sense of meaning and satisfaction (Kozak, 2011).

There seems to be agreement in the literature on the idea that a mature personality has certain features that build it. A thorough review of such features was performed by Zamorski, who indicated those that most often make up a mature personality (Zamorski, 2003):

- openness to experience,
- no defensive attitude,
- clear and precise awareness of personality coherence,
- unconditional self-esteem,
- harmonious relationships with people,
- being guided by intuition rather than inference (although one's rational thinking allows one to amend one's intuitive behaviour),
- choosing experiences that allow one to develop and experience joy,
- flexibility and ability to correct attitudes by addressing both internal and external conditions.

An interesting concept of mature personality was presented by Allport. In his view, personality is a dynamic creation that is shaped by an individual's interactions with the surrounding environment. Development towards maturity is about choosing forms of behaviour that allow one to achieve consistency and stability, as well as set goals that are valuable to the given individual. Allport (1998) identifies six criteria of a mature personality:

1. **Expanding the range of one's 'sense of self'**, understood as searching for new experiences, curiosity in the world, and a constant search for information. A person who extends the range of their own 'sense of self' eagerly discusses with others, looks for new solutions, is not afraid of new knowledge and experiences, is flexible in thinking, and uses the knowledge and suggestions of others. This interpretation of expanding one's 'sense of self' is related to experiencing satisfaction when these experiences are consistent with the individual's views; however, it is also related to their frustration when these experiences are inconsistent and, for example, when they make it difficult to achieve goals or consolidate one's self-esteem. However, a mature person is not afraid of this kind of experience because they are able to accept failures or mistakes and different points of view. With regard to the role of a manager, expanding the reach of the 'sense of self' enables them to acquire new information about themselves and integrate it into a coherent whole. A manager's openness to discussion and confronting their visions and expectations with others, in particular with subordinates, makes it possible to set goals that are not only in line with their own needs and expectations but also take into account the needs of their employees.
2. **Warm relationships with others.** According to Allport, the maturity of a manager's personality is manifested in the creation of close emotional relations with their subordinates, great empathy, understanding, and patience for otherness. A mature manager turns to using their position of power only when managing people in critical situations, otherwise they prioritize influencing through persuasion and understanding their subordinates' needs. A manager's mature personality allows them to treat each subordinate as a valuable person with their own unique capital of subjective experiences and knowledge. A mature personality allows a manager to see others not as useful for their career, but as partners in mutual development and satisfaction in personal and professional life, thus a manager can subjectify their subordinates.
3. **Emotional security and self-acceptance** are very important features of a manager's mature personality. The role of a manager is associated with many situations in which there is the risk and uncertainty of generating stress and frustration. A manager with a mature personality is able to understand their own emotions and manage them properly. This manager does not suppress bad emotions and does not behave defensively. Instead, managers accept emotions as an inevitable part of their role and try to take actions that will eliminate the sources of negative emotions. Self-acceptance helps managers tolerate their own deficits and accept negative emotions without falling into excessive self-criticism, depression, and without covering up their negative

emotions with aggression. A mature manager is able to build a sense of emotional security in their team, which they manage by means of open communication and accepting the range of emotions that result from the practice of managing a group of people.

4. **Realistic assessment of the environment and of others** is another feature of a manager's mature personality. Mature managers are characterized by common sense and adequate assessment of events. On the one hand, they do not exaggerate things unnecessarily; on the other hand, they do not underestimate the potential and achievements of other people. They can live here and now without running away into dreams and confabulations when difficult situations occur. Although they do not lack imagination, they do not use it for defensive purposes but rather to boldly create new visions and projects which are realistically adapted to the existing possibilities. Thanks to the proper assessment of situations and the proper assessment of their own and other people's capabilities, a mature manager perfectly copes with the unpredictability and changeability of the conditions in which they have to achieve business goals.
5. **Self-objectification** is another criterion of a manager's mature personality. It means perfect knowledge of both oneself and the motives that push one to action. It also allows a manager to have some distance to themselves, which makes it easier to accept failures or one's own deficits. This distance is also a prerequisite of a sense of humour, which is also a feature of a mature personality. Humour is an expression of the joy of acting and being here and now; it is a manifestation of sympathy for people nearby. A mature manager is far from being malicious, aggressive or cynical. However, a manager's objective perception of themselves and recognition of their own negative qualities do not constrain their self-esteem and self-assessment; instead, this is an impulse to work on their development. Any feedback they receive from others can be helpful in this process as, thanks to their good insight into themselves, they accept it without escaping into defence mechanisms. Instead, it inspires them to work on improving and developing their own personality. Such an approach allows a manager to manage people autonomously without being subject to the pressure and expectations of the environment.
6. **A unifying philosophy of life** is another feature of a mature personality. It refers to the consistency between one's consciously recognized system of values and the activities that are undertaken in everyday life or professional practice. Integrating one's own short-term and long-term goals with the professed system of values gives one's life a sense of meaning and importance. It also allows for greater consistency in actions and prevents changes caused by random, short-term motivations. Although a mature manager is willing to discuss their own views and actions, their unifying philosophy of life is consistent with their values and gives them their own unique specificity, which is noticed by the people in the surrounding environment. It is also visible in the decisions that they make in the day-to-day management of their team of employees.

Summing up, it can be concluded that the maturity of a manager's personality manifests itself in many different dimensions. The most important one is the ability to make independent decisions without fear of making a mistake and without taking into account the expectations of the environment. Moreover, a mature manager maintains warm relations with other people, in particular with their subordinates. There is no need to seek the favour of others or take action aimed at winning the approval of others. This should not be necessary as a mature manager has adequate self-esteem which is not vulnerable to criticism they might receive from others. They have a good insight into themselves, which allows them to maintain distance from their own emotions and everyday events, or even to react with a sense of humour. A mature manager does not strive to prove their perfection to others. Instead, they are able to accept the necessity to continue working on themselves and be responsible for their own mistakes. They live here and now and gain satisfaction from what they are and the world around them. Mature managers are gifted with great imagination and creativity, but they do not run away from everyday problems into dreams. A mature manager is emotionally stable. They do not hide their emotions and can manage them in a manner which is consistent with the rational requirements of their professional role. They have a sense of security, which means that in the event of failures or criticism from others, they do not react using defence mechanisms and can accept responsibility for their mistakes. A mature manager has a relatively permanent value system that gives meaning to their life and is also visible in their managerial activities (Kozak, 2011).

A mature manager, like every other human being, has strengths and weaknesses. However, what distinguishes them from immature managers is their focus on developing strengths. Thanks to that, they can strengthen their independent 'sense of self', which allows them to create a sense of autonomy and conduct while managing their team in a way that is independent of external expectations but in line with their own will. By acting on the basis of their autonomous motivation, a manager identifies with the actions taken, willingly takes responsibility for them, and acts with passion and expectation of success (Kozak, 2007).

Focusing on one's strengths has another important correlate. It turns out that such people cope with stress much better and function better in a changing and unpredictable environment, as well as under time pressure. Under such conditions, they can choose strategies that better serve the achievement of goals, including (Kozak, 2011):

- accepting responsibility for solving problems,
- looking for information, help, support,
- creating realistic action plans,
- focus on implementing plans and postponing any activities that conflict with them,
- optimistic attitude to action.

A manager with a mature personality constantly strives for success and believes that its achievement is possible or, with adequate effort, certain, or at least more likely than failure. According to Markowski (2003), characteristic features of success are:

- no reliance on luck – success is a consequence of planned and deliberate actions,
- considerable effort, including creativity and perseverance, is involved when trying to achieve success,
- the inevitable uncertainty of achieving a given goal,
- sense of satisfaction when a goal has been achieved.

Success may be related to achieving goals in one's job position or by the entire organization. However, it can also relate to the internal development of a manager and may be seen as their desire to do better than in the past. By looking back on their own development in the past rather than that of other people, a manager can identify their own huge internal motivation resources, and this does not require confrontations or comparisons with others. A mature manager's pursuit of success is characterized by a constant critical overview of the undertaken actions. Thanks to their high self-esteem and faith in success, a mature manager does not dodge the need to change decisions, which might be necessary in order to improve their operational efficiency. On the contrary, their behaviour is constantly subject to a process of self-regulation through observation and evaluation of the effects of actions, and, if necessary, immediate correction aimed at improving the achieved results (Kozak, 2011).

An important feature of a mature manager is their self-efficacy. This can be understood as the feeling that they can control their own behaviour in a way which facilitates meeting the requirements of a particular situation and achieving goals. A manager's belief in their own effectiveness largely determines their determination to make persistent efforts to overcome obstacles that hinder the intended result. Achieving success causes an increase in self-efficacy in the long term (Bandura, 1981; as cited in Kozak, 2011).

Bearing in mind the purpose of this article and the considerations described so far, it seems justified to point to a direct connection between the issue of a manager's personality traits and maturity, and the effectiveness of their actions.

Based on a large amount of empirical evidence, it may be concluded that, among many other factors, it is personality that seems to be the strongest element that determines the effectiveness of a manager's functioning (Hogan, Kaiser, 2010). Many researchers also flag the problem of apparently insufficient reference to personality factors when trying to understand managers' behaviours (cf. Hughes et al., 1996; Kraczkla, 2016).

It is worth emphasising that the complexity of the conditions in which managers are forced to perform the role they have been entrusted with requires a suitable personality, which can be perceived as an internal source of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of action (Osmelak, 2008). Personality is the foundation upon which a manager should be able to build strong and effective employee teams, with the aim of achieving bold organizational goals (Osborne, 2015). This is why recognition of both a manager's root personality factors and aspirations to strengthen them – as part of the process of shaping a mature personality – are crucial in explaining a manager's behaviour and are a condition for successful outcomes of their actions.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this article has been to demonstrate the relationship between the maturity of a manager's personality and the effects the manager produces. It is an attempt to present this relationship by analysing various professional roles that a manager plays in a contemporary organisation. A particularly strong relationship seems to occur between the maturity of managers and the social roles they play, as these factors are gaining increased importance for and influence on an organisation's success.

Analysis of the effective performance of managerial roles, however, would be incomplete if a manager's personality were not addressed. As shown in the article, there is a close relationship between a manager's personality traits and the personality development that occurs in interaction with the social environment on one hand, and the efficiency and effectiveness in achieving set goals on the other hand.

The complexity of a manager's work and the diversity of their character, combined with major changes in the challenges faced by contemporary managers, mean that even favourable personality traits and their dynamic development through interaction with the work environment are not sufficient. It seems that a manager's mature personality significantly increases their chances of meeting these greater, more complex, diverse and changing expectations. Therefore, the last part of the article focused on the description of a mature personality and its characteristic features and change dynamics. A manager's personality maturity results in consistent behaviours which comply with the values that they themselves endorse; this, in turn, allows for their self-fulfilment in performing their managerial roles.

References

1. Adamska-Chudzińska, M. (2007). Płaszczyzny zaangażowania społecznego w działalności organizacji promowanie idei czy trud realizacji? In: S. Banaszak, K. Doktor (Eds.), *Socjologiczne i psychologiczne problemy organizacji i zarządzania* (pp. 273-278). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Komunikacji i Zarządzania.
2. Adamska-Chudzińska, M. (2008). Zachowana prospołeczne w przedsiębiorstwie a spójność społeczno-ekonomiczna. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytet Rzeszowski*, 12, 409-421.
3. Allport, G.W. (1937). *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
4. Allport, G.W. (1998). *Osobowość a religia*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
5. Argyle, M. (2002). *Psychologia stosunków międzyludzkich*. Warszawa: PWN.
6. Bacon, T.R. (2013). *Sztuka skutecznego przywództwa*. Sopot: GWP.

7. Bacon, T.R. (2013). *Sztuka skutecznego przywództwa*. Sopot: GWP.
8. Banaszak, S. (2007). Dylematy moralne współczesnych menedżerów. In: S. Banaszak, K. Doktor (Eds.), *Socjologiczne i psychologiczne problemy organizacji i zarządzania* (pp. 129-139). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Komunikacji i Zarządzania.
9. Bandura, A. (1981). Self-Referent Thought: The Development of Self-Efficacy. In: J.H. Flavel, L.D. Ross (Eds.), *Cognitive Social Development: Frontiers and Possible Futures* (pp. 124-135). New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Bartkowiak, G. (1994). *Psychologia zarządzania*. Poznań: AE.
11. Blanchard, K. (2013). *Przywództwo wyższego stopnia*. Warszawa: PWN.
12. Borowiecki, R., Jaki, A. (2015). Restrukturyzacja – od transformacji do globalizacji. *Przegląd Organizacji*, 9(908), 4-9.
13. Bratnicki, M., Kulikowska-Pawlak, M. (2013). Uwarunkowania pomiaru efektywności organizacji. *Zarządzanie i finance*, 4(2), 53-66.
14. Cervone, D., Pervin, L.A. (2011). *Osobowość: teoria i badania*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
15. Chabris, Ch., Simons, D. (2011). *Niewidzialny goryl. Dlaczego intuicja nas zawodzi*. Warszawa: MT Biznes Sp. z o.o.
16. Drucker, P.F. (1976). *Skuteczne zarządzanie*. Warszawa: PWN.
17. Drucker, P.F. (2004). *Zawód menedżer*. Warszawa: MT Biznes.
18. Fraley, R.C. (2002). Attachment Stability from Infancy Adulthood: Meta-Analysis and Dynamic Modeling of Developmental Mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 123-151.
19. Gliszczyńska, X. (1991). *Psychologiczny model efektywności pracy*. Warszawa: PWN.
20. Griffin, R.W. (2000). *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*. Warszawa: PWN.
21. Hallowell, E.M. (2011). *Shine: Using Brain Science to Get the Best from People*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
22. Hodgetts, R.M. (1977). *Introduction to Business*. Boston: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
23. Hogan, R., Kaiser, R.B. (2010). Personality. In: J.C. Scott, D.H. Reynolds (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Assessment, Organizational Studies* (pp. 81-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
24. Hughes, R.L., Ginnett, R.C., Curphy, G.J. (1996). *Leadership*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
25. Jadwiga, M. (2008). Koncepcje i metody doboru menedżerów. In: A. Sajkiewicz (Ed.), *Kompetencje menedżerów w organizacji uczącej się* (pp. 152-177). Warszawa: Difin.
26. Juchnowicz, M. (2001). Partycypacja jako narzędzie polityki personalnej. In: K. Makowski (Ed.), *Zarządzanie pracownikami. Instrumenty polityki personalnej* (pp. 135-155). Warszawa: POLTEXT.
27. Kaplan, R.S. (2013). *O co zapytasz człowieka w lustrze?* Gliwice: Helion S.A.

28. Kostera, M., Śliwa, M. (2012). *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer Polska.
29. Kozak, A. (2007). Menedżer nośnikiem wartości w organizacji. In: S. Banaszak, K. Doktor (Eds.), *Socjologiczne i psychologiczne problemy organizacji i zarządzania* (pp. 141-150). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Komunikacji i Zarządzania.
30. Kozak, A. (2011). *Dojrzałość menedżerska*. Warszawa: Difin.
31. Kożusznik, B. (1994). *Psychologia w pracy menedżera*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.
32. Kożusznik, B. (2002). *Zachowania człowieka w organizacji*. Warszawa: PWE.
33. Kraczlą, M. (2013). *Osobowościowe uwarunkowania przywództwa. Menedżerowie a specjaliści*. Dąbrowa Górnicza: Wydawnictwo WSB w Dąbrowie Górniczej.
34. Kraczlą, M. (2016). *Stres w pracy menedżera*. Warszawa: CeDeWu.
35. Lewicka, D. (2010). *Zarządzanie kapitałem ludzkim w polskich przedsiębiorstwach*. Warszawa: PWN.
36. Łukasiewicz, M. (1998). Uwarunkowania wykorzystania oceny umiejętności społecznych kierownika do zwiększania skuteczności kierowania. In: S. Witkowski (Ed.), *Prace psychologiczne XLVII – psychologiczne wyznaczniki sukcesu w zarządzaniu, Vol. 4* (pp. 137-144). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
37. Makin, P., Cooper, C., Cox, Ch. (2000). *Organizacja a kontrakt psychologiczny*. Warszawa: PWN.
38. Markowski, K. (2003). Podmiotowe uwarunkowania skutecznego zarządzania. In: E. Bojar (Ed.), *Menedżer XXI wieku. Ile wiedzy, ile umiejętności?* (pp. 17-27). Lublin: Politechnika Lubelska, Towarzystwo Naukowe Organizacji i Zarządzania.
39. McCrae, R.R., Costa, P.T. (1994). The Stability of Personality: Observations and Evaluations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 3, 173-175.
40. Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper and Row.
41. Nieckarz, Z. (2014). Stres i efektywność pracy menedżera. In: T. Konieczny (Ed.), *Stres w organizacji* (pp. 63-82). Gdańsk: Harmonia Universalis.
42. Nogalski, B. (2009). Rozważania o modelach biznesowych przedsiębiorstw jako ciekawego poznawczo kierunku badań problematyki zarządzania strategicznego. In: R. Krupski (Ed.), *Zarządzanie strategiczne. Problemy, kierunki badań* (pp. 9-27). Wałbrzych: Wałbrzyska Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania i Przedsiębiorczości.
43. Oleś, P.K. (2003). *Wprowadzenie do psychologii osobowości*. Warszawa: Scholar.
44. Osborne, C. (2015). *Leadership*. London: Penguin Random House.
45. Penc, J. (2000). *Menedżer w uczącej się organizacji*. Łódź: Menadżer.
46. Penc, J. (2005). *Role i umiejętności menedżerskie*. Warszawa: Difin.
47. Pervin, L.A. (2002). *Psychologia osobowości*. Gdańsk: GWP.
48. Pietrasieński, Z. (1994). *Znakomici szefowie i ich podwładni*. Warszawa: First Business College.

49. Pietruszka-Ortyl, A., Gach, D. (2005). Przywództwo i style kierowania. In: A. Potocki (Ed.), *Zachowania organizacyjne* (pp. 204-246). Warszawa: Difin.
50. Pochtowski, A. (2003). *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi. Strategie – procesy – metody*. Warszawa: PWE.
51. Pochtowski, A. (2008). *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi. Strategie – procesy – metody*. Warszawa: PWE.
52. Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A. (2012). *Zachowania w organizacji*. Warszawa: PWE.
53. Roberts, B.W. (2006). Personality Development and Organizational Behaviour. In: B.M. Staw (Ed.), *Research on Organizational Behaviour* (pp. 1-41). Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
54. Sajkiewicz, A., Sajkiewicz, Ł. (2002). *Nowoczesne metody pracy z ludźmi*. Warszawa: Poltext.
55. Schultz, D.P., Schultz, S.E. (2006). *Psychologia a wyzwania dzisiejszej pracy*. Warszawa: PWN.
56. Siek, S. (1982). *Osobowość. Struktura, rozwój i wybrane metody badania*. Warszawa: ATK.
57. Siek, S. (1986). *Formowanie osobowości*. Warszawa: ATK.
58. Smolbim-Jęczmień, A. (1999). Badania i ocena efektywności pracy. In: Z. Jasiński (Ed.), *Zarządzanie pracą* (pp. 243-264). Warszawa: Agencja Wydawnicza Placet.
59. Smoleński, S. (1990). *Praca kierownicza*. Gdynia: Wydawnictwo Uczelniane WSM.
60. Stoner, J.A.F., Freeman, R.E., Gilbert, D.R. (1997). *Kierowanie*. Warszawa: PWE.
61. Stoner, J.A.F., Wankel, Ch. (1992). *Kierowanie*. Warszawa: PWE.
62. Stoner, J.A.F., Wankel, Ch. (1995). *Kierowanie*. Warszawa: PWN.
63. Strużyna, J. (2013). Puzzle „bycia zatrudnionym” – wyzwania nowego HRM dla menedżerów. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Łódzkiej Organizacja i Zarządzanie*, 1146(51), 40-49.
64. Terelak, J.F. (1999). *Psychologia menedżera*. Warszawa: Difin.
65. Wajda, A. (1999). *Spoleczne podstawy organizacji i zarządzania*. Warszawa: Akademia Obrony Narodowej.
66. Zamorski, J. (2003). *Dojrzałość psychologiczna: uwarunkowania wychowawcze obrazu siebie*. Lublin: Polihymnia.
67. Zbiegień-Maciąg, J. (2008). *Kultura w organizacji*. Warszawa: PWN.
68. Zieleniewski, J. (1978). *Organizacja zespołów ludzkich*. Warszawa: PWN.
69. Ziębicki, B. (2007). Efektywność a jakość w sektorze publicznym. In: A. Potocki (Ed.), *Spoleczne aspekty przeobrażeń organizacyjnych* (pp. 332-339). Warszawa: Difin.
70. Zimbardo, P.G., Johnson, R.L., McCann, V. (2010). *Psychologia. Kluczowe koncepcje*. Warszawa: PWN.