Journal of Intercultural Management
Vol. **15** | No. **4** | **2023**
pp. **147–177**
DOI **10.2478/joim-2023-0021**

Justyna Dziedzic
University of Social Sciences, Poland
jdziedzic@san.edu.pl
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8292-0892

Łukasz Sułkowski
Jagiellonian University, Poland
lukasz.sulkowski@uj.edu.pl
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1248-2743

Challenges of Academic Ethos: The Scientific Community's Response to the Ostracism of Russian Scientists Following the Invasion of Ukraine

ABSTRACT

Objective: The primary aim of this article is to understand how contemporary scientists from the Polish academic community perceive the scientific ethos in the context of ostracism within the scientific community, which emerged following Russia's invasion of Ukraine. The article focuses on analyzing the epistemological and ethical implications of this ostracism in the academic context, considering Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

Methodology: For this purpose, in-depth interviews were conducted within the Polish scientific community (11 participants), with respondents with degrees (full professors, Ph. D's, associate professors, assistant professors, and professor emeritus), and literature review was carried out.

Findings: Based on the discussion, the research findings illuminate diverse approaches within the Polish academic community regarding the ostracism of Russian scientists following Ukraine's invasion, shedding light on the intricate interplay between personal beliefs, scientific ethos, and educational values while also highlighting the multifaceted ethical challenges faced by scientific research, especially within military and political contexts.

Value Added: The study suggests the necessity for academic institutions to establish clear protocols for knowledge dissemination and crisis management that respect the ethos of scientific work while being adaptable to the shifting geopolitical landscape. It is also recommended that there should be a concerted effort to create forums for international scholarly dialogue to ensure that ostracism does not stifle academic collaboration and knowledge advancement.

Recommendations: This article contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical insights into how the academic community navigates the ethical dilemmas posed by geopolitical conflicts. Moreover, it underscores the importance of maintaining the integrity of the scientific discourse amidst external pressures, offering a nuanced understanding of the interplay between political events and academic practices.

Key words: ostracism, academic ethos, scientists, post-academicism, military science

JEL codes: M14, I23, Z13, P48

Introduction

Ethos is intrinsically associated with a collective entity, reflecting the unique characteristics, communal rationale, and shared behavior that underscore its distinct role and identity. Ethos should manifest a community's collective morality and customs in the academic context. The ethos of scientists[1] reflects the diversity inherent in their approach to the profession. It may be related to tendencies that appear in the context of the scientific field, the labor market itself, internal diversity, differences in individual approach toward science, or identity diversity. However, within the institutional context of science, personal considerations yield

1 The term "scientists" is deliberately used over alternatives like "scholar" or "academic" to underscore the specific professional identity of the individuals concerned. This choice highlights the empirical, experimental nature of their work, grounded in the scientific method. This is pertinent given the article's focus on topics such as ethical considerations in scientific research and the responsibility of scientists within their professional domain. The term "scientists" thus ensures an accurate representation of the group, closely aligning with the article's exploration of the scientific ethos.

to the issues pertinent to the collective, which ought to be examined through a social lens.

The debate on the associative-normative aspects of scientific functioning is also mirrored in the discourse that emerged following Russia's invasion of Ukraine. The normative dimension encompasses potential actions, including systemic measures, undertaken by state and university authorities to preclude Russian scientists from participating in scientific endeavors and collaboration beyond their national borders. A critical inquiry pertains to scientists' interpretation of normative exclusion, particularly in this instance, considering the scientific ethos, post-academism, and scientific collaboration. These factors influence the prospective growth of the science industry and are shaped by state and institutional regulations. Within these deliberations, there is contemplation over whether knowledge production is reverting to a realm of politically engaged science. Within this context, scientific ostracism is utilized, and conventional references to scientific identity are being explored. Given the rising geopolitical tensions and their influence on the academic sphere, this article aims to understand the perception and response of the Polish scientific community to the ostracism of Russian scientists following the Ukraine invasion. This research fills a notable void in scholarly literature concerning the academic ethos and post-academism amidst international conflicts. The motivation for this study arises from a noticeable gap in existing literature regarding the intersection of academic ethos, post-academism, and international conflict, specifically focusing on the recent geopolitical tensions between Russia and Ukraine.

The research question guiding this study is: How does the Polish academic community interpret and respond to the ostracism of Russian scientists in the wake of the Ukraine invasion, and how do these responses correlate with the academic ethos and the phenomenon of post-academism? This question is pivotal in understanding the dynamic interplay between academic values and geopolitical crises.

The article employs a qualitative research methodology, using in-depth interviews with eleven Polish scientists from public and private sectors across various disciplines. This approach is chosen due to the sensitive and complex

nature of the subject, allowing for a detailed exploration of individual beliefs and reactions within the context of academic ethos and the ostracism of Russian scientists.

The study's objectives are twofold: first, to explore how the Polish scientific community perceives the scientific ethos in the context of the ostracism following Russia's invasion of Ukraine; second, to analyze the epistemological and ethical implications of this ostracism in the academic context. This is achieved by formulating and exploring three research hypotheses, each addressing different dimensions of the study's central question.

The methodology section of this article offers a comprehensive overview of the study's design, including participant selection, data collection, and analysis. The interviews provided a rich and diverse dataset, facilitating an in-depth understanding of the participants' perspectives on the complex issues. Snowball sampling enables access to a wide range of participants, enhancing the depth and quality of the data.

The interviews yielded a rich data collection, facilitating a profound analysis through an identity model of scientific ethos. Utilizing NVivo software to analyze interview transcripts enabled efficient management and organization of extensive textual data. The coding process in NVivo, involving identifying and classifying critical statements and concepts, allowed for a detailed analysis and interpretation of the collected material. This tool was crucial in extracting patterns and relationships that form the foundation for a deeper understanding of the issue.

This approach offered detailed insights into respondents' individual beliefs and reactions, vital to understanding the scientific ethos and the ostracism phenomenon within the framework of contemporary geopolitical events.

In summary, this study aims to contribute significantly to the academic discourse on the role of ethos and post-academism in the face of geopolitical crises, using the specific case of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict and its impact on the scientific community. The insights from this research are expected to contribute to a richer understanding of the intricate relationship between academic values, ethical dilemmas, and international conflicts.

Producing knowledge from academic ethos to post-academism

Scientific discussions regarding preferred forms of knowledge production naturally arise due to numerous challenges within the scientific community. These challenges are intertwined with social changes, work ethics, the concept of academies, the inherent difficulty of achieving complete objectivity, and the central role that science and research activities perform. Investigations into the way of generating knowledge were undertaken by Merton (1973), who decided that it is possible to adopt a normative structure of science, which is based on values, freedom, and openness of knowledge exchange, unfettered and selfless search for the truth, the belief that nature is the most crucial instance settling disputes about the physical world. The classical way of producing knowledge (Mode 1) means formal and established scientific practice, which manifests in discipline, hierarchy, homogeneity, and problems solved and proposed by a specific community (Jiménez, 2008). The new mode of knowledge production (Mode 2) stands out from the previous one regarding trans directionality, interactivity, and flexibility and it is more socially responsible (Jiménez, 2008). Mode 3 marks the social responsibility of science (Jiménez, 2008); The Triple Helix (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000) defines the relationship between University, Industry, and Government; The Quadruple and Quintuple Helix (Carayannis et al., 2021) brings a reflection on the profound democracy of knowledge and ecological attitudes to the discussion. An essential voice in the evolution of science was also taken by Ziman (1996b, 1996a, 2002), introducing the category of post-academism.

Ziman discusses how to produce knowledge about academic ethos, considering that Merton's idea that theoretical science is expressed by an ethos that includes functional norms has been debated but has contributed to further inquiries (Ziman, 1996b after Merton, 1942). It introduces the concept of post-academic science, i.e., one that derives from academic sciences and is its continuation. Therefore, it is determined by many values (Ziman, 1995).

Ziman proposes the standard of industrial science: Proprietary, Local Authoritarian, Commissioned, and Expert (Ziman, 1995; Ziman, 1996b). Such features distinguish the nature of industrial science in the form of an expert trait, and we

use the acronym for that idea, which is PLACE (Ziman, 2002). Post-industrial times have brought multinational firms, specialized service units, global coordination, sub-contractors, and the culture of post-academic science will be predominantly postindustrial (Ziman, 1996b).

Ziman (2000) also outlines the concept of "post-academic knowledge", which discusses moral integrity, the power of governments and corporations to initiate research projects, the rationalization of the research process that weakens creativity, and the questioning that the creation of valid neutral knowledge is its sole purpose. Post-academic science contains a reflective postmodern background, but Ziman (2000) explicitly states that science is not noticeably postmodern.

Politically engaged science – a return or a new beginning?

Shifting the epistemological burden from knowledge production individually to broad cooperation can set in motion the institutional mechanisms that financially support their creation and underpin research practice. Then, the phenomena of fashions, desirable directions of research inquiry, or institutionally and governmentally preferred directions of research analysis may be emphasized. Therefore, the question remains whether research practice can be politicized in the face of such ways of initiating research ideas or forms of cooperation. This may mean favoring areas that seem more applicable to stakeholders and serve their essential interests. In a narrow dimension, it directs researchers' attention to specific research problems that reflect the leading trends in the interests of scientific and grant institutions.

The culture of knowledge represents a dimension of contemporary academic identity. It is based on the era of knowledge generation, which may reflect the different dimensions of the ethos of science and manifest the need for social good.

Researchers are also subject to many individualized motivation mechanisms and exhibit different organizational identities (Sułkowski & Dziedzic, 2021). Scholars also experience the political and business influence on the directions of

scientific research and academic development, which are shaped by funding institutions and governmental policies that dictate the allocation of resources and research priorities (Sułkowski & Dziedzic, 2021).

The development of science, technology, and the cultural signs of civilization should influence the development of responsible societies that can anticipate the problems and possibilities of the future and react accordingly. However, the growth of knowledge and the possibility of its transfer is subject to times of uncertainty that generate anxiety. They are also related to the goals of producing knowledge, its ethical contexts, and even understanding relationships and what this knowledge is supposed to serve. Ecological crises exacerbate these anxieties, the depolarization of regions of extreme poverty and hunger and great wealth, or ideological, religious, and geopolitical conflicts. Questions about the knowledge's shape, form, condition, primacy of freedom, and academic responsibility can express an increasingly complex nature and are an area of ontological inquiry.

Ostracism as an attitude of the university – rationality or harm

Ostracism is a state that can be understood as rejection by the environment (Węcowski, 2018). Ignoring and excluding are the two main features of ostracism (Williams & Nida, 2011, p. 71). The term also refers to socially occurring envy, reparation, persecution, and injustice.

The problem of ostracism became the subject of interest in social psychology in the mid-90s of the twentieth century (Williams & Nida, 2011). However, the origins of this social phenomenon can be traced back to Athenian sources. A manifestation of this was the Athenian law allowing one of the prominent citizens to be sentenced to ten years of exile due to grave but often unfounded accusations without trial or the possibility of defense (Węcowski, 2018). An essential stage in shaping the tradition of the sense of the law of ostracism was Aristotle's studies in Politics, in which he inquired that ostracism is a tool of opposition to

excessive exuberance of the individual in *Polis* and a preventive measure against tyranny (Węcowski, 2018). Athenian ostracism consisted of exile, with a ten-year period of distancing, and a peaceful return from the exile of a person, who during this time did not face material punishment (Węcowski, 2018). The ancients saw it as an effective political means and a legal tool (Forsdyke, 2000).

Obviously, in this study of scientific ostracism, we have no right to use findings significant for antiquity, primarily because of its debatable form, ruthlessness, and archaicity. Nevertheless, certain ontological assumptions resulting from Aristotelian times seem adequate as a starting point of a discussion around the idea of ostracism in the context of modern times and the politics of university organizations.

Currently, ostracism is studied by social psychologists as a negative phenomenon for the individual and their experience, and it is disturbing for them (Kerr & Levine, 2008; Wesselmann et al., 2009; Williams, 2007, 2009; Williams & Nida, 2011). People can pick up any signs of exclusion, ignoring, and ostracism, which results from the benefits of belonging to a group and from strategies for dealing with the threat of ostracism (Buss, 1990; Kerr & Levine, 2008; Wesselmann et al., 2009). Brief episodes of ostracism cause sadness and anger and threaten a person's basic needs (Williams, 2007a). Persistent exposure to ostracism over time can lead to resignation, alienation, helplessness, and depression (Williams, 2009). Ostracism permeates social life so strongly that all people experience it directly (as victims or perpetrators) or indirectly (as observers) (Zadro, 2004). People perceive punitive, defensive, and unconscious ostracism more negatively than role-based and ambiguous ostracism, indicating that the reflective effects of ostracism may vary depending on who the perpetrator is and the reason for exclusion (Nezlek et al., 2012).

Systemic decisions of universities to use institutional ostracism as a counter to abuses or violations of human rights may be a strategy for consolidating the value of impeccability. The authorities shape the image of the University and care about its reputation. In this way, it gains public trust and creates the image of an impeccable organization. In promoting the ideas of the common good, the University is torn between social expectations and recognition of science and its development beyond any political or military context. Therefore, it is

essential to ask whether ostracism, *in the strict sense,* falls within the canon of impeccable organization.

The University can be regarded as a depository of knowledge about management rules following the public interest (Rotengruber, 2017). Among the characteristics that make up the responsibility of universities in a social context is the reconciliation of particular goals (trusteeship) with universal ones (charity) (Rotengruber, 2017). This means a tendency to perceive the needs of one's environment and to look universally at the problems and needs of people and humanity in general. In this respect, the requirement to protect the subjectivity of every participant in social, economic, and cultural life is essential. Thus, in this sense, the ostracism of the University toward a group can be interpreted as abuse and goes beyond the ethical considerations of this subjectivity.

In the concept of the university as an organization, it can be recognized that universal and leading ideas shape its axiological basis of functioning. Its judgments matter in the arena of public discussion. Caring for the good of this organization relates to defending its good name. Making public views on socially essential issues has to do with reputation.

Following Freeman's (2010) stakeholder theory, it can be concluded that any form of exclusion of academic community representatives would constitute abuse. In this theory, Freeman et al. (2004) emphasize that values are essential for an organization that must understand its goals and shape relationships to achieve them. Based on these theoretical foundations, this article concludes that exclusion could disrupt these relationships and be contrary to the fundamental objectives of an academic organization (Freeman et al., 2004). In this sense, ostracized stakeholders might feel they are suffering a loss because of erroneous ostracism decisions.

In contemporary science, one can find various assessments of ostracism, on the one hand, as an effective means of defending democracy against its enemies, including a way of protecting power. On the other hand, it is an ineffective way of conducting institutional persecution and even a particular social mania and scapegoating (Węcowski, 2018).

Ostracism in the academic environment is a phenomenon that requires a more complex approach and understanding. Traditionally seen as a negative

aspect of social interaction, ostracism can take various forms and generate diverse consequences. In the academic context, ostracism does not have to be solely a tool of exclusion or repression. Still, it can also serve as a form of social responsibility and an expression of moral stance. However, it is also essential to consider that ostracism can lead to unintended consequences, such as limiting academic freedom and exchanging ideas. It can also affect innocent scientists who, despite originating from an aggressor state, do not support their government's actions. Consequently, when deciding on ostracism, academic communities should carefully consider both the short- and long-term effects of such a stance to ensure that their actions align with the scientific ethos and broader educational and research goals. These aspects can lead to a deeper understanding and better management of ethical conflicts in the academic environment. In discussing the consequences of ostracism, it is vital to realize the complexity of the loss suffered by the excluded stakeholders.

Ostracism in the academic context can have multiple and far-reaching effects beyond immediate material consequences. Considering these various aspects, it is essential for universities and educational institutions to thoroughly evaluate the potential implications of ostracism, trying to balance the necessity of taking a moral stance and maintaining an open and supportive educational environment. Understanding the complexity and multidimensionality of the loss suffered by excluded stakeholders can lead to more informed and balanced academic policies and practice decisions.

Methodology

The concept of ostracism in the context of the post-academism dilemma is based on a critical analysis of the literature dealing with a sense of academic value and critical university reflection. The research gap stems from a need for a deeper understanding of how the academic community, particularly in the Polish context, perceives and responds to the ostracism of Russian scientists following Russia's invasion of Ukraine in light of educational ethos and post-academism. There

is a need to explore how these geopolitical events affect scholarly discourse, academic ethos, and academic practices and how the scientific community copes with the ethical dilemmas arising from these events. The posed research question is: How does the academic community, especially in Poland, interpret and respond to the ostracism of Russian scientists in the context of the invasion of Ukraine, and how do these responses correspond with the academic ethos and the phenomenon of post-academism?

The primary objective of this article is to understand how contemporary scientists from the Polish academic community perceive the scientific ethos in the context of ostracism within the scientific community, which emerged following Russia's invasion of Ukraine. The article focuses on analyzing the epistemological and ethical implications of this ostracism in the academic context, considering Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Three research hypotheses were formulated: H1: The academic community in Poland exhibits significant differences in perceptions of the ostracism of Russian scientists, depending on their educational values and experiences. H2: The ostracism of Russian scientists following the invasion of Ukraine leads to a conflict of values within the academic ethos, eliciting ethical dilemmas among Polish scholars. H3: The influence of post-academism is significant in shaping responses to ostracism in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, suggesting a shift in how knowledge is produced and managed during times of crisis.

A qualitative study was conducted to delve deeper into the research topic. Qualitative research was carried out over three months. Individual In-depth interviews (IDI) were conducted with eleven scientists, who represented both public and private units; sensitization allowed us to reach emotional and motivational belief patterns that could be analyzed through the identity model. The research was conducted using audio-video interviews via the Teams platform, accompanied by simultaneous transcription, as well as through telephone interviews. The collected audio material lasted about 13 hours, and its transcription consumed about 40 hours. Semi-structured interviews were conducted from September to November 2023. Given the complexity of the research problem and the sensitivity of the subject related to the ongoing armed conflict, the choice of in-depth interviews was most appropriate. This allowed for a detailed

examination of respondents' individual beliefs and reactions in the context of academic ethos and the ostracism of Russian scientists. The respondents were selected using a snowball sampling method based on recommendations from other participants. This method enabled access to a broad and diverse group of participants, contributing to the depth of data quality.

The interview transcripts were imported into NVivo as text documents and organized into folders. Familiarization with the data involved reviewing and annotating transcripts in NVivo to better understand the context and content of the conversations. Key concepts were coded, and relevant text segments were assigned to these codes. Keyword searches and frequency analysis of themes were conducted, followed by grouping codes into broader categories. Axial and selective coding were applied to identify the main categories and their relationships. NVivo's visualization tools were used to map connections and identify patterns. The in-depth interviews enabled a deep understanding of individual perspectives, which is especially important in the emotional and ethical context of the research subject. NVivo, as a QDA tool, provided efficient management and analysis of large amounts of textual data.

The research sample included participants from various fields and academic ranks, allowing for the acquisition of multi-layered perspectives on the research topic. The detailed description of the sample consists of the diversity of disciplines and educational experiences, which is crucial for the research outcomes.

IDIs consisted of an in-depth conversation in which scientists revealed deep beliefs and ingrained ways of thinking. Previously established contacts allowed the interlocutors to conduct an honest interview, during which the characteristics of speech, awareness, and beliefs were analyzed. The research results were prepared using the qualitative data analysis (QDA) software – NVivo. The software was instrumental in methodically coding the interview transcripts, enabling the identification and classification of critical statements and concepts expressed by the participants. The coding process involves tagging data segments corresponding to specific topics or ideas. NVivo's capabilities were crucial in handling and organizing extensive textual data, consolidating coded segments into more significant thematic categories, and uncovering patterns and connections within these themes. This approach was essential for highlighting recurrent motifs

and critical elements vital for comprehending the subject matter of the study. Through this methodology, the researchers gained a more profound insight and interpretation of the perceptions and meanings ascribed by the respondents, an aspect fundamental to qualitative research analysis.

Table 1. Sociodemographic data in the interview questionnaire

Interview code	Type of University	Gender	Academic ranks	Field
DHOP	Public	Female	Associate professor	Economics
DMSSAN	Private	Male	Associate professor	Fine Arts and Management
DMTSAN	Private	Female	Ph. D	Management
DOISAN	Private	Male	Assistant professor	Computer science
DZSAN	Private	Male	Ph. D	Engineering
EPASZU	Public	Male	Professor emeritus	Philology
PILW	Private	Female	Associate professor	Philology
PLSUJ	Public	Male	Full professor	Humanities and Economics
PMSSF	Public	Male	Full professor	Fine Arts
PSPWR	Public	Female	Full professor	Economics
PWMUO	Public	Female	Full professor	History

Source: The authors.

Table 1 presents the composition of the study's participants: two Ph.D. holders, one assistant professor, three associate professors, four full professors, and one professor emeritus. They represented management, economics, fine arts, history, humanities, philology, engineering, and computer science. The study involved seven men and four women; six were affiliated with public universities,

and five were associated with private universities[2]. Utilizing a unique coding system for the empirical material enabled the derivation of significant conclusions.

These conclusions are presented in Table 2, which outlines the Epistemological Entanglement of Science in a Crisis (Ostracism) through selected, necessary research codes.

2 The study focuses on the diversity of experiences and perspectives in the academic environment, justifying the selection of demographic data such as the field of study, academic rank, gender, and affiliation with public or private universities. The field of study is necessary as various disciplines may possess unique cultures and practices influencing scientific identity and sensemaking processes. Academic rank indicates the level of experience and status within the academic community, potentially impacting the perspectives and influence of researchers.

Table 2. Epistemological Entanglement of Science in a Crisis (Ostracism) – Selected, Significant Research Codes

Codes	Description
1. Ideational Belief	Scientists are guided by ideas when evaluating academic activities, valuing the academic situations they analyze. Judgment formation is related to the role and importance of universities and academic work.
1.1. Internal Responsibility	Responsibility is viewed as shaping individual and personal choices. Emphasis is placed on a unique approach to problems in academic work, which is considered more important than collective responsibility.
1.2. Social Sensitivity	Sensitivity is a trait that becomes characteristic of personal judgments and aspects of scientific work. Sensitivity in the scientific profession extends beyond personal contexts, becoming a critical factor in shaping scientific attitudes, language, and relationships.
2. Ethical Considerations in Science and Military Issues	Moral dilemmas involve addressing the responsibility of science in the context of the military and the militarization of scientific disciplines.
2.1. Disciplinary Moral Relativism	Conclusions about science issues should be discussed within the context of the science discipline and the problems it raises.
2.2. Advocacy for Ostracism	Scientists can be ostracized due to the political situation.
2.3. Opposition to Ostracism	Scientists should not be ostracized, regardless of the political situation.
3. Ethics in the Scientific Profession	The scientific profession requires distinct ethical reflection due to the nature of scientific work and its accompanying values.
3.1. Application Crisis	The application crisis in psychology is a phenomenon present in reflections on science.
4. Unethical Career Advancement	Unethical behavior in shaping a professional career is a deliberate scientific action aimed at gaining measurable benefits, regardless of the principles and norms present in science.
4.1. Integrity Issues in Research Practices	At various stages of research, harmful practices are engaged that do not serve society and science. These practices are undertaken for tangible benefits.

Source: The authors.

Table 2 presents various research codes related to epistemological controversies in science in the context of ostracism. In the table, these codes describe essential aspects related to scientists' ethics, knowledge, and attitudes in the face of a crisis. Firstly, code 1 indicates that scientists are guided by ideas when evaluating academic activities and attach importance to academic situations they analyze. This suggests that their judgments are closely linked to their perceptions of the role and significance of the university and scientific work. Similarly, code 2 focuses on ethical considerations in science, especially in the context of militarization. Here, we contrast code 2.2, which suggests the possibility of ostracizing scientists due to the political situation, and code 2.3, which argues that scientists should not be excluded regardless of the political situation. Code 3 emphasizes that science requires special ethical considerations due to its nature and accompanying values. Code 4, on the other hand, concentrates on unethical practices related to career advancement. Table 2 is a valuable tool for analyzing and understanding various aspects of ethics and values in science, especially in challenging situations such as crises that can influence the attitudes of scientists and decisions.

Research results

Ideational beliefs determine the objectives for academic values

Researchers who identify with different scientific ethos exhibit diverse approaches to scientific research. Valuation significantly distinguishes one's approach to the significance of one's scientific work, intellectual pursuits, and university characteristics in a narrow sense.

Universities and intellectuals perform a significant role in shaping society and culture. However, to fulfil this role effectively, they must cultivate values such as empathy, social responsibility, and the ability to think critically to avoid past mistakes and contribute to a positive social change:

The university's raison d'être endures as long as it benefits society. It is not simply an institution that confers diplomas upon students; it generates specific

value within its confines (DMSSAN). We are mainly addressing a humanistic crisis marked by a lack of empathy, which has been systematically suppressed (PILW). There exists a depiction of intellectuals, especially writers, as 'useful fools' who supported communism, fervently believing in the idea while failing to realize that the system was fundamentally flawed and endorsing the USSR during its darkest periods (PLSUJ).

Internal responsibility performs a crucial role in ethical decision-making beyond prevailing discourses. One's personal beliefs and individual sensitivity are critical factors in evaluating moral situations.

The university generates social value and can serve as a starting point for discussions on the role of higher education and intellectuals in shaping society and culture. It also provides a basis for exploring challenges such as the lack of empathy and unwavering belief in ideologies:

Firstly, there is the responsibility inherent to being a human, followed by the responsibility of an intellectual, and then comes the responsibility of a researcher and member of the academic community for critical thinking. As researchers, our skepticism should be heightened given our scientific roles and approach to truth, which is more cautious than artists who exercise poetic license. Artists are not bound to rigorous insight or verification methods and can afford subjectivity (PLOUGH). Russian scientists, by not openly challenging government propaganda that is inconsistent with reality, are, in essence, betraying the ethos of a scientist. Should they persist in this course, their separation from the global scientific community is warranted. Conversely, reintegration into this community should be possible if they demonstrate a clear and active shift in their stance (DMTSAN).

These statements present a range of perspectives that provide insight into the complexities of personal responsibility, ethical choices, and the intricate relationship between individual principles and professional duties. They offer analytical insights into these aspects, particularly within the context of academia and scientific research:

Human responsibility is fundamentally individual rather than collective, though one's position in a conflict does carry consequences (DOISAN). Ethical universals guide scientists to avoid unethical actions, yet they also face arbitrary

choices (PMSSF). Influenced by idealism, shaped by upbringing and literature, an individual might feel accountable only for personal scientific integrity and disinterested in the broader environment (PMSSF). In higher education institutions (HEIs), parallels are drawn with business enterprises, where management assigns tasks and responsibilities to its paid employees. However, this does not extend to infringing on private choices, as these realms are seen as distinct, akin to most companies (PWMUO). Support for Ukraine's survival and development of its culture and science is completely justified (DMTSAN).

Collective sensitivity emerges from individual sensitivity, tenderness, and empathy. When sensitivity is explored in opposition to a rational, factual, and emotionless perspective of reality, it often tends to oversimplify, leading to a misleading dichotomy (Szpunar, 2018). The incorporation of sensitivity into research is crucial for understanding the state of postmodern individuals (Szpunar, 2018), reflecting on text communication (Lehman & Krzeszowski, 2022), and the paradigmatic practice of cultural management science (Grosskopf & Marmeyer, 2021). The manifestation of self-responsibility is closely linked to the attitude of sensitivity:

It is imperative to always consider the interpretative possibilities of our audience. Thus, we must craft our messages keenly aware of how a particular piece of information or communication will be perceived. Sensitivity should permeate every aspect of scholarship, scientific communication, and written and spoken discourse. In science, this sensitivity should manifest as openness, active listening, and responses that encourage dialogue. Such an approach facilitates the exploration of more profound and meaningful content, creating an environment marked by openness, empathy, and tenderness (DMTSAN).

The conclusion underscores the importance of considering the audience's or recipients' perspectives and interpretations when communicating information or messages. It also highlights that sensitivity should be present throughout scholarly and scientific communication. Through openness, active listening, and providing responses that encourage dialogue, researchers and scholars can create an environment conducive to exploring more profound and meaningful content. Such an approach enhances the quality of academic discourse and fosters a deeper understanding and engagement with the subject matter.

Ostracism in Science: Ethical Considerations

Moral dilemmas necessitate a thorough examination of scientific responsibility within the context of the military and the militarization of scientific disciplines. Knowledge generation is intrinsically tied to both the methods used in its production and the guiding ideas that shape the process. Within the context of ethical considerations in the realm of science and war, several statements offer diverse perspectives:

The supportive stance toward Ukrainian scientists and solidarity with those affected by war, including scientists from Ukraine, is deemed justifiable. Such an approach is likely to influence knowledge creation (DHOP) positively. An essential ethical question arises concerning engagement in military science: Is it justifiable if it serves a just war, such as the one being fought in the East? (PLSUJ). The critique against Russian scientists is not based on their nationality but stems from their failure to oppose the criminal actions of their state. Their complicity is not necessarily about active involvement in the arms industry, military, or security services; instead, it is about their silence or failure to challenge the unrealistic narratives of government propaganda, which is viewed as a betrayal of the scientific ethos (DMTSAN).

These statements highlight scientists' intricate ethical challenges when their research and professional roles intersect with military and political contexts. Beyond this observation, they underscore the need for a nuanced ethical framework that guides scientists in navigating such complexities. This framework should encourage critical reflection on the justifiability of their actions, promote empathy and solidarity in times of conflict, and acknowledge the potential consequences of silence or complicity in situations where ethical principles are at stake. Ultimately, these statements emphasize the critical role of ethics and moral deliberation in shaping scientific engagement within challenging socio-political environments.

War is a rivalry, and its outcome is profoundly influenced by the progress of science, particularly in the field of technology. Science enables the development of more advanced weaponry, improved methods of communication, enhanced data processing, and more effective approaches to combat and neutralization.

Contacts within scientific communities provide intelligence services with extensive opportunities to acquire information (human intelligence – HUMINT), utilize it in warfare, and substantially impact the course and even the outcome of battles. Nonetheless, ethical considerations must form the foundation for discussions regarding the primary objectives in this context. In the discourse surrounding scientific engagement in the context of warfare and propaganda, two statements offer contrasting perspectives:

Scientific activity in the field of technology must first serve man and must not be directed against him. Some scientists thought we already lived in a world of higher technical and cultural civilization. War events have shown that defense is a priority, and scientists' work in defense is a service to man, society, and world security (DZSAN). In the humanities, rivalry between states is a crucial aspect of propaganda. Gaining influence over social groups can impact the size of military budgets, the potential for recruiting collaborators, and the ability to sabotage projects necessary for the war effort (DOISAN).

Ethical standards only sometimes easily translate into righteous moral judgment and conduct. Research shows the universality of the ethical values of the scientific community, but the attitude of relativism is also revealed. Values and principles in relativism are considered relative to or dependent on the perception of specific people. However, cultures, given places and times in which evaluations and events occur, situations, and the level of people's involvement in each problem may be necessary (Napal, 2014). The perspective on ostracism and the evaluation of scientists' actions varies depending on the discipline they are involved in:

It all depends on the discipline we deal with. If a scientist deals with quantum physics, then the evaluation of the actions of certain people does not matter. However, if we deal with social sciences, e.g., management or psychology, the issue of valuing events is essential, and you need to have a system of references (DMSSAN). General ostracism makes no sense because there are scientists who support such methods of action, and there are scientists who oppose them. It is only necessary to consider what this scientist does (DMTSAN). One should not be ostracized because the mentality of the Russian people must change (PMSSF).

Collectively, these statements illuminate the multifaceted nature of assessing scientists and their actions, emphasizing that the evaluation process depends highly on the specific academic discipline, individual actions, and cultural considerations. While some disciplines may prioritize objective criteria, others require a more nuanced system of references. Additionally, a one-size-fits-all approach to ostracism is deemed ineffective, as scientists may hold diverse perspectives and actions within their respective fields. Ultimately, the evolving mentality and changing contexts further complicate the issue of ostracism in the scientific community.

The decision to discontinue cooperation with a Russian professor from St. Petersburg, despite prior shared achievements, stems from the perception of a lack of explicit protest against the war from the Russian elite, reflecting a call for comprehensive ostracism and a sense of global solidarity with the Ukrainian nation:

I work with scientists from St. Petersburg, and it is with great regret that I received the information that a particular professor, a project partner, could not be included in the work. It was decided that this cooperation could not continue, even though we already had some everyday achievements. However, this is the only right way. The Russian elite did not explicitly protest against the war, so I think that means that ostracism should be comprehensive. I consider questions about the basis of state and institutional regulation, which have the hallmarks of normative exclusion, to be correct because it is a kind of, I interpret as, a kind of European or world solidarity toward what happened to the Ukrainian nation and the axiological dimension (DHOP).

Scientists represent their country and its politics, especially when working at public universities, and it suggests the lack of opposition:

Applying collective responsibility is never a positive phenomenon, but every scientist represents the state. In the case of work at a state university, he or she is also an employee of the public sector. If he or she does not object to the criminal policy of his or her government implemented by the state structures, he or she is, unfortunately, part of these activities. He or she must, therefore, be aware of the consequences. The government of a given country is the representative of the society. If it does not encounter strong opposition among citizens, including

scientists, they are jointly responsible for all actions of this country (DMTSAN). Caution in dealing with scientists from Russia is a very well-justified need to end the enormous suffering of the population. The inconvenience of refusing to read or speak is nothing compared to the increasing number of mass graves with each passing day of war and occupation (DOISAN).

There is the importance of preserving academic freedom and cultural value in our globalized world:

We absolutely should not ostracize science because science is an area that should be since there is free movement. This area should not be fortified with any ideologies and worldviews. Every scientist should be able to speak freely on various topics (PILW). Culture should be left untouched. Like the culture of Pushkin or Akhmatova, it has value, regardless of the situation, and significantly contributes to world culture (PMSSF).

These diverse perspectives on ostracism of scientists from Russia and its implications highlight the issue's complexity. While some argue for comprehensive ostracism in response to the lack of protest against the war from the Russian elite, others caution against collective responsibility, emphasizing the importance of free movement in science. The need to alleviate the suffering of the Russian population is acknowledged. Still, the discussion underscores the challenges of finding a balanced approach that respects culture and the value of scientific discourse.

Academic traditions and ethical dilemmas: navigating values and choices in professional academia

This exploration delves into the complex interplay between enduring academic traditions and the evolving ethical dilemmas confronting contemporary scholars, highlighting the critical decisions and value judgments inherent in the professional academic landscape. The scientists with the least favorable perception of the academic system tend to align themselves with the literary tradition. The study reveals a notable trend: Scientists who view the academic system less favorably often find alignment with literary traditions. This perspective is further elucidated in the following observation:

As the country's intellectual elite, scientists are responsible for opposing immoral initiatives (DMTSAN). What holds importance are individual choices, universal ethics, and deontology. Codes of ethics serve as guidelines but not absolute principles; they do not qualify as categorical imperatives in the Kantian sense. Instead, they represent general ethical principles, individual and social choices, and individual issues. There is no single model to follow; instead, we rely on case studies (PLSUJ).

In contrast to researchers deeply entrenched in academic values, those who align with the post-academic ethos tend to perceive more excellent career prospects. They are also more attuned to detrimental mechanisms impacting the scientific career trajectory.

When examining the dynamics within the scientific community, it becomes evident that ostracism is pivotal. It serves as a critical deterrent mechanism for preventing research fraud and, at the same time, functions as a selective filter to discourage unethical career advancement pursuits:

Ostracism is a crucial deterrent mechanism for research fraud and a selective filter for unethical career advancement (DMTSAN).

The replication crisis in psychology is a significant and concerning issue. It highlights the challenges of ensuring that research findings are robust and replicable, which is fundamental for the integrity and credibility of scientific literature. This crisis prompts a reevaluation of research practices and the need for greater transparency and rigor in scientific inquiry to address these challenges effectively:

The replication crisis is a widespread issue encompassing numerous phenomena extensively studied in psychology, revealing unconfirmed artefacts in the vast literature (PLOUGH).

Science is a method for verifying reality, and replication involves repeating a specific scientific study. The research results should prompt a thorough critical analysis and verification of their accuracy. This issue was raised by Ioannidis (2005), who demonstrated that simulations indicate a higher likelihood of research claims being false rather than accurate in most projects. Research outcomes can effectively measure the prevailing bias. Systematic support for replication initiatives could motivate scientists to be more active, fostering a greater

willingness to adhere to scientific standards and uphold scientific principles, ultimately strengthening critical discourse on research results. Ostracism is a category gaining importance in developing scientific standards in this context, extending beyond political ostracism. It may begin a discussion about scientific ethos in its strictest sense.

Discussion

In examining the responses of the Polish academic community to the ostracism of Russian scientists after Ukraine's invasion, this study elucidates the complex interplay between personal beliefs, scientific ethos, and educational values. It highlights universities' pivotal role in society, transcending their traditional function of conferring diplomas to generate social value. This broader role is tightly linked to their capacity to foster empathy, social responsibility, and critical thinking, which is essential in addressing contemporary humanistic crises and driving social progress. The enduring purpose of a university is thus seen as its contribution to society, extending the impact of its internal activities beyond mere academic accomplishments.

The research also highlights the multifaceted ethical challenges of scientific research, especially in military and political contexts. An imperative need for a nuanced ethical framework emerges, guiding scientists in conflict. The moral responsibility to support war-affected scientists, a stance that positively impacts knowledge generation and upholds scientific solidarity, is underscored. Furthermore, the study probes into the ethical quandaries confronting scientists in politically sensitive situations, with non-opposition to state propaganda potentially amounting to a betrayal of scientific ethos.

An intriguing finding are the varying perceptions of the academic system among scientists. Those with critical views often align with literary traditions, indicating a divergence in the perception of educational values and responsibilities. Ostracism within the scientific community is identified as serving a dual purpose: deterring research fraud and acting as a selective filter against unethical career advancements. While important, the study proposes that ethical guidelines in academia are not absolute but serve as frameworks for individual and

social choices, highlighting the distinction between universal ethical codes and personal moral decisions.

Verification of the study's hypotheses reveals H1 (Perceptions of Ostracism): There are discernible differences in the Polish academic community's perceptions of the ostracism of Russian scientists, rooted in diverse educational values and experiences. This aligns with the hypothesis, indicating that personal beliefs and scientific ethos significantly shape attitudes toward the significance and impact of ostracism. H2 (Conflict of Values and Ethical Dilemmas): The conflict of values within the academic ethos concerning the ostracism of Russian scientists post-Ukraine invasion is evident, aligning with the hypothesis. Polish scholars face ethical dilemmas, with nuances in their ethical considerations highlighting an internal conflict within the academic community. H3 (Influence of Post-Academism): The study confirms the significant influence of post-academism in shaping responses to ostracism amidst the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. This confirms the hypothesis, indicating a shift in knowledge production and management attitudes during crises, especially among those aligned with the post-academic ethos.

The study substantiates its hypotheses, revealing varied responses within the Polish academic community to the ostracism of Russian scientists. It underscores the complexities and dynamism of ethical and value-based considerations in educational settings, particularly politically charged environments. The findings emphasize the critical role of academia in navigating ethical dilemmas and value conflicts, especially during times of crisis.

Conclusions and limitations

In academia, scholars embodying the conscience of socially responsive institutions actively engage in public discourse on critical issues such as abuse, repression, exclusion, and human rights violations, extending to the intricacies of armed conflicts. Their moral stances, characterized by an ethical opposition to specific attitudes, behaviors, policies, or warfare, represent quintessential expressions of applied ethics, reflective of the scholarly commitment to societal and global concerns.

These dilemmas raise pertinent questions about the rationality of ostracism, sparking a wide-ranging discussion that extends beyond the strict sense of ostracism to encompass the state of democracy, both in its contemporary and ancient forms, within the context of this debate. This issue also encompasses social compromise and exclusion as a normative form of cultural management. Athenian ostracism targeted notable individuals; in modern times, it has evolved into a political tool used against the academic elites of an invading entity. Consequently, the ancient debate regarding the regulatory role of ostracism in a democratic framework remains unresolved in the post-academic era.

In scenarios where scientists confront ethical dilemmas, notably in collaborating with representatives from an aggressor state, ostracism can be interpreted as deliberate exclusion, grounded in moral and academic values. This position may mirror the institution's deeply entrenched values and individuals' convictions, responding to breaches of social or ethical standards. Conflict situations pose distinct ethical and moral challenges to scientists, necessitating a careful adaptation and reinterpretation of established ethical and academic principles. In these contexts, the institutional values of universities undergo critical examination, with their responses having considerable implications for both the academic community and the broader societal landscape.

Armed conflict, such as Russia's invasion of Ukraine, creates a series of unique challenges and ethical dilemmas for the academic world, especially in terms of scientific cooperation with representatives of the aggressor state. In such situations, scientific communities are forced to confront questions of ethics and responsibility, often extending beyond the traditional frameworks of academic action. One of the main dilemmas is whether and to what extent scientists should maintain cooperation with representatives of a state that commits military aggression and human rights violations. This situation leads to difficult questions about how to differentiate between individual scientists and the actions of their governments and how academic ethics may or should influence decisions on international cooperation.

Additionally, the war situation may provoke questions about the role of science and education in building peace and resolving conflicts. Are universities obligated to engage in peace-building activities, and if so, how can they do so

effectively while maintaining their educational and research mission? These questions underscore the need for a holistic and balanced approach to ethics in wartime in an academic context. They require scientists to engage in deep reflection and openness to dialogue to find morally responsible answers in line with fundamental scientific values.

An alternative approach could prioritize dialogue, understanding, and conflict resolution over direct ostracism. This may involve establishing platforms for discussion, promoting intercultural cooperation, and actively seeking peaceful solutions through educational and research efforts. In this context, scientists advocate for an education and awareness-focused approach, emphasizing tolerance, peace, and international understanding. Instead of resorting to sanctions, the aim is to create an environment where conflicts are addressed through dialogue and collaboration rather than exclusion.

Limitations of the study include a relatively small sample size, consisting of only eleven Polish scientists. While this approach allows for in-depth interviews and a detailed exploration of individual beliefs, it may not fully represent the diversity of perspectives within the entire Polish scientific community. The study focuses on the ostracism of Russian scientists in the context of the Ukraine invasion. This focus may introduce bias in the research, as it assumes a particular stance on the geopolitical conflict and its implications for the academic community. The study does not extensively explore the cultural and contextual factors that may influence the perceptions and responses of Polish scientists. These factors can have a significant role in shaping individual beliefs and reactions. The study's three-month data collection period may not capture potential changes or developments in the perceptions and responses of the academic community over time. Future research may address these constraints to understand the subject matter comprehensively.

In conclusion, questions are posed to encourage further exploration of how scientific communities can effectively balance academic ethos with the need to respond to unique geopolitical events, such as Russia's invasion of Ukraine: What are the optimal strategies for educational institutions to uphold their ethical values while navigating geopolitical conflicts, such as the invasion of Ukraine, without compromising academic freedom? How can universities actively engage in

peace-building and conflict-resolution efforts while upholding their core education and research missions? Are there alternative approaches to addressing ethical dilemmas arising during armed conflicts that do not involve ostracizing or imposing sanctions on scientists from aggressor states? These questions catalyze ongoing discussions and research on how academic institutions can navigate the complex global landscape while upholding their ethical and academic commitments. Addressing these challenges necessitates collaborative efforts and dialogues among scientists, educational leaders, students, and other stakeholders to foster a more integrated and resilient academic community in the face of global uncertainties.

References

Buss, D. M. (1990). The Evolution of Anxiety and Social Exclusion. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *9*(2), 196–201.

Carayannis, E. G., Campbell, D. F. J., & Grigoroudis, E. (2021). Helix Trilogy: The Triple, Quadruple, and Quintuple Innovation Helices from a Theory, Policy, and Practice Set of Perspectives. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *13*(3), 2272–301.

Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "'Mode 2'" to a Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations. *Research Policy*, *29*, 109–123. www.elsevier.nlrlocatereconbase.

Forsdyke, S. (2000). Exile, Ostracism, and the Athenian Democracy. *Classical Antiquity*, *19*(2), 232–263. https://doi.org/10.2307/25011121.

Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, R. E., Wicks, A. C., & Parmar, B. (2004). Stakeholder Theory and "The Corporate Objective Revisited". *Organization Science, 15*(3), 364–369.

Grosskopf, S., & Marmeyer, C. (2021). Learning from Multi-paradigmatic Sensitivity in Cross-cultural Management? Empirical and Theoretical Considerations. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, *21*(2), 181–202.

Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why Most Published Research Findings Are False. *PLoS Medicine*, *2*(8), 124–124.

Jiménez, J. (2008). Research socially responsible: may we speak of a mode 3 knowledge production? *RECIIS*, *2*(1), 48–56.

Kerr, N. L., & Levine, J. M. (2008). The detection of social exclusion: Evolution and beyond. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *12*(1), 39–52.

Lehman, I., & Krzeszowski, T. (2022). Introducing Reflexivity to Academic Writing in Business and Management. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, *1*, 938–938.

Merton, R. K. (1942). Science and technology in a democratic order. *Journal of Legal and Political Sociology, 1*(1/2), 115–126.

Merton, R. K. (1973). *The Sociology of Science. Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.

Napal, G. (2014). The impact of the financial crisis on developing economy: building trust through universalism as opposed to relativism. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, *6*(2), 142–152.

Nezlek, J. B., Wesselmann, E. D., Wheeler, L., & Williams, K. D. (2015). Ostracism in Everyday Life: The Effects of Ostracism on Those Who Ostracize. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *155*(5), 432–451. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1062351.

Rotengruber, P. (2017). Słowa i czyny. O społecznej (nie)odpowiedzialności uniwersytetu. *Annales. Etyka w Życiu Gospodarczym*, *20*(1), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.18778/1899-2226.20.1.03.

Sułkowski, Ł., & Dziedzic, J. (2021). Scientist Organizational Identity Orientations. *Economy & Sociology*, *14*(4), 310–325.

Szpunar, M. (2018). (In)sensitive culture. Sensitivity in culture. *Kultura Współczesna. Teoria, Interpretacje, Praktyka*, *4*(103).

Węcowski, M. (2018). *Dylemat więźnia: ostracyzm ateński i jego pierwotne cele*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Wesselmann, E. D., & Bagg, D., & Williams, K. D. (2009). "I Feel Your Pain": The effects of observing ostracism on the ostracism detection system. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*(6), 1308–1311.

Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 425–452.

Williams, K. D. (2009 Ostracism: Effects of being excluded and ignored. In Zanna, M. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 275–314). Elsevier Academic Press.

Williams, K. D., & Nida, S. A. (2011). Ostracism: Consequences and coping. *Current Directions in Psychological Science 20*(2), 71–75.

Zadro, L. (2004). *Ostracism: Empirical Studies Inspired by Real-world Experiences of Silence and Exclusion*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Ziman, J. (1996a). Is Science Losing its Objectivity? *Nature*, *382*(6594), 751–754.

Ziman, J. (1996b). "Postacademic Science": Constructing Knowledge with Networks and Norms. *Science Studies*, *9*(1), 67–80.

Ziman, J. (2002). A Response to Reflection on "Real Science: What it is, and What It Means". *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *8*(2), 253–255.

Ziman, J. (1995). *Of One Mind the Collectivization of Science*. Springer.

Ziman, J. (2000). *Real Science: What it Is and What it Means*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.