

behaviours, coercive actions). The regularity legitimises aggressive behaviours expressed towards those who are negatively evaluated, i.e. hypothetically “deserve” them. Aggressive behaviours take the form of “coercive actions”. James T. Tedeschi and Richard B. Felson (1994: 346–353) treat them as instrumental (functional) activities of various nature, but associated with making decisions about their use and the choice of action which is best in a given situation to reach the desired aim. The aggressor may follow three major aims and motives, i.e. controlling the behaviour of others, restoring justice, proving and protecting one’s own identity. This translates into attitudes to life related to the attitudes towards self and other people which are of defensive and instrumental character. Therefore, the aggressor makes a subjective evaluation of the value of the target/aim he/she tries to achieve, the probability of its achievement and failure in this regard and the potential negative consequences of his/her own actions. This assessment is possible on the basis of the previous experience gained in similar situations, while the decision to use the coercive strategy is triggered by script availability (its consolidation). Moreover, the decision about coercive action is also related to confronting it with the established system of values, which determines the possibility of its justification on the one hand and is associated with the protection of self-esteem on the other hand (behaviour against commonly accepted values poses a threat to self-esteem). The special importance of this concept lies in the analysis of aggressive behaviours in the context of other social behaviours related to the impact on others, as a result of the experience gained in contacts with people and attitudes towards life (attitudes towards “I” and “YOU”), which are their consequences. It is also the basis for the interpretation of the obtained results as it indicates potential cognitive mechanisms (self-perception and perception of others) as decisive in the choice of coercive versus non-coercive behaviours, depending on beliefs that rationalise them.

## **References**

- Bartholomew K., Horowitz, L.M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, no 61(2), pp. 226–244.
- Harris, T.A. (1987). *W zgodzie z sobą i z tobą. Praktyczny przewodnik po analizie transakcyjnej*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, wyd. 2, tłum. E. Knoll.
- Harris, T.A. (2009). *Ja jestem OK. – ty jesteś K. Praktyczny przewodnik po analizie transakcyjnej*. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy “Rebis”, wyd. 3, tłum. E. Knoll.

- Sajewicz-Radtke, U., Radtke, B.M., Kalka, D. (2010). *Kwestionariusz Agresywności Młodzieży – Reaktywność emocjonalna*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP.
- Sukiennik, A. (2012). *Kwestionariusz Ustosunkowań (KU). Podręcznik*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP.
- Tedeschi, J.T., Felson, R.B. (1994). *Violence, aggression & coercive actions*. Washington: American Psychological Association.