MANAGEMENT OF SOCIALLY IMPORTANT VALUES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Agnieszka KLIMSKA

Wydział Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego, Warszawa;
a.klimska@uksw.edu.pl; ORCID 0000-0002-9115-9492

Abstract: The question of values more and more often constitutes a point of departure in deliberations on the practice of sustainable development. Some propositions have been developed for the axiological system of sustainable development. They are structurally complex since they incorporate defined levels of values Implementation of a given axiological system can, in turn, be secured by properly planned management. This management can be defined as the management socially important values that are part of the widely understood social management. The article will show the role of sustainable development axiology in the context of the crisis of morality. In addition, there will be a question of value, including socially important values, especially in the systematic management of sustainable development.

Keywords: sustainable development, axiology of sustainable development, socially important values, systemic management.

1. Introduction

The question of values more and more often constitutes a point of departure in deliberations on the practice of sustainable development. Within numerous concepts of sustainability, there have appeared a number of proposals for its axiology, which are structurally complex since they incorporate defined levels of values, their classification, hierarchization and, finally, their socio-cultural status. Those proposals can provide foundations for sustainable programs or strategies. Implementation of a given axiological system can, in turn, be secured by properly planned management. Management targeted at sustainable development and incorporating the axiological dimension, to a certain extent includes management of socially important values that are part of the widely understood social management.

A proposition of value management incorporated into systemic management of sustainable development, can strengthen the *praxis* sphere of sustainability and it also inscribes itself in the process of transforming moral order.

2. Axiology of sustainable development in the face of the moral crisis

Today, the crisis phenomenon is more and more often perceived systematically, which allows to point out the links between the financial and economic crisis leading to a crisis in, for example, the sphere of production, consumption or investment, with the social crisis. Moreover, such a systemic approach allows to reveal a number of irregularities in the legal and political sphere, improper functioning of public trust institutions and, finally, the collapse of the moral sphere. Some scientists also approach the problem of value crisis in its various contexts (Pietrzak et al., 2011). Scientists point to the noticeable chaos in the sphere of values[1] (Siemianowski, 1993) or to the question of inadequate understanding of values both in the individual and social dimension, induced by the lack of one axiology or the effects of globalization. The role of values in human life is rather undisputable. It is emphasized, however, that man who finds himself in the "axiological maze" is not only unable to reflect on the sense of values, but he may also experience the sense of disappointment in relation to them (Siemianowski, 1993). In such a case, values cease to provide proper justification for the norms of righteous conduct, which consequently can, to a certain extent, subvert the moral order or prevent a person from undertaking certain actions.

An attempt at identifying the moral crisis[2] makes it necessary to identify the areas affected by it. The thematic scope of the present article limits those areas to the social context of the moral crisis, which means that the idea of morality, as discussed here, will be linked to social factors and needs. It is important to emphasize, that man as a person possessing dignity, should always constitute the highest value of the social and moral order. It is due to the fact, that any axiological order is legitimized on the basis of the category of human dignity (Mariański, 2014).

The crisis of morality in its social dimension does not necessarily imply undertaking actions directly aimed at affecting human dignity. However, through the attitude of indifference to the existential needs of another person, or even by unconscious contribution to lessening the quality of other people's lives, we can indirectly influence the sense of dignity or value of their lives.

---

[1] This chaos can be caused by, among others, supplanting values by science and pushing them into the realm of irrationalism, as well as neutralizing axiology.

[2] Morality is understood here in the neutral sense as all existing values, norms, and evaluations regulating human behaviors in general as well as behaviors perceived in terms of both good and evil by society members. Mariański, 2014, p. 56.

Z. Bauman, when analyzing "(...) the thought and practice of the modern *morality* (...)" recalls the opinion of G. Lipovetsky, according to whom today's social life is free from moral concerns, since man is not obligated by the category of duty, even in relationships with other people (Bauman, 1996, p. 16). Consequently, the moral norms that were once universally valued, have nowadays almost completely lost their importance. Today's world, in contrast to that of the past, is characterized by diversity as regards most areas of life. It lacks a comprehensive vision of the world with universally recognized values and norms. Sometimes, there even appear obvious contradictions. Values shared in one sphere of social life (e.g. economy, science, culture, politics) are not necessarily accepted in another. Specific areas of human activity often rely on different rationality or logic. J. Mariański notes that the postmodern society is characterized by a constant change which has an impact on the general approach to traditional models of morality, usually subverting their significance (Mariański, 2014). In the modern society, various sectors of life are oriented at inconsistent, often conflicting values and systems of meaning. Hence, it is more and more difficult to integrate them into a compact system or to persuade people effectively to adopt certain patterns of behavior or attitudes.

Axiological dilemmas also emerge "(...) when there are no clear common criteria, because overlapping types of rationality are mutually exclusive or it is difficult to judge clearly which of them should become dominant. This is particularly the case, when human activity is based on mutual, impossible to eliminate interdependencies typical of networked societies." (Osika, 2015, p. 398). It is also problematic when, for example, some social initiatives undertaken for the common good are promoted through legislative solutions while, at the same time, the needs of individual persons, sometimes irrational or irresponsible are also legally supported. On the one hand, the purposefulness of unifying the efforts of those who serve the good of the community is demonstrated, but on the other, individual undertakings devoid of concern for other beings, including human beings, are not only allowed but also made possible. In this sense, the moral crisis will also mean a collapse of the axio-normative order[3] (Szacka, 2003).

According to G. Kołodko, an attempt at stabilizing or overcoming the crisis should be connected with the adoption and realization of the idea of sustainable socio-economic development, taking into account three points of reference: values, institutions and politics (Kołodko, 2010). Although each of these points is of primary and undisputed importance in creating conditions conducive to achieving sustainable development, it is the values that must provide the foundations and moral reinforcement for human existence, both individual and collective. In addition, values should be given priority over institutions or policies and be implemented through their means. It is due to the fact, that they often constitute an element of the axiological basis accepted, for example, in social policy (Goleński, 2013; Miklaszewska, 1998).

---

[3] The axio-normative order is understood as a configuration of norms and values characteristic of a given culture.

A range of approaches from the area of ethics and axiology of sustainability[4], or widely understood global ethics have been worked out within numerous concepts of sustainable development[5]. In selected proposals, one can perceive an attempt to draw attention to value categories in the context of sustainable development, analyses of the nature of values, classification and prioritization of values, a strive for sensitizing society to key values, set standards and valuation criteria or the possibility of implementing certain values.

Axiology can be understood as a general orientation that directs thinking and acting towards what is, on the one hand, most elementary and, on the other, particularly valuable and important (Tyburski, 2011). In relation to sustainable development, as W. Tyburski and P. Domeradzki contend, axiology "proposes a set of universal values, such as life, health, justice, which have the advantage of being acceptable to every human being and, therefore, can serve as a global unifying factor" (Domeradzki, and Tyburski, 2011).

One of the most important works in the area of sustainable development axiology, is a publication by A. Papuziński (Papuziński, 2013), in which the author systematized axiology-related disputes providing their typologization. The author analyzed, for example, the views of W. Tyburski, J.M. Dołęga and L. Gawor, among others, in the context of the philosophy of sustainable development proposed by Z. Hull. A. Papuziński pointed to two distinct types of axiology, i.e. one holistic and altruistic, and the other, individualistic and egoistic. Those two axiological projects are not only different, but they are mutually exclusive. Despite significant discrepancies or contradiction as regards, for example, defining an instrumental goal or taking measures for its implementation, those types are defined as the axiology of sustainable development. Thus, the set and system of values proposed in the axiology of sustainable development, can not only differ, but also exclude each other, which may consequently influence social interpretation of the very idea of sustainable development.

As regards management of sustainable development, including socially important values, it is important to emphasize that, as highlighted by A. Papuziński, values attributed to sustainable development in political discussions related to the needs and acceptable changes in creating a *sustainable* world are diverse and variable (Papuziński, 2013). It is also important to avoid proposing a random axiological system of sustainable development or unspecified understanding of values, even of those widely recognized as rudimentary as this can lead to the risk of accepting attitudes in society which, while expressing concern for the value of life and health, will in practice not be consistent with, for example, the realization of the principle of justice put forward by J. Rawls, which is crucial for the idea of sustainable development. Clearly defined and justified values (e.g. ideal, autotelic, instrumental ones[6]

---

[4] It is worthwhile to pay attention to such authors as W. Tyburski, A. Papuziński, A. Pawłowski, L. Gawor.

[5] The authors addressing the issue of global ethics include, among others: P. Singer, M. Frost, M. Fritzhand, H. Ciążela, J. Lipiec, M. Leźnicki, M. Kaniewska, A. Klimska. Articles of the following authors are also important from the point of view of the thematic scope addressed in this article: R. Boddice, Z. Piątek, T. Ślipko, Z. Łepko, A.G. Bączyk, M. Klimski.

[6] *Conf.* proposition of the axiological system of sustainable development by A. Papuziński (Papuziński, 2013).

(Papuziński, 2013)), which form an ordered and non-accidental axiological system of sustainable development, are an important part of the process of managing sustainable development. Its implementation opens up a chance of exerting a real impact on human morality and, consequently, on the gradual re-shaping of social attitudes.

Axiology of sustainable development, irrelevant of the proposed version, may provide a kind of link between the theory and practice of sustainable development. It constitutes an essential element of "practical ethics", which can be understood as, following A. Pawłowski, a system of values that man respects in his own life and which is reflected in individual attitudes (Pawłowski, 2010). Most often, people implement the existing values and declare those that result from some duty or that are socially accepted and preferred.

The idea of sustainable development does not assume adopting one axiology adequate to the proposed rules, defined problems or postulates. What is taken into account are quantitative and qualitative changes generating new patterns of thinking, decision making and acting, as well as, as L. Zacher wrote (Zacher, 2008), the context of existential and functional conditionings of people in their living environments and the need to adapt to those changes.

Axiology of sustainable development may provide an option for the modern pluralistic society which is entering the next phase of development. Faced with the crisis of morality characterized by the fact that values and moral norms are losing their validity, this axiology has the chance to unite and integrate people. Axiological consensus in the sphere of fundamental values, such as health, life, dignity, justice, is essential for introducing an axio-normative order, i.e. implementing the idea of sustainable development. Its implementation is important because of future generations, but also because of the consequences ensuing from living in the society of risk (Beck, 2002), uncertainty and moral instability.

3. The "goal" values of sustainable development as socially important values

An axiological basis of sustainable development consists primarily of autotelic values (constituting an end in themselves), i.e. the "goal" values which, by virtue of their importance and significance, have become the object of aspirations. They have a normative character, convey the sense of duty, are rational and permanent. The feature of rationality implies that they are implementable, while permanence means that they are passed from generation to generation and are thus lasting.

The idea of sustainable development is presented in many different perspectives and interpreted variously in particular concepts, models or strategies. Each specific proposal defines certain tasks and goals that often relate to a concrete plane (economic, social, ecological, etc.) which, in turn, translates into the established value system.

Focusing on the environmental sustainability means promoting values and the resulting norms, which will relate to the relationship between man or society and nature. Due to the anthropocentric dimension of the idea of sustainable development, the values meant to help in preserving the balance of the ecosystems and the entire biosphere will be pointed out primarily in view of the good of the human species. What can have a positive influence on human existence, health, well-being, improvement of living conditions and civilizational development, should be particularly valued and socially recognized. Values are a manifestation of human concern for the environment as a result of "(...) successively acknowledged ontological dependence of the human organism on the natural conditions favorable to its existence" (Zięba, 2007, p. 20). Ecological values include: dynamic balance and sustainability of ecosystems and the biosphere, biodiversity, natural landscape, biogeochemical cycles, good quality air, unpolluted water and renewable resources.

The value catalog is also created within the framework of the economic plane of sustainable development. However, it is also postulated that an ecological factor understood as a concern for nature, especially for limited non-renewable resources, should be taken into account in economic processes. However, such a specification of preferable values is not an easy task. This difficulty lies in, for example, multiplicity and, what follows, ambiguity as regards proper understanding of economics, management theory or such terms as growth, development, progress, etc. Z. Hull postulates that the economic values of sustainable development should incorporate "(…) all those elements and forms of economic activity (management of nature, and the so-called human resources), conducting business, etc., which in the long-term perspective should support continuity and sustainability of civilizational development in harmony with the capabilities (productivity, efficiency) of ecosystems and the biosphere, enable renewal of its resources and provide conditions for self-realization of people, at the same time leading to reorienting their life attitudes from "having" to "being" (Hull, 2011, p. 76). These include such values as: moderation, thriftiness, proportionality in relation to the volume of production, ecological rationality in business, taking into account capabilities of ecosystems in recreation and consumption, and controlling the technical and technological sphere in the manner that would be most favorable for nature. Adoption of the economic values of sustainable development involves modification of the existing value system functioning in neo-liberal economics. Such attempts are currently being made in the framework of research conducted by ecological economy[7].

---

[7] Ecological economy is a discipline that has emerged as a result of the critique of neoclassical environmental economics. It should not be identified with environmental economics, which examines the relationship between the environment and the economic system, focusing on external effects (the use of the environment as a waste disposal site for the economic system) and natural resources (the natural environment is understood as a provider of renewable and non-renewable resources). In this economics, the natural environment is treated on equal terms with the economy or it constitutes a subsystem which is dependent on it. Eco-economy is, in turn, a discipline which, on the one hand, seeks to solve environmental problems and, on the other, promote and realize the idea of sustainable development. It has an interdisciplinary character - it relies both on economic methods and the data obtained from natural sciences, especially ecology. Ecological economy, which is important in implementing the postulates and principles of sustainable development, promotes values, purposefulness, action and practical application (Jeżowski, 2001, pp. 168-169).

Due to cultural and linguistic pluralism or contemporary political and religious conflicts, development of social values of sustainable development can pose a problem. Realizing those difficulties, Z. Hull proposes to create at least a minimum set of social values and incorporate in it all ideas, structures, institutions, mechanisms and social ties that contribute to developing the consciousness and sense of unity among all people, help solve internal and external conflicts including those of a political, economic and ecological nature by peaceful means. This set of values also includes those that stimulate the processes of developing and propagating environmentally friendly techniques and technologies, and lead to eradicating the general focus on continuous increase in the consumption of material goods. The catalog of sustainable social values comprises, for example, equality, solidarity, security, tolerance, rationality, moderation of consumption, democracy and quality of life (Hull, 2011).

Values may induce people to commence or refrain from undertaking both individual and group activities. An individual plans and then directs his or her own actions in two dependent worlds – the subjective and objective one. Activities are devised and undertaken in one's "own" subjective reality, which is simultaneously experienced with other personal beings. An individual is, therefore, a "co-initiator" of his or her own activities, which are to a high degree influenced by other people, both contemporary and those living in the past. The same refers to values that exist as social products that define what is desirable. In an individual dimension, the fact of being guided by a certain value can mean simply favoring something. Subjective values constitute a benchmark for evaluating the righteousness and urgency of tasks. In social terms, values exist independently of the individual and are the decision-making criteria on which that individual rests his or her actions in a conscious or unconscious way (Adamczyk, 2003).

It is difficult to point to an objective catalog of values that would be socially recognized as important in, for example, our country. However, there are studies showing what values are particularly cherished in a given society. Good health seems to be here the primary one (CBOS, BS/111/2013). Although, a majority of opinion polls in Poland relate to local problems, some of their results can be applied to the international situation. An example may be the study on social perception of poverty (CBOS, No. 83/2017) or readiness to cooperate (CBOS, No. 22/2016). For most Poles (95% of respondents), poverty means in particular inability to meet basic needs, i.e. lack of money for food. More than half of respondents (51%) are ready to undertake cooperation for the benefit of those in need. This, however, is not reflected in practice. Private funding for poor countries is still small, despite the problem being promoted by organizations dealing with development cooperation or humanitarian aid. However, an undoubtedly positive phenomenon here is the growth of Polish development aid by over 40% (Zagranica, 14.08.2017).

Values that could be considered as socially important in a global perspective have been highlighted in international documents, such as the *2030 Sustainable Development Agenda* or the *EU Sustainable Development Strategy*. The values expressed in those documents serve to

implement the key postulates of sustainable development and they can be referred to as socially important or, in other words, as the "values of the future" (Mayor, 2001). They include those values that are autotelic and universal at the same time, such as life and health, dignity, justice, responsibility, moderation, etc. Although not explicated, they are usually clearly indicated in such documents.

However, their importance is not defined by strategies or specific sustainability programs, but by human solidarity and concern for future generations expressed in attempts at overcoming global problems, especially poverty.

4. Socially important values in the concept of systemic management of sustainable development

The term "management" is an ambiguous one and it is contemporarily enriched by newer and newer contexts and meanings. "Management" is a category considered in terms of diverse human activities. Not every management can be attributed a positive character since, as emphasized by B. Piontek, without indicating axiological evaluation criteria of the "management" category, we run the risk of generating apparent growth or even anti-development (Piontek, 2007).

Following B. Poskrobko, we may presently define management, as "(...) organizational and managerial activity based on knowledge and conducted for effective and efficient use of human, capital and material resources" (Poskrobko, 2007, p. 10).

While addressing the process of sustainable development management, it is necessary to explain also the concept of "development management". Based on the indications by B. Piontek, we might adopt the following definitions:

- development management is a superior category to any other forms and types of management,
- development management is a benchmark for sectoral management areas,
- the aim of development management is to shape both the order as well as the internal and external balance of the management area.

Hence, development management can be defined as "a complex activity consisting of partial functions and relying on transition from the less perfect to more perfect forms, which should be subordinated to the dignity of the human person (...) and have axiological foundations" (Piontek, 2007, pp. 372-373). Thus understood, development management, also referred to as sustainable development, should be seen systematically. System is defined as a set of various elements differentiated from its surrounding (a larger system) that are interrelated, interdependent, mutually interacting and which form a whole with respect to a defined feature. Each element serves specific functions within this whole, and it can form

subsystems. It is assumed, that system is a mental construct, a way of discovering the world by identifying systemic features in it (Lubański, 1997). As rightly noted by L. von Bertalanff, "in all areas of knowledge we are compelled to deal with complex arrangements, "wholes" or "systems"" (Bertalanffy, 2012). According to the author, a systemic approach is a prerequisite for achieving the set goals by way of analyzing all possible solutions and then selecting the most appropriate ones. Systemic thinking, which is the basis of any system-based management, allows to gain deeper understanding of relationships as compared to the linear chain of causes and effects. It also provides a view of the whole process, rather than just some snapshots of it (Senge, 2012).

Systemic management of sustainable development requires a comprehensive approach in analyzing change determinants within specific subsystems (among others, social, economic, environmental), generating the desired interactions and coupling. The degree of complexity of an otherwise well-structured system may be indicative of high management quality. Good management, to a large extent conditions implementation of the idea of sustainable development. An important element in the concept of systemic management of sustainability is value management or management of socially important values.

Value management is most often associated with an enterprise management strategy. Value Based Management is about striving to increase a company's potential by implementing a proper growth strategy (Szczepankowski, 2008). However, the practice of sustainable development requires viewing values in the existential dimension as valuable, worthy of desire, constituting the goal of human endeavors. It, therefore, requires managing socially important values from the point of view of sustainable development and within the proposed axiology.

As part of systemic management of sustainable development, which assumes implementation of "planned" development, taking into account human dignity and a defined catalog of values, it is necessary to adopt a preferred concept of sustainable development axiology. However, it should not be regarded as unchanging and final, since it is impossible to work out the full list of values that fit into the content and the assumptions of the idea of sustainable development. This is due to the dynamic character of values that are subject to change in the context of historical and situational changes. Depending on the prevailing conditions, place and time, certain values that were previously neutral may become crucial in the process of implementing sustainable development. Their catalog may also be enriched in the future with values whose significance we do not yet recognize or are aware of (Hull, 2011). Furthermore, given the specific axiology of sustainable development, it is worth noting that "Today's axiological doctrines influence reality through the mobilization of people, that is, by inclining them to adopt a particular attitude. They generally contain three component parts: a far-reaching autotelic goal, an instrumental goal and means for the attainment of that goal. Their power depends primarily on the attractiveness of the goals and the credibility of the proposed means". (Papuziński, 2013, p. 19).

The next stage of management may consists in propagating values recognized in this axiology as socially important, so that they can be properly reflected in individual values. Socialization and linguistic communication are important in the process of creating, modifying and strengthening individual values. Institutions and organizations, including both governmental and non-governmental ones, play a significant role here. Institutions, especially the state ones, are an important reference point in the lives of individuals and society. They set direction for human activities, establish routine with respect to social initiatives and contribute to the strengthening of some social relationships. Moreover, institutions help to grasp the proper meaning of values or strengthen their significance, which is particularly important in the process of sustainable development. As noted by J. Górniak, "(...) in Poland, it is not so much the problem of substantial values that would hinder development, as of poor institutions. Institutions based on the foundation of values, should set direction for development and give it a momentum. Poorly constructed, (...) they create a barrier to this development" (Górniak, 2005). In order to increase social activity directed towards implementation of sustainable development, objective values cataloged for the purposes of building a new social and economic order must be reflected in the attitudes of individuals. Individualized values provide stronger motivation for people to take action and they effect in shaping certain habits. Not everyone understands the same value in the same way, and not everyone recognizes to the same degree the importance and urgency of a given activity. Permanence and proper understanding of values can be ensured by appropriate institutions. It is important that institutions supporting sustainable development are guided by a similar value system (Adamczyk, 2003) and, therefore, promote it. Competing or conflicting institutions may lead people to revealing different individual values or to disregarding values, e.g. those which are globally recognized as socially important and considered as priority values for the restoration of human dignity or the pursuit of the common good.

The use of philosophical and educational tools is an important element in managing socially important values. Education may provide effective means of reaching the public and promoting activities that will constitute realization of specific values. Therefore, the systemic concept of sustainable development should incorporate education for sustainable development, whose "essential component ... must be the axiological basis and education in the spirit of universal values such as goodness, justice, responsibility, solidarity and tolerance" (Kuzior, 2014, p. 88). Philosophy, in turn, can set the direction for human thinking and action and, consequently, the process of development itself. One could read in an ironic way the sentence of K. Rawls quoted by Pankoj Kanti Sarkar: "While activists goes on and do something, philosophers just thinks". However, as the author adds, "But a normative thought, a causal and phenomenological analysis of modern social condition is the necessary conditions for solving environmental problems. Thus, there is an important normative relationship between environmental ethical thought and environmental action in our efforts to save the world from global catastrophe" (Sarkar, 2012, p. 394). At the same time, it should be

emphasized that philosophical models of action may supersede a specific type of praxeology, which influences the decisions of individuals.

Engaging philosophers in the process of managing socially important values, also means analyzing the essence of values in the context of their changing rank in modern society and of the need to interiorize them. It will, therefore, be important to decide how to build a "sense of worth" in a man. It is possible to "grasp the idea of justice in a purely intellectual way, but to grasp, for example, the value of justice (...) requires an act, which would at the same time have an emotional character" (Filek, 1996, p. 116). A sense of worth is a prerequisite for people to feel obliged to, for example, implement the value of justice. J. Filek, referring to N. Hartmann, points out that this sense of worth is also one of human moral capacities which must be developed because there is a risk that it will disappear. As a specifically human "axiological organ", it can also reach full maturity (Filek, 1996, p. 119).

Systemic management of sustainable development which includes, among others, management of socially important values, is not an easy task due to the diversity of subsystems – distinct system features, or different ways in which entities, organizations and institutions operate. Philosophical thinking (including systemic, abstract, logical thinking) helps to create a holistic vision of management, which, if it "(...) is wise and comprehensive, enables carrying out sensible, multi-directional activities" (Borkowski, 2013, p. 33). This management should, at the same time, be supported by educational activities, which provide higher chance for equipping the human being with the system of values and the resulting norms.

5. Conclusion

Adoption of patterns and standards of behavior or attitudes and principles of behavior proposed in certain sustainability concepts and strategies as well as their justification, are largely dependent on values accepted by man or respected by society. Crisis in the sphere of morality or destruction of normativity[8] (Mariański, 2014) characteristic of the postmodern society point to the necessity to create axiomatic normative programs. A number of proposals for such programs have emerged with reference to the idea of sustainable development. A strive towards introducing a global order at the economic, socio-cultural and environmental level requires establishing an axiological basis. The axiologies of sustainable development point to values whose realization is particularly important for both contemporary and future generations. These values are the regulators of human activities orienting them, among others, towards sustainable development purposes. Among them, are values that are an end in

---

[8] Destruction of normativity is manifested in the breakdown of social norms, i.e. generally accepted rules of conduct (Mariański, 2014, pp. 222-223).

themselves. They express duty and are characterized by permanence. The normative nature of these values justifies their being recognized as socially important. However, there are values that are identified e.g. as instrumental and whose rank allows them to be classified as socially important.

Today's values often change due to historical or situational transformations. As a result, there is a proposal to manage socially important values. Educational and philosophical tools shape in people the need for their realization. Such value management is an important part of systemic management of sustainable development, which seems necessary for the introduction of a holistic axio-normative order.

Bibliography

1. Adamczyk, G. (2003). *Wartości społeczne w świadomości młodzieży niemieckiej i polskiej.*, Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.

2. Bauman, Z. (1996). *Etyka ponowoczesna.* Warszawa: PWN.

3. Beck, Ű. (2002). *Społeczeństwo ryzyka. W drodze do innej nowoczesności.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

4. Bertalanffy, L. von (1984). *Ogólna teoria systemów. Podstawy, rozwój, zastosowania.* Warszawa: PWN.

5. Borkowski, T. (2013). Aksjologia w zarządzaniu. In T. Oleksyn (ed.), *Filozofia a zarzadzanie.* Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer Polska, 28-33.

6. Filek, J. (1996). *Z badań nad istotą wartości etycznych.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Platon.

7. Goleński, W. (2013). Polityka społeczna i ekonomia społeczna. Kilka uwag o sprawiedliwości społecznej. *Ekonomia Społeczna, 2*, 9-19.

8. Golka, M. (2007). *Socjologia kultury.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Scholar.

9. *Gotowość do współpracy, 22/2016.* Warszawa: Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej.

10. Górniak, J. (2005). Od czego zacząć zmianę – rekomendacje praktyczne. In J. Szomburg, Z. Krasnodębski, D. Gawin et al. (eds.), *System wartości i norm społecznych podstawą rozwoju Polski.* Gdańsk: Instytut Badań Nad Gospodarką Rynkową, 150-173.

11. Hull, Z. (2011). Wprowadzenie do filozofii zrównoważonego rozwoju. In W. Tyburski (ed.), *Zasady kształtowania postaw sprzyjających wdrażaniu zrównoważonego rozwoju.* Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 33-83.

12. Jeżowski, P. (2001). Ekonomia ekologiczna a rozwój zrównoważony. In F. Piontek (ed.), *Ekonomia a rozwój zrównoważony. Teoria i kształcenie.* Ekonomia i Środowisko, Białystok, 167-177.

13. Kołodko, G.W. (2010). Neoliberalizm i systemowy kryzys globalnej gospodarki. In G.W. Kołodko (ed.), *Globalizacja, kryzys i co dalej?* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Poltext, 88-100.

14. Kuzior, A. (2014). Dekada edukacji dla zrównoważonego rozwoju. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej, s. Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 72*, 87-100.

15. Lubański, M. (1997). Informacja – system. In M. Heller, M. Lubański, S.W. Ślaga (eds.), *Zagadnienia filozoficzne współczesnej nauki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo ATK, 15-153.

16. Mariański, J. (2014). *Moralność w kontekście społecznym*. Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy ”Nomos”.

17. Mayor, F. (2001). *Przyszłość świata*. Warszawa: Fundacja Studiów i Badań Edukacyjnych.

18. Miklaszewska, J. (1998). Obecność wartości w życiu publicznym. In J. Miklaszewska (ed.), *Polityka i świat wartości*. Kraków: FMCRD, 9-14.

19. Osika, G. (2015). Aksjologiczne dylematy inteligentnego rozwoju. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej, s. Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 85*, 395-406.

20. Papuziński, A. (2013). The Axiology of Sustainable Development: An Attempt and Typologization. *Problems of Sustainable Development, 8, 1*, 5-25.

21. Pawłowski, A. (2010). Sustainable development as a Civilization Revolution. In Z. Łepko, R.F. Sadowski (eds.), *A Humanist Approach to Sustainable Development*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 169-184.

22. Pietrzak, E.: Szczepanik, R., Zaorski-Sikora, Ł. (2011). *Aksjologia życia publicznego*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Akademii Humanistyczno-Ekonomicznej.

23. Piontek, B. (2007). Rola i znaczenie planowania w zarządzaniu rozwojem. In B. Piontek, F. Piontek (eds.), *Zarządzanie rozwojem – aspekty społeczne, ekonomiczne i ekologiczne*. Warszawa: PWE, 369-388.

24. Poskrobko, B. (2007). Podstawowe pojęcia nauki o zarządzaniu. In B. Poskrobko (ed.), *Zarządzanie środowiskiem*. Warszawa: PWE, 9-16.

25. Sarkar Pankoj, K. (2012). Saving Earth: An Environmental Ethical Perspektive. In Shivendra Kumar Kashyap, Awadhesh Pathak, and Gaurav Papnai (eds.). *Saving Humanity – Swami Vivekananda Perspektive*. Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, 392-396.

26. Senge, P. (2012). *Piąta dyscyplina*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer Polska.

27. Siemianowski, A. (1993). *Człowiek i świat wartości*. Gniezno: Prymasowskie Wydawnictwo Gaudentinum.

28. *Społeczne postrzeganie ubóstwa*, nr 83/2017. Warszawa: Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej.

29. Szacka, B. (2003). *Wprowadzenie do socjologii*. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.

30. Szczepankowski, P. (2008). Zintegrowany model zarządzania wartością przedsiębiorstwa. In E. Weiss, M. Godlewska, A. Bitkowska (eds.), *Nowe trendy i wyzwania w zarządzaniu. Koncepcje zarządzania*. Warszawa: Vizja Press & IT, 269-282.

31. Tyburski, W. (2011). Etyka środowiskowa i jej wkład w budowanie świadomości sprzyjającej wdrażaniu idei zrównoważonego rozwoju. In W. Tyburski (ed.), *Zasady*

kształtowania postaw sprzyjających wdrażaniu zrównoważonego rozwoju. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 85-157.

32. *Wartości i normy*, BS/111/2013. Warszawa: Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej.

33. Zacher, L. (2008). Sustainable Development – Utopia or Real Possibility? *Problems of Sustainable Development, 3, 2*, 63-68.

34. *Zagranica*. Available online: http://zagranica.org.pl/aktualnosci/wstepne-statystyki-oda-dla-2016-roku-wzrost-polskiej-pomocy-rozwojowej-o-ponad-40, 2017.08.14.

35. Zięba, W. (2007). Filozoficzno-aksjologiczne zaplecze ekorozwoju. *Problemy Ekorozwoju, 2, 1*, 19-25.

36. Zuziak, W. (2012). Czy aksjologia może przezwyciężyć ponowoczesny kryzys wartości? *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria, 2(82)*, 295-310.