

The Global Problems of Sustainable Development of Society in the context of Management of Higher Education and Science

Viktor Zinchenko¹, Mykhailo Boichenko², Iryna Drach³, and Alla Guzhva⁴

¹*Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Senior Researcher, Principal Researcher in Department of University Research Activities, Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9729-6861>*

²*Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of Theoretical and Practical Philosophy, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine*

³*Doctor Habilitated of Education Sciences, Director of Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7501-4122>*

⁴*PhD in Philosophical Sciences, Vice-director, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Kharkiv, Ukraine, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5821-8182>*

¹vvzinchenko@ukr.net, ²mykhai@ukr.net, ³drach_i@ukr.net, ⁴aguzhva@ukr.net

Abstract

Tasks of the sustainable development of society make demand the reforming of national systems of education, because of the need to promote the best values of globalization and internationalization to the next generations. The key role in such promotion plays the effective implementation of higher education development strategy according to sustainable development goals. Management of the integration of higher education in Ukraine into the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area should be conceptually proved by the study of the compliance of strategic guidelines of higher education and its specific educational models with the needs of civilizational progress toward a sustainable future, peace, mutual understanding, mutual respect and care for the environment. The purpose of this study is to reveal the relationship between the solving of the global social problem of ethical motivation to work and the management of higher education and science according to the goals of sustainable development of society. The neo-institutional analysis clarifies the ways of implementing research results in management practice, which will improve the level and quality of internationalization of higher education in Ukraine, shaping a worldview background to stimulate and ensure sustainable development of society, increasing social responsibility of higher education and strengthening its function of serving society.

Keywords: Globalization, Sustainable development, Management, Internationalization, Higher education, Social activism

1. Introduction

Article history:

Received (August 25, 2022), Review Result (October 4, 2022), Accepted (November 21, 2022)

The standpoint that society needs an individual who is characterized by activity, dynamism, ability to act quickly in difficult situations, independence in decision-making, and a sense of responsibility is constantly gaining more and more supporters in the philosophy of education, pedagogy, and sociology of education in the developed countries. Voices, advocating the training of the "effective citizen" as an important condition for strengthening modern society, are becoming louder and louder. In this regard, the problem of individual behavior, the search for forms and means to give it the right direction, is especially sharp [21]. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide a special context for understanding the challenges of education for individuals.

The study of socialization is considered the most traditional in the social philosophy of education, social management theory (as well as in educational management theory), and sociology of education. In general, educational socialization means the transfer to a person the social information, experience, behavioral and ideological values, and culture accumulated in society. Meleckidzedek Khayesi noted that: "In virtually every society, past and present, issues of dignity, fairness, justice, and respect, as spelled out in the SDGs, have been considered in the organization of the social, political, and economic activities of communities. This reality means that concerns about the ethical development of society are not limited to the present" [13]. So it should be examined the origins of modern morality of work and education. José Baltazar Salgueirinho Osório Andrade Guerra et al., have already worked out "different views on the topic "sustainable development," relating them to ethical issues and then associating the discussions with the SDGs" [9]. But the issue of work ethics does not still have its modern assessment of SDGs.

The purpose of this study is to reveal the relationship between the solving of the global social problem of ethical motivation to work and the management of higher education and science according to the goals of sustainable development of society.

2. Neo-institutional Analysis as a Methodology for Studying Motivation in Education and Educational Management

Work ethics was a subject of neo-institutional analysis in the study of Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson [1], Joe Studwell [27], and other researchers. This approach needs to be extrapolated to the study of education management issues. Emphasis should be placed on motivation to learn, teach and work. This motivation is to be taken as a subject of educational management and affects the motivation to manage education.

3. The Threat of Diminishing the Importance of Moral Values and Work Ethics

Modern social scientists are looking at the process of further destruction and alienation of the human personality with particular concern. Viktor Zinchenko emphasizes the crisis of "democratic consciousness" [28], which manifests itself primarily in the destruction of a sense of responsibility, distortion of the concept of freedom which is being interpreted as a large number of rights and lack of responsibilities, in the claim to meet unthinkable needs, in locking a human in the world of his interests and rejection of any social institutions. Mykhailo Boichenko analyses the limits and risks of technocentrism [3].

Thus, 84% of young people aged from 16 to 22 surveyed in the 2000s stated that their interests were focused on their parents, their own home, and communication with friends. Most of all, they value freedom, which is understood as the opportunity to live at one's discretion, up to the commission of crimes [6].

Since the 1980s, the falling prestige of work ethic has become particularly noticeable: people began to avoid public duties and any forms of socialization [8]. This process involved representatives of different age groups, including middle-aged people, and various social groups, especially the middle classes.

Trying to find the cause of this process, some researchers and thinkers see one of the important reasons for avoiding work by representatives of some age groups as the actual industrial "rationalization" of production and education, which increases human dissatisfaction with work and the education system.

Thus, according to the experts in the field of labor economics from West Berlin, Professor Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann and Professor Burkhard Strümpel, in recent years there have been changes in workers' incentives to the forefront when assessing working conditions, the workers now put forward no increase in wages and other material factors (subject to a simultaneous increase in working hours), but the prestige of work, its ability to influence self-development of an individual [22].

Although both theorists of education and public training, as well as those who are involved in educational practice in developed countries, discuss a lot about the need to educate a person in the spirit of freedom, discipline, and respect for authority, they seem to have little idea how to combine these values, what specifically the freedom of young people is expressed in, in particular how it should be manifested in the education institutions.

There is no clarity about the relationship between secular and religious education as well. Many modern researchers still assign a decisive role in education and moral upbringing to religion, which, in their opinion, is best in the formation of the idea of good and evil in young people, to target them to virtuous behavior. The others criticize religion for harming the humanistic nature of education, linking human achievement not to earthly life but to the afterlife. All this indicates that in the modern system of education and public training, as in a mirror, the crisis of the capitalist system in general, and its culture is being reflected. This is manifested, in particular, in the lack of spirituality, and the degradation of public morality.

As if confirming this thesis, many representatives of public opinion in both the West and Ukraine point out that the crisis of moral values is a consequence of the loss of one's own "self", the destruction of family and social relations, the orientation on the brute force as an argument. "Most Americans have a feeling that the foundations of human relations have been destroyed in their lives and the rules of decency that cement society has been forgotten. Americans perceive this as a general destruction of national values, believing that people no longer adhere to the noble and moral way of life that they used to follow" [21], – writes the American expert in pedagogy, philosophy of education, and morals axiology H. Muson.

The European Group on the Study of the Value System has noted a tendency to reduce the significance of absolute moral values for the individual in the world and this region as well. Only 25% of respondents were found to have strong moral convictions, and the ability to distinguish well from evil [18].

4. Crisis of Motivation to Study

Dissatisfaction with their existence generates in people, especially young people, all sorts of negativist reactions. Thus, the 1960s and the early to mid-1970s were marked by a rapid surge of the left-wing youth movement in the West [24]. Social criticism of many members of this movement took distorted forms, resulting in the denial of social responsibilities, principles, and norms, the refusal of obligations to the older generation, and unwillingness to work, because work does not contribute to the disclosure of their creative forces.

This gave rise to the American educator and psychologist K. Keniston, characterizing the young generation of the mid-twentieth century, to call it “irresponsible”, and then – the generation of “young radicals” [12]. It is noteworthy that some ideologues of “rebellious youth”, in particular such significant representatives of neo-Marxism in philosophy as T. Adorno and M. Horkheimer, justified such orientation, arguing that modern rich society can allow young people to replace work with a game that helps to identify and develop creative forces. They shared the view that labor is an “alienated need” and serves as a source of “substance” in which the older generation is immersed [10]. Further on, the opposition of the youth to the existing system was widespread in the West under the name “counterculture”. It was represented by former “fighters” who became (after a period of spontaneous revolt) trustworthy citizens, deprived of interest in modern politics, science, art, etc. “Representatives of this generation may remember who Columbus was, but most of them are unable to name those who have recently been in space” [2]. The author of this apt description of the socio-cultural image of a large part of Western youth at the turn of the 1970s and 1980s rightly sees the reason for this situation in the dominance of a well-established mechanism of planting patterns that have nothing to do with real culture.

One of the manifestations of “counterculture” is the shift of interest of young people from work to leisure, which is justified by such American theorists as Ch. Reich [25], K. Leech [26], and others because labor is the source of exploitation, which is associated with the decline of all Western values. Sharing this position, the Austrian theorist F. Karmel believes that society can allow young people to engage in any other form of activity that they like [11]. The scientific argumentation of these and other theoretical adherents of “counterculture” only encouraged the antisocial behavior of the younger generation. In addition, justifying negativity towards work and abandoning it, meant justifying the destructive instinct for all the values of society, the best elements of culture created by previous generations.

As much theoretically questionable as the direct justification of refusal to work, is the denial of the legitimacy to consider the preparation of the younger generation to work as an important goal of education, thus separating education from training. In this case, according to proponents of this position (for example, the American philosopher of education R. Dennehy), the approach to education becomes relativistic, i.e the role of truth is reduced, and all education is subjected to current, purely practical interests [5].

There is no need to prove that there is no connection between relativism and the desire to prepare a person for practical activities during training. The connection of theory with practice and confirmation of judgments in experience (in the broadest sense of the word) is the most important basis for mastering the truth.

5. Conceptual Philosophical and Pedagogical Principles of Sustainable Development of Society in Higher Education and Science

According to foreign researchers of social and moral customs, since the 1980s privatism, which is a form of social individualism, has been one of the characteristic moral guidelines of people in the developed world. Uniting both liberals and conservatives, privatism as an expression of the desire to succeed, according to the American philosopher and psychologist L. Kohlberg, literally became a national disease that affected primarily the younger generation of developed and transitive (“developing countries”, or transitional type“) states [14]. The essence of the ideology of privatism is expressed in the slogan “seek the best in life”, which in practice turns into a fascination with hedonism (aimed at obtaining unlimited pleasure) in its most primitive form, in the introduction of a kind of every day “philosophy of

permissiveness" into thinking and behavior. The latter is so destructive to the individual that the modern industrial world, writes journalist S. Salkowska, resembles the Roman Empire in decline: it has established a morality that supports the desire for unbridled pleasure, to violation of the moral principles of society [26]. People have become more tolerant of deviations from moral norms, recognizing it as a completely natural situation, when everyone does whatever he wants.

Privatism, according to the definition V. Behr, means "total inflation" of the values of culture, art, morality, and language, loss of understanding of one's purpose, and place in life. These conclusions of V. Behr, and other theorists are confirmed by data from experimental research, and sociological surveys [2]. For example, a three-year study of the behavior of young people in England aged from 16 to 25 in the mid-1990s conducted by the London Central Christian Youth Society found that 54.8% of respondents considered money to be the highest value; one in three young people surveyed called hedonism the main principle of their lives; 79.9% stated that they recognize the importance of only the code of morality developed by them, assume the manifestation of indifference towards other people, their opinions and assessments, the chaotic nature of sexual relations, etc. [19]. Trying to identify and comprehend the reasons for such a turn in the moral orientations of Western youth at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, the transformation of "radicals" into "neoconformists", T. Lickona attributed these changes largely to the fact that former youth values and idols were overthrown. Their attempt to improve society through spontaneous left-wing riots proved unsuccessful.

The 1980s and 1990s gave birth to a whole generation of "young conservatives" who learned the moral norms and values of a capitalized society of consumption and the corresponding way of life. In the late 1980s, the American historian Ch. Lasch described young people as a generation covered by the "culture of narcissism", meaning extreme selfishness, narcissism, loss of social mobility, and recognition of moral regulation is not the mind but the feelings. "Generation is me" is the most capacious formula for expressing the selfish psychology and orientation of a large part of young people at that time [15]. Focused only on private interest, captivated by the desire for satisfaction, in whatever form it manifests itself, Keniston notes, young people remained indifferent to social problems, such as the racial problem, the changing political situation in the country, and so on.

As E. Pellegrino, editor of the Catholic journal *Medicine and Philosophy*, notes, "narcissism at this time is no longer just a form of neurosis, it is the subject of boasting and pride of the youth" [23]. This is understood by progressive-minded scientists around the world.

As the American researcher in the field of ethics and philosophy of education and public training T. Lickona notes, "the national consciousness of the country is now more than ever focused on moral issues. We discuss not only the nature of morality but also how to cultivate a moral personality, which means adherence to principles in human behavior, what factors influence the actions of people in a particular situation, and what can the family and society do to form morally mature citizens [19]. Also Th. Brameld emphasized, "preparing a mature, holistic personality" as a "main purpose of education" [4].

The 2000s, by contrast, contributed to a total revolution in the thinking, values, and patterns of social behavior of the younger generation – growing frustration among Western youth (which, however, does not lead to social apathy, unlike the youth non-conformism of the 1960s, and on the contrary, produces a kind of peculiar and growing social activism) [17] in the pseudo-values of consumption, accumulation, conformism; increasing commitment not

only to theoretical studies but also to the practical implementation of models of social justice (including in the field of education), public and educational self-government.

In the current situation, many representatives of the philosophical, pedagogical, sociological, and ethical thought of the developed countries associate hopes for the resolution of existing contradictions in society, the recovery of socio-moral customs with the search for a “new morality”, the idea of which, however, they have far not unambiguous. Their assessment of the socio-moral situation itself is also contradictory.

On the one hand, the search for a “new morality” would seem to mean an indirect recognition of the deep moral crisis of the dominant version of the industrial “consumer society”, its traditional moral values, and above all the principle of individualism, recognition of alienation, initiative, and ability to influence social events and one that has lost value even in their own eyes.

Recently, the idea of changing the moral atmosphere of society has been discussed again, however, now with the help of not a “new morality” but a “new ethics”.

For a human to become an individual, the process of his/her learning must be inextricably linked with moral education, the formation of such moral qualities that would help to take a worthy place in public life, make moral choices, determine behavior, and own life position [23]. And the task of forming these qualities in people in all regions of the modern interdependent world is becoming increasingly important and acquires the status of a truly universal social and moral need.

At the same time, it is often suggested that the “new ethics” can develop only as a system of applied knowledge, in which one of the first places belongs to environmental ethics, which is sometimes called “planetary ethics” [8]. The sustainable development of society needs advanced learning based not only on new scientific achievements but on proper ethical values and sound social virtues as well.

6. Conclusions

At first look, according to a large number of educators and philosophers, who specialize in education, educational institutions and other social institutions related to human formation do not cope with this task. This is not hypercriticism, but a focus on problems rather than prospects.

One of the most vulnerable places in the modern system of education and science, they see in the fact that there is no clear line of relations between learners and teachers and, more broadly, between an individual and society, which prevents the construction of a hierarchy of moral values. But if one takes into account SDGs, then such hierarchy will emerge – from the needs of mankind as a strategic goal to the rights of individuals as the only means to achieve this goal. The national educational system can be both an obstacle (if opposed to the SDGs) and an important contribution and a powerful tool to achieve the global goal (in the case of the considerable implementation of the SDGs).

As a fact, most of the national education systems had recently failed to adequately address the social conflict between a person interested in controlling his or her behavior based on his or her own goals, goals, and preferences, and a state more interested in educating a person who is completely loyal to what existing systems. This put a limitation on educational success, but the prospect is in a broader appeal to the potential of civil society, non-formal educational institutions, and the fuller use of the family as a participant in education.

The state should more widely encourage private initiatives and involve all education stakeholders in identifying ways to obtain an education and to do so diversify ways to achieve common goals for the development of education and society – SDGs.

References

- [1] D. Acemoglu and J. A. Robinson, “Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty,” (1st). 1st Ed. New York: Crown, 529, **(2012)**
- [2] W. Behr, “Jugendkrise und jugendprotest,” Stuttgart: Kohlhammer W. **(1982)**
- [3] M. Boichenko, “Human evolution: The limits of technocentrism,” *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 19, 15-22, (2021), DOI: 10.15802/ampr.v0i19.235956
- [4] Th. Brameld, “Education for the emerging age,” New York: Harper and Brothers, VIII, **(1961)**
- [5] R. Dennehy, “Education, vocationalism and democracy,” *Thought: Fordham University Quarterly*, vol.57, no.2, pp.182-195, **(1982)**
- [6] M. Depaepe, and P. Smeyers, (eds.), “Beyond empiricism: On criteria for educational research,” Leuven: Leuven University Press, **(2003)**
- [7] Education at a Glance 2021. OECD Indicators. <https://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance/> **(2021)**
- [8] K. E. Goodpaster and K. M. Sayre, (eds.), “Ethics and the problems of the 21-st century,” University of Notre Dame Press, **(2016)**
- [9] J. B. S. O. A. Guerra, M. Hoffmann, R. T. Bianchet, P. Medeiros, A. P. Provin & R. Iunskovski, “Sustainable development goals and ethics: building “the future we want,” *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, vol.24, pp.9407–9428, **(2022)** DOI:10.1007/s10668-021-01831-0
- [10] M. Horkheimer, “Bemerkungen über wissenschaft und krise,” *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, vol.1, no.2, pp.1-7, **(1932)**
- [11] F. Karmel, “Youth, education and employment,” *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol.7, no.2, pp.35-60, **(1990)**
- [12] K. Keniston, “Youth and dissent. The rise of a new opposition,” New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, **(1971)**
- [13] M. Khayesi, “What is the ethical reflection of the sustainable development goals?” *Sustainability and Climate Change*, vol.14, no.3, pp.138, **(2021)** DOI: 10.1089/scc.2020.0073
- [14] L. Kohlberg, “Education for a just society,” In: Munsey, B. (ed.). “Moral development, moral education, and Kohlberg: basic issues in philosophy, psychology, religion, and education”, Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, pp.15-98, **(1980)**
- [15] Chr. Lasch, “The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations,” New York: W. W. Norton, **(1991)**
- [16] K. Leech, “Youthquake: The growth of a counter-culture,” London: Sheldon Press, **(1973)**
- [17] L. LeVasseur and A. Robichaud, “L’envers de la résistance en éducation: Emancipation, conservatisme et paradoxes,” *Education et sociétés*, vol.39, no.1, pp.85-99, **(2017)**
- [18] Les indicateurs de l’enseignement 2018 (La Direction générale du Pilotage du Système éducatif présente la treizième édition des «Indicateurs de l’enseignement»), (2018). Le portail de l’enseignement en Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles. <http://www.enseignement.be/index.php?page=28126&navi=4551>
- [19] T. Lickona, “Moral development and behavior: Theory, Research, and social issues,” New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, **(2018)**
- [20] B. Moignard and S. Rubi, “Les figures de la déviance à l’école: les “élèves perturbateurs, comme analyseur de la transformation des milieux éducatifs et scolaires”, *Education et sociétés*, vol.41: Vingt ans après: la sociologie de l’éducation et de la formation francophone dans un univers globalisé, pp.43-61, **(2018)**
- [21] H. Muson, “An overview of educational efforts to improve character,” In: McClelland D. (ed.), “Education for Values”, New York: Irvington Publisher, pp.1-25, **(1982)**

- [22] E. Noelle-Neumann, and B. Strumpel, "Macht Arbeit Krank? Macht Arbeit Glücklich: Eine Aktuelle Kontroverse," München: Piper Verlag, **(1984)**
- [23] E. Pellegrino, "The catholic universities and the church's intellectual ministry: the crisis of identity and justification," *Thought: Fordham University Quarterly*, vol.57, no.2, pp.165-181, **(1982)**
- [24] M. Potvin, "Diversité ethnique et éducation inclusive: Fondements et perspectives," *Education et sociétés*, vol.33, no.1, pp.185-202, **(2014)**
- [25] Ch. Reich, "The greening of society," New York: Bantam Books, **(1970)**
- [26] Ch. Salkowska, "America's morality. Hanging in the balance," In: Rieff, P., & Finkle, I. (eds.). "Moral Choices in Contemporary Society", Del Mar, CA: Publisher's Inc., pp.63-78, **(1977)**
- [27] J. Studwell, "How Asia works: Success and failure in the world's most dynamic region," New York: Grove press
- [28] V. Zinchenko, "Global institutional transformations and the prospects of sustainable development of society in the context of the internationalization of higher education," *Perspectives of Science and Education*, vol.44, no.2, pp.10-18, (2020) DOI: 10.32744/pse.2020.2.1