Edukacja Etyczna 18/2021 ISSN 2083-8972

Mateusz Szast
Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny w Krakowie
ORCID: 0000-0001-5677-6471
DOI 10.24917/20838972.18.9

Ethical or unethical, permitted or prohibited? Social coexistence norms in the opinion of the surveyed youth

1. Introduction

Approaches and modern man's view of the world are a subject to dynamic changes as a result of various factors. These include, among others: the increased importance of consumerism, increased social mobility (both internal and external), increased enrolment ratios, and above all, changes in the perception of human beings and their rights with respect to leisure time, self-fulfillment and self-determination. In addition, it is remarkable to note the present situation, namely the increased interest in the issues of health and compactness as a result of the global crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which, contrary to appearances, may have slightly altered the optics of how modern man sees the world. This optics, as I mentioned earlier, has been dependent on man-made factors so far, as the man has made alterations as a result of his individual decisions. Nowadays, decision-making in the area of health, its protection and isolation, does not necessarily depend on the individual, except is rather directed from above by governmental institutions, which does not remain without the significance for its functioning. Two issues seem to be of interest to sociologists within this field of transformation: values and norms. The first one, concerning the axiology of modern man in the era of COVID-19 will as well be described on the basis of research, while the second issue, i.e. norms and standards of social coexistence will be converted into the main theme of this particular text.

The indicated article is a response to the essential inquiry: what norms do the surveyed youth is guided by? Is it focused on the pursuit of particular individual interests or does it conservatively recognise the norms that have so far been most cherished among Poles, which include the principles contained in the decalogue, respect and the rules of family life, honesty/loyalty as regards family, nation, the common good and the acquisition of material goods? Which norms are presently the most

significant for the respondents? The expected response to such research inquiries is not straightforward, as nationwide surveys provide information on the values and norms of Polish society[1].

The hypothetical response to the inquiry posed in this way oscillates around the assumption that contemporary young respondents may be guided by norms referring to their individual programmes of activities adjusted to their own needs correlating with the realisation of current tasks. However, such a response would be simplistic, as the research on which this article is based allows for additional conclusions in this field.

The respondent guided by both affiliation norms and less stabilization along with religious norms, is sensitive to social injustice as well as animal cruelty. The aim of the article is to identify the moral / ethical standards of the respondents, without comparing the norms before and during the pandemic through a set of declarations about moral standards given by the respondents. In the light of the declarations specified in the introduction (hypotheses), there may be an alteration in the declarations of the respondents, however more information is presented in the further part of this article.

2. Conceptualisation

What is currently ethical and what is not ethical? Which norms are desirable and which are not? Each social group develops a series of different suggestions, measures, orders, prohibitions, a system of persuasion and pressure up to physical coercion, as well as a system of recognition (rewards) in order to act according to an accepted pattern of action, respecting the criteria of social values. The following elements can be distinguished in this area: custom, habit and sanctions. a custom is an established way of behaving in certain situations, while a habit is an established way of behaving from which a group or an individual associates certain moral evaluations and the violation of which generates sanctions. Sanctions, in turn, are specific ways of repression[2]. a particular kind of influence on man is the establishment of norms supported by sanctions, that is, ordering actions considered good, since the society has formed the habit of behaviour determined by these norms. Axiologically justified norms are called “moral norms, either in the judgement of the addressee of the norm (autonomous moral norms) or in the judgement of some person considered as an authority (heteronomous moral

1 B. Badora*, Wartości w czasach zarazy, Komunikat z badań,* nr 160/2020, CBOS.

2 J. Szczepański, *Elementarne pojęcia socjologii* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1965), s. 120.

norms)"[3]. It is not clear who is currently the authority, i.e. the individual who can establish or has established the norm (theoretical justification of the norm)[4].

Terms, such as: amoral, immoral and unethical - are frequently used to refer interchangeably to a person behaving inappropriately. What is important, ethics itself, as the science of morality, its origin and development, rules of human conduct, is sometimes treated interchangeably as morality[5]. As Janusz Mariański says, "the term moral norm is used in sociology as a basic tool to describe and explain social phenomena. The term "ethical norm" is avoided, although such a term would be in line with a certain semantic convention, according to which the normative sphere of human activities would be described by the term "ethical". (e.g. ethical norms) while the sphere of actual human attitudes and actions would be characterised by the term "moral" (e.g. moral attitudes, moral behaviour)"[6]. Such a convention, as Janusz Mariański says, has not taken hold in the sociology of morality.

Therefore, it seems thought provoking what is significant nowadays as well as which behaviors a contemporary young person considers legitimate moreover which are considered inappropriate. As a result, it is vital to raise a subject of the discipline of science which concerns the study of moral facts as pure socio-cultural facts, consequently, examines the essence of good, moral behavior, inquiries about humanity as well as the nature of humanity. The ambiguity of the words good and bad is relevant nowadays, since it may not in fact clarify anything as of the subjective approach to universally applicable norms. On the contrary, normative ethics (deontology), deals with norms, i.e. obligations in the field of individual ethics along with social ethics[7].

Norms are defined in sociology as specific "social rules as well as guidelines defining appropriate behaviour in particular situations"[8] and ought to be studied by using various indicators as empirical, observed elements of the concept[9] which concerns the sociology of morality, further known as sociological ethics. Moral phenomena are included in the category of social phenomena, in consequence, they acquire an objective

3 Z. Ziembński, *Elementy socjologii* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Ars boni et aequi, 1994), s. 28.

4 Ibidem.

5 Hasło: Etyka, w: M. Rozentala, P. Judyna, *Krótki Słownik Filozoficzny* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1955), s. 151.

6 J. Mariański, *Socjologia moralności* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2006), s. 301.

7 P. Pratley, *Etyka w biznesie* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo FELBERG SJA, 2000), s. 12.

8 N. Goodman, *Wstęp do socjologii*, przeł. J. Polak, J. Ruszkowski, U. Zielińska (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, 1997), 362

9 Ch. Frankfort-Nachmias, D. Nachmias, *Metody badawcze w naukach społecznych*, przeł. E. Hornowska (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, 2001), s. 611.

character, external to individuals, as well as exert coercion supported by sanctions. According to Mariański, subjective morality is a reconstruction of socio-objective morality. In sociological ethics, the individual is not a person, a self-contained subject of action, having his own individual goal, except lives and acts in a social group[10].

The concept of the present research stemmed from learning about the respondents' opinions on their preferences, norms, values, which were to be independent variables in other analyses. The concept of norms used for the purposes of the present research is in other words "permanent guidelines, enabling an independent choice in various situations (including those that are not regulated by customs and habits), such behaviours that would not violate the welfare of others, the common welfare, or even one's own well-being"[11]. Moral norms are justified by values and linked to sanctions. As a result, man is not only able to act correctly, however in addition they enable him to response the inquiry concerning the legitimacy of acting in accordance with the norms as well as to predict the consequences of his socially acceptable behaviour or which violate existing norms. a distinction is made between moral norms as the principles of behaviour, expressed as guidelines (do unto others as you would have them do unto you), or as concrete patterns of behaviour that are prescribed or recommended (positive patterns) or discouraged (negative patterns)[12].

3 Methodology

The data which the author bases this article on, comes from three scientific studies conducted in 2020 and 2021. The research was carried out by means of an online survey CAWI (*Computer-Assisted Web Interviews*)[13], as *face to face* surveys were excluded due to social isolation. The first survey was carried out in spring (May) 2020 among 820 people under the title "Contemporary Ideals". The second survey of 607 people was entitled 'Preferences of Contemporary Singles' and was being conducted now, April 2021, and the third research project entitled 'Trust and distrust in the age of pandemonium' was being conducted among 807 respondents in October 2020. All studies included inquiries relating

10 J. Mariański*, Nauka o moralności Marii Ossowskiej w opinii środowisk katolickich*, „PRINCIPIA" XLV–XLVI (2006), s. 15.

11 K. Bolesta-Kukuła, *Socjologia ogólna* (Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, 2003), s. 196.

12 Ibidem.

13 D. Mider, *Jak badać opinię publiczną w Internecie? Ewaluacja wybranych technik badawczych*, w: Przegląd Socjologiczny, Łódzkie Stowarzyszenie Naukowe, 2013, http://sbn.wat.edu.pl/pdf-129788-56659?filename=KU%20NOWOCZESNOSCI%20_%20CAWI.pdf, s.2.

to norms and values, the inquiries were similar or sounded the same, all in order to compare them later - which I hereby do. The inquiries about axiology and norms were to become variables used for other analyses in this research. It occurred that in the course of analysis and preparation of reports from individual studies, interesting tendencies regarding the norms of social coexistence preferred by the respondents were noticed. It should be noted that the respondents were mainly young people between 18 and 25 years of age, living mainly in the Małopolska region and Kraków itself, where women predominated in terms of gender (Table 1.). The population taking part in the research was comparable, the research was carried out with the use of purposeful sample and therefore non-random selection scheme[14], consequently the research does not meet the features of representativeness, for that reason the results will not be generalised to the entire community and there was no requirement to conduct in-depth statistical analyses in this range. No additional statistics were performed based on the testing of variables as well as the data employed is merely illustrative of the ethical standards of the respondents, without comparing the standards before and during the pandemic. Due to the lack of representativeness, comparative analyses in this area are unjustified, although countless nationwide sources might allow for comparisons (references to the research in the footnote[15]).

Table 1. Gender of respondents

	Female	**Male**	**Total**
„Ideals of modern youth"			
Number of respondents (N)	707	113	822
Percentage of respondents (%)	86,2%	13,8%	100%
„Trust and distrust"			
Number of respondents (N)	527	280	807
Percentage of respondents (%)	65,3%	34,7%	100%

14 Ch. Frankfort-Nachmias, D. Nachmias, *Metody badawcze w naukach społecznych*, przeł. E. Hornowska (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, 2001), s. 198.

15 B. Badora, *Wartości w czasach zarazy, Komunikat z badań,* nr 160/2020, CBOS. R. Boguszewski, *Co jest ważne, co można, a czego nie wolno – normy i wartości w życiu Polaków, Komunikat z badań,* nr BS/99/2010.

„Singles”			
Number of respondents (N)	336	271	607
Percentage of respondents (%)	55,3%	44,7%	100%

Source: Own calculations

4. Analysis of the collected material

The analysis of the collected research material will begin with issues related to the general assumption of the importance of norms for the respondents. The inquiry was: Are the norms of social coexistence important for you? The results in Table 2. illustrate the responses received on this issue. It is shown that presently 18.3% of the respondents participating in the study oppose the norms at all, as a large percentage of respondents, i.e. 34.6% have no judgment on this issue, which raises some concerns, for the reason that we unrecognize whether these people reject to admit their own opinion on this matter, whether people dismiss the norms within which shape their own conduct as well as life or whether detest the norms or are ashamed to admit to them. Nearly half of the respondents respect the norms.

Table 2. Importance of norms in the opinion of respondents

Yes	**No**	**I don’t know**	**Total**
285 (47,1%)	111 (18,3%)	209 (34,6%)	605 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

A further issue is the general assumption of applying savoir-vivre rules on a daily basis by the respondents. Namely (Table 3.), ¾ of the respondents are of the opinion that these rules are significant to them and are applied. These rules are of little or no importance for 19% of the respondents. This inquiry proves that savoir-vivre rules are essential for the respondents. The respondents were asked (Table 4.) “Do you think that dress code should be appropriate to the place and situation? The obtained results confirm that according to the surveyed, the vast majority of them are of the opinion that the dress code should be appropriate to the circumstances. No more than 6.8% of the respondents claim it is unimportant what they will be dressed in during different events of their life. It would be appropriate to ask another probing inquiry, which was

missing, namely, according to the respondents, what characterizes this adequacy of attire? Respecting the norms and principles of dress code, consent or contemporary fashion, or perhaps following the classical canon of beauty in terms of clothing as well as emphasising one's individuality (make-up, cosmetics, permanent decorations - tattoos).

Table 3. Savoir-vivre rules as assessed by the respondents

Very important	Important	Of little importance	Unimportant to me	I have no opinion	Total
79 (9,6%)	543 (66,1%)	142 (17,3%)	14 (1,7%)	44 (5,3%)	822 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

Table 4. Resourcefulness of outfit selection in relation to circumstances and occasions in the opinion of respondents

Clothing should be appropirate to the occasion	No, it doesn't matter	I have no opinion	Total
674 (82,2%)	56 (6,8%)	90 (11%)	820 (100%)

Source: Own calculation

Subsequently, it is worth paying attention to the issue of application of norms and principles determined by the religion of the respondents. Taking into account the scope of the inquiry, it was general and referred to the followers of all religions, not only Roman Catholicism. Half of the people participating in the study try to follow the principles of their religion, however only 7.3% of the respondents definitely follow these principles. a large group of respondents does not observe these norms, which in connection with general data concerning decrease in importance of faith (our research confirmed it in two projects among this group of respondents) is justified and results from the fact that values stemming from faith and religion are not that significant for a contemporary young person participating in the research. The detailed distribution of responses is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Range of respondents' responses to the inquiry: Do you follow the norms/rules/commandments set by your religion?

Yes	No	I try to obey	Total
59 (7,3%)	342 (42,2%)	410 (50,5%)	811 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

Considering the issue of religion a inquiry was raised about the legitimacy of teaching them at schools (Table 6). The initial question inquired the elimination of religion and ethics from schools, however it is elementary that one inquiry should refer to single issue - therefore the inquiry was merely restricted to religion. The opinion of respondents in this area is interesting, since the option of removing religion from schools is supported by 38.1% of the respondents, while only one fourth of the respondents was of an opposite opinion. Indifference in this respect is declared by a large percentage of respondents which as well raises some doubts about the value of religion, the legitimacy of taking it up in the opinion of those who lackse a clear, explicit opinion on this issue, an issue that causes a lot of controversy and social tensions.

Table 6. Opinion of respondents on eliminating religion from schools

I agree	I disagree	I don't care	Total
313 (38,1%)	204 (24,8%)	305 (37,1%)	822 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

Religious holidays are, despite the previous responses, still vital for the respondents, as a small percentage of respondents contemn religious holidays, whereas merely 15.2% of respondents declare atheism or agnosticism. It is compelling, especially in the context of at least partial participation of respondents in religious festivals or those of a religious nature in the context of earlier responses of these people concerning elimination of religion from schools as well as application of religious principles in life. This may indicate that the respondents, professing faith, attend celebrations of holidays (even the most significant ones),

however reject interference of religion in institutional assumptions or curricular frameworks of schools and their influence on the principles of social life in the common sense. In addition, is assumed that religion is currently becoming an individualised matter of each person, whilst it ought to be manifested without the participation of the wider community. The detailed distribution of responses is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Do you celebrate religious holidays?

Yes, all	**Yes, however only the most important**	**No, I do not celebrate any religious holidays**	**I am atheist/agnostic**	**Total**
231 (28,1%)	434 (52,9%)	31 (3,8%)	125 (15,2%)	821 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

One of the moral norms stemming from faith as well as tradition is cohabitation or living together before entering into a formalized marriage or "before marriage". a survey inquiry was asked: Is living with your partner/partner before marriage in your opinion allowed? According to the responses obtained, the respondents are of the opinion that living together before legalization of the emotional union is permissible (sum of the responses definitely yes and rather yes), only 6.8% of the respondents were of the opposite opinion. In this inquiry the respondents presented more decisiveness in defining their preferences and clearly stated their opinion (Table 8).

Table 8. Respondents' approval for living with their partner before marriage

Definitely yes	Rather yes	Total of Definitely yes and Rather yes	Definitely no	Rather no	I have no opinion	Total
603 (73,4%)	150 (18,2%)	753 (91,6%)	29 (3,5%)	27 (3,3%)	14 (1,6%)	822 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

The next inquiry concerned trust and falsehood to people close to the respondents. The inquiry was asked about the frequency of lying to loved

ones by the respondents. The results are presented in Table 9., where responses from three research projects were included, as well as bring interesting conclusions. It presents that a small percentage of respondents always lies to their relatives. Subsequently, few of the respondents lie to their relatives frequently, while far more people lie sometimes. It should be noted that as the frequency of lying changes, the possibility to be dishonest increases and it is interesting that in different surveys, the response to the same survey inquiry is characterized by small percentages of differences in individual preferences. The conclusion is: as the intensity of the frequency of lying changes, the intensity of insincerity increases, i.e. often respondents declare lying less often than occasionally. The lack of the data is remarkable - the respondents presented decisiveness in this extent. Another thing is the percentage of people who are sincere: about one fifth of the respondents declare sincerity despite the circumstances and variability of fate.

Table 9. Respondents' responses to the inquiry: How often do you lie to your partner/parents/relatives?

	Always	**Very often**	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Never**	**No data**	**Total**
„Ideals"	2 (0,2%)	26 (3,2%)	77 (9,4%)	549 (66,8%)	168 (20,4%)	0	822 (100%)
„Trust"	5 (0,6%)	14 (1,7%)	44 (5,4%)	600 (74,4%)	144 (17,9%)	0	807 (100%)
„Singles"	6 (1%)	28 (4,6%)	56 (9,2%)	417 (68,8%)	99 (16,4%)	0	606 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

Interesting, in the context of shaping interpersonal relations, is the inquiry asked to respondents in one of the research projects, concerning readiness to forgive betrayal by a partner. It turned out that almost half of the respondents would not forgive (needless to say in a hypothetical situation) a betrayal by a close person. No opinion on this issue was declared by a large group of respondents (41.7%), which may result from young age, lack of emotional relations and lack of experience in this area. Those willing to forgive accounted for 8.8% of the respondents (Table 10).

Table 10. Willingness to forgive a betrayal by a partner

Yes	No	I don't know	Total
72 (8,8%)	407 (49,5%)	343 (41,7%)	822 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

Rules of social coexistence in the area of law enforcement is an interesting issue, especially in the context of traffic law. There is an established conviction, a social acceptance of traffic offences (driving faster than the speed limit, parking in a forbidden space, e.g. a lawn, a space for the disabled, etc.) or talking on a mobile phone while driving. a inquiry on this issue was asked to identify the respondents' preferences regarding traffic norms and rules. According to the material collected (Table 11), regarding the survey inquiry: Do you, as a driver, pedestrian or cyclist, obey traffic rules? the vast majority of respondents declare to obey traffic rules, few surveyed were of the opposite opinion and depending on the situation on the road the tendency to break the rules may increase, as almost 1/3 of the respondents specified such a response.

Table 11. Respondents' compliance with traffic rules

Yes	No	Depends on situation	Total
400 (66,5%)	31 (5,1%)	171 (28,4%)	602 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

Observance of the law, especially criminal law, is an important issue in judicial practice, for the reason that contrary to the opinion crimes prosecuted by public indictment constitute a small percentage of all proceedings in Polish courts (the largest percentage are civil law cases), however, it is worth asking a inquiry about the most severe crime against life, which is penalized in article 148 of the Penal Code under the ordinary and qualified procedure. The crime of deprivation of life touches on two areas: violation of the law as well as violation of human welfare of the highest value, which is human life. In addition, violation of

the standard of protection of life gives consent to the so-called self-judgment, i.e. the imposition of punishment according to the individual, biased will of the victim or a person related to the victim. a survey inquiry was asked: Would you commit homicide if the act was not punishable? According to the data collected and presented in Table 12, one can learn that 10.6% of the respondents taking part in the survey (87 persons in total) would deprive of life, 5.7% of the respondents expressed no opinion on this issue (it is puzzling how many people hesitate), while the opposite opinion, i.e. the possibility of depriving of life of a human being despite the lack of criminal liability was expressed by 83.7% of the respondents.

Table 12. Agreeing to murder in the absence of criminal responsibility according to respondents

Definitely yes	**Rather yes**	**Definitely no**	**Rather no**	**I have no opinion**	**Total**
23 (2,8%)	64 (7,8%)	464 (56,4%)	224 (27,3%)	47 (5,7%)	822 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

Table 13 contains data on the survey inquiry: Do you support experimenting drugs, cosmetics on animals? This inquiry may indicate social sensitivity towards animals, which has recently been raised in public discourse, equal treatment of animals and securing proper conditions for their breeding and functioning. The area of human-animal relations is becoming “fashionable”. The responses in this area leave no illusion that respondents in the two research projects considered that the vast majority of respondents were against the use of animals for experimental projects. All respondents spoke out on this issue with, significantly, small percentages supporting such practices. The undecided, hesitant ones also constituted a small percentage among the respondents. The responses obtained indicate the interest of the respondents in fate of animals and their functioning. The detailed distribution of responses is presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Permission of the respondents to the experiment drugs, cosmetics on animals

	Yes	No	I don't know	No data	Total
„Ideals"	66 (8%)	583 (70,9%)	173 (21,1%)	0	822 (100%)
„Singles"	89 (14,7%)	353 (58,2%)	164 (27,1%)	0	606 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

The norms of respecting the law as well as customs concern a public welfare, a common welfare such as public transport. a inquiry was raised (Table 14), content: How often do you happen to ride without a ticket in Urban Transport Company? According to the collected data the percentage of people using public transport without a valid ticket is negligible, while people who frequently evade payment for a ride constituted 3.5% of the respondents. 1.8% of the respondents drive repeatedly without a ticket, while 32% of the respondents drive sometimes without a ticket. The vast majority of respondents always pay the fare. The research proves that the percentage of people who notoriously evade paying for a ride is small among the surveyed group as well as the fact that more than a half of the respondents always pay for a ride. It should be remembered that the payment of the fare is also an "insurance" for the traveler using public transport of which the users are yet unaware. It should also be remembered that public transport is subsidised by public levies, and therefore it is paid by all payers of these levies as well as obtaining a ticket is, apart from insurance, participation in the maintenance of the public welfare, which is the possibility to reach the chosen destination.

Table 14. Permission for „free riding" according to the respondents

Always	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never	Total
6 (0,7%)	29 (3,5%)	15 (1,8%)	263 (32%)	509 (62%)	822 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

The 1990s was the decade of the development of two notable notions: combine and arrange. The decade was also characterised by the highest unemployment rates in Poland since World War II, reaching around 20%. Many people were unemployed, without the right to receive benefits, many Poles left their homeland in "search of bread" to the West, many took casual jobs and many agreed to work illegally - all in order to survive. Some of the habits have remained, such as working on the black market while receiving family benefits or disability benefits, "to make some extra money". It is therefore interesting to observe what respondents consider about working without a contract. The inquiry was asked: Do you support working "illegally", without a contract? The extent of responses given is presented in table 15 which presents that such a form of work is supported by a large percentage of respondents (18.2%), while only 34.1% of those taking part in the survey were of an opposite opinion. Substantial number of people withheld a response - it is unspecified whether they forgot what to reply, reluctant to share their observations or disliked to present their weaknesses as well as internalized cultural patterns (consent) to work without a contract. For the sake of explanation it should be pointed out that the respondents are mainly young people, people who currently have a lot of opportunities to take up employment (currently the unemployment rate in Poland is 6.3% and young people benefit from numerous privileges, e.g. tax exemption, contracts for an indefinite period of time with a departure from the so-called junk contracts).

Table 15. Respondents' responses to the survey inquiry: Do you support working illegally, without a contract?

Yes	No	I have no opinion	Total
154 (18,2%)	280 (34,1%)	388 (47,7%)	822 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

The last issue concerning the standards discussed in this article concerns the respondents' willingness to help a disabled person in public space (tab. 16). The collected research material proves that a vast majority of respondents responding the inquiries would provide help to a disabled person in a public space (this is confirmed by practically equal percentages in two research projects). Only a few people were of an opposite opinion and a quarter of respondents are willing to provide

help depending on the situation. The data confirms that the sensitivity of respondents to the needs of people requiring assistance is considerable. Claims commonly treating youth as individuals who only pursue their own individual needs preference strategies with a smartphone in hand may be exaggerated - taking into account this study.

Tabela 16. Willingness of respondents to help a disabled person in public space

	Yes	**No**	**Depends on situation**	**No data**	**Total**
„Ideals”	592 (72%)	16 (2%)	214 (26%)	0	822 (100%)
„Singles”	426 (70,3%)	19 (3,1%)	161 (26,6%)	0	606 (100%)

Source: Own calculations

5. Towards a conclusion

The analysis of the collected empirical material proves that the respondents are characterized by sensitivity to the needs of another human being, especially the disabled, sensitivity to the harm of animals, opposing experiments with their parts, as well as sensitivity to the principles of savoir-vivre or dress code depending on life circumstances.

Slightly different, however, are the principles and norms concerning religious life and religious or ethical teaching in schools - here opinions were no longer so affirmative. This does not necessarily mean the eradication of principles of faith, since the respondents, contrary to appearances, attend the most important religious festivals - therefore they can treat religion as their own individual preference (value) without manifesting it.

Moral norms, e.g. living with a partner before marriage are not so important in the opinion of the respondents. In turn, the vast majority of respondents respect the norms and traffic regulations (a small percentage of respondents held the opposite view). The issue of self-judgment, i.e. consent to murder in the absence of criminal liability looks different in the opinion of respondents, who in the percentage of 10.6% of respondents participating in the study confirmed that life could be taken away - the opposite opinion was held by 83.7% of respondents. There is a noticeable loosening of the principles treating the highest welfare, i.e. human life. a considerable percentage of respondents (18.7%) supports

"black jobs", while only 43.1% of those taking part in the survey were of an opposite opinion. Substantial number of people withheld a response - it is unspecified whether they forgot what to reply, reluctant to share their observations or reluctant to present their weaknesses and internalized cultural patterns (consent) to work without a contract. There is a low percentage of respondents as well who determines to use public transport without a valid ticket. The vast majority of respondents (62%) purchase a ticket, which indicates care for the common welfare, i.e. public transport and participation in the costs of its functioning.

Taking into account non-representative research results in the area of norms, normative integration is noted as the degree of conformity of values and norms followed by group members with the norms and values accepted in a given group or society. Normative ethics aims to formulate certain universal norms that an individual could use. Presentation of selected assumptions of descriptive ethics dealing with the description of human behavior, especially what happened in the consciousness of an individual when he was in the moment before performing an action - in this approach was carried out. It is worth noting that this text may become an excellent starting point for further in-depth analyses in this field.

Bibliography:

Badora B.*, Wartości w czasach zarazy, Komunikat z badań,* nr 160/2020, CBOS.

Boguszewski R., *Co jest ważne, co można, a czego nie wolno – normy i wartości w życiu Polaków, Komunikat z badań,* nr BS/99/2010.

Bolesta-Kukuła K., *Socjologia ogólna.* Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR, 2003.

Filek J.*, Wprowadzenie do etyki biznesu.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne w Krakowie, 2001.

Frankfort-Nachmias Ch., Nachmias D., *Metody badawcze w naukach społecznych*, przeł. E. Hornowska. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, 2001.

Goodman N. *Wstęp do socjologii*, przeł. J. Polak, J. Ruszkowski, U. Zielińska. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, 1997.

Hasło: Etyka, w: M. Rozentala, P. Judyna, *Krótki Słownik Filozoficzny.* Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1955, ss. 151–153.

Mariański J., *Socjologia moralności.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2006.

Mariański J.*, Nauka o moralności Marii Ossowskiej w opinii środowisk katolickich*, „PRINCIPIA" XLV–XLVI (2006), ss. 15–42.

Pratley P.*, Etyka w biznesie.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo FELBERG SJA, 2000.

Sułek A.*, Ogród metodologii socjologicznej.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, 2015.

Szczepański J., *Elementarne pojęcia socjologii.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1965.

Turowski J., *Socjologia. Małe struktury społeczne*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2001.

Ziembński Z., *Elementy socjologii*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Ars boni et aequi, 1994.

Ethical or unethical, permitted or prohibited? Social coexistence norms in the opinion of the surveyed youth

Abstract

This article is the result of empirical research conducted by the author with the participation of the Scientific Circle "Apertum", whose members have long undertaken numerous studies in order to learn about the transformations in the functioning of modern man in the areas of interest to them, i.e. leisure time, axiology, social participation, as well as preferences for implementing their own life strategies. The aim of this article is the desire to study about the norms of social coexistence of young people. All this in order to learn about the transformations in this area among the group of surveyed respondents. The research material used, comes from three research projects carried out in 2020 and 2021 of samples of several hundred people each (mainly students), while the detailed and reporting of individual research projects has shed valuable light on the norms of social coexistence as well as in the opinion of the respondents, which has become the subject of this article. Research projects carried out, due to the time of the pandemic, took place using an Internet survey, the sample was selected purposively, as a result the research does not meet the features of representativeness and its results will not be generalized to the entire community. Only about 1/5 of the respondents declare full honesty towards their loved ones, while a large percentage of the respondents would forgive their partner a betrayal (a few people as well periodically repress their own opinion on the subject, which may be treated differently). Willingness to forgive infidelity as well as a low percentage of people being honest with their closest ones may indicate consent to the "loosening" of emotional relations and a tendency to disregard fidelity, loyalty - regardless of whether the persons live in a formal relationship or in a partnership, i.e. cohabitation. One repeatedly hears opinions about promiscuity or the tendency of modern man to abandon his family or partners without self-reflection. The problem turns out to be more complex and at the base of it there may also lie the issues of axiology and certain inclinations and permissions of man entangled in various social positions, social roles (role conflicts) as well as lack of the sense of responsibility in his own behaviour, i.e. collective, fashionable behaviour.

Keywords: youth, values, norms, attitudes

Streszczenie

Niniejszy artykuł stanowi pokłosie badań empirycznych prowadzonych przez Autora w udziale Koła Naukowego „Apertum", którego członkowie od dawna podejmują liczne badania, by poznać przeobrażenia w funkcjonowaniu współczesnego człowieka w interesujących ich obszarach, tj. czasu wolnego, aksjologii, partycypacji społecznej jak również preferencji realizacji własnej strategii życiowej. Celem niniejszego artykułu jest chęć poznania norm współżycia społecznego młodych ludzi. Wszystko po to, aby poznać przeobrażenia w tym obszarze wśród grupy badanych respondentów. Wykorzystany materiał badawczy pochodzi z trzech projektów badawczych realizowanych w 2020 i 2021 roku na próbach każdorazowa kilkuset osób (głownie studenci) zaś szczegółowa i raportowanie poszczególnych projektów badawczych rzuciła cenne światło na normy współżycia społecznego i w opinii badanych co stało się tematem niniejszego artykułu. Realizowane projekty badawcze, z uwagi na czas pandemii, odbywałyście przy wykorzystaniu ankiety internetowej, próba była dobrana celowo, zatem badania nie spełniają cech reprezentatywności i ich wyniki nie będą uogólniane na całą społeczność. Jedynie około 1/5 badanych deklaruje pełną szczerość wobec swoich najbliższych zaś spory odsetek badanych wybaczyłby partnerowi zdradę (sporo osób także nie okresowo własnego zdania w tym temacie co można traktować różnie). Skłonność do wybaczenia zdrady jak również niski odsetek osób szczerych wobec swoich najbliższych świadczyć może o przyzwoleniu na „rozluźnienie" relacji uczuciowych oraz skłonność do nieprzestrzegania wierności, lojalności – niezależnie czy osoby żyją w związku sformalizowanym czy partnerskim, tj. konkubinacie. Częstokroć słyszy się opinii traktujące o rozwiązłości czy skłonności współczesnego człowieka do porzucania rodzin czy partnerów bez autorefleksji. Problem okazuje się bardziej złożony u podstaw którego leżeć mogą także kwestie aksjologii i pewnych skłonności oraz przyzwoleń człowieka uwikłanego w rozmaite pozycje społeczne, role społeczne (konflikty ról) jak również brak poczuci sprawstwa we własny postępowania, tj. postępowanie zbiorowe, modne.

Słowa kluczowe: młodzież, wartości, normy, postawy.

Mateusz Szast – PhD, works at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Pedagogical University of Cracow. Scholarly interests include: migrations, social and cultural capital, relational capital, communication, mediation and negotiations.