



MANAGEMENT OF THE TERRITORIAL UNIT IN THE ASPECT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL ECONOMY

Izabella Sowier-Kasprzyk¹, Edward Chrzan¹, Paweł Pietrasieński²,
Anna Surowiec³

¹Czestochowa University of Technology, Faculty of Management

²SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Collegium of Management and Finance,

³AGH University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Management

Abstract: Nowadays, the social economy responds to the economic crisis as a result of over-liberal free-market policies and criticism of the "welfare state". In turn, the most common goal of sustainable development is to increase the well-being of the community as well as of individuals in the context of a harmonious relationship between man and nature. The economic aspects of local development are always linked and interdependent with social aspects.

The purpose of the study is therefore to demonstrate, based on literature research, how important it is to include in the management of territorial units (Territorial Units) the idea of social economy as well as sustainable development.

Keywords: social economy, sustainable development, management of territorial units

DOI: 10.17512/znpcz.2017.3.1.17

Introduction

Social economy proposes active forms of help rather than passive ones, it points to the need for co-responsibility instead of the claim and expectation of assistance, civic mobilization instead of the bureaucratic system, and thus becomes an important ally of the state in creating and implementing social policy.

The most common goal of sustainable development is to increase the well-being of the community as well as of the individuals in the context of a harmonious relationship between man and nature. Another objective is to satisfy the physical and psychological needs of a human being by properly coordinating his / her relationship with the natural environment, as well as satisfying the basic needs that are needed to achieve a well-balanced quality of life through proper physical and mental development. It also aims to combat poverty by increasing employment, improving food security, fighting discrimination and securing social security for all (compare: Wielgórka 2016, p. 178).

The most common goal of sustainable development is to increase the well-being of the community as well as of the individuals in the context of a harmonious relationship between man and nature. Another objective is to satisfy the physical and psychological needs of a human being by properly coordinating his / her relationship with the natural environment, as well as satisfying the basic needs that

are needed to achieve a well-balanced quality of life through proper physical and mental development. It also aims to combat poverty by increasing employment, improving food security, fighting discrimination and securing social security for all (compare: Wielgórka 2016, p. 178).

The economic aspects of local development are always linked and interdependent with social aspects. Economic development is subordinated to the obvious attainment of specific social objectives. It is also conditioned by social factors of development and vice versa. It is also often impossible to distinguish the symptoms of economic development from social development. At the social level, local development manifests itself primarily in improving the level and living conditions of the community. In turn, the level of living of local communities is mainly determined by the income that determines the extent to which local community members can afford to meet their needs. Living conditions in turn are created by the quantity and quality of local facilities that meet social needs. This is mainly due to positive changes in the components of local infrastructure (example: health centers, educational and cultural facilities, sports and recreational facilities) (see: Kudłacz 2008, p. 109). Taking into account the tasks that local authorities face today, they can be described as "a well thought out and structured set of management actions that include setting objectives and objectives for the organization, obtaining and implementing measures in an efficient, effective and socially responsible manner, monitoring the results achieved to ensure their functional balance and compliance with the needs of the recipients within the constraints of the environment in which the territorial unit operates" (Pabian 2013, p. 197).

The idea of social economy

The term "social economy" first appeared in France in the early nineteenth century. For a long time, this term was broader and less definite than today. A more precise concept of social economy emerged at the end of the twentieth century. At present in the economy and in politics, the third sector is emerging, acting in addition to the profit-oriented aggressive private sector and the social sector. Nevertheless, the name and shape of this sector and the understanding of the term "social economy" may vary from country to country (Defourny, Develtere 2008, p. 16).

Actions consistent with the idea of social economy are new and old at the same time. The social economy companies of the nineteenth century, most often in the form of cooperatives, had the task of helping each other's members and allocating some of their profits to the local community. At present, the social economy should be understood in terms of entrepreneurship based on willingness and ability to assume responsibility for their destiny. It should also be understood as a form of civic engagement in local affairs and taking responsibility for the community. Responsibility and self-organization are key terms. Accountability in the economic sphere means actions for the greatest possible self-reliance and economic sovereignty. In the philosophy of social economy this will mean that individuals,

organizations or whole local communities will be able to make sovereign decisions on goals and ways of achieving them in their activities. Social economy is changing the attitude of individuals, organizations and whole communities to social issues. This concerns attitudes to their own problems, which need to be resolved through entrepreneurship rather than demanding or waiting for help, and this is mainly through collective action rather than individual action. This also applies to the overriding goals of the community over the particular goals of individuals or groups. "These actions are based, to a large extent, on solidarity and cooperation, not on particularism and competition" (Wygnański 2009, p. 5).

The concept of social economy (also called social economy or solidarity economy) is a term that is quite debatable and defined in different ways and in different aspects. For example, on the one hand, it is indicated in the definition of organizational forms and, on the other hand, the normative aspects relating to the common principles governing social economy entities are signaled (compare: *Krajowy Program Rozwoju ...*, 2012, p. 6). J. Defourny and P. Develtere define social economy as follows: "Social economy encompasses all types of economic activity carried out by enterprises, mainly cooperatives, associations and mutual benefit societies which comply with the following principles in their ethical norms" (Defourny, Develtere 2008, p. 25):

- presenting the community of intangible property preferences in relation to profit;
- autonomous management;
- democratic decision making process;
- values of people and work in relation to capital.

Social economy can be seen in two ways:

- 1) as an alternative to purely market-based solutions based on free competition (aggressive capitalism) and the model of the welfare state (socialism);
- 2) as a specific method of market participation - evolving forms of business without the disadvantages of companies operating on the basis of free market competition, and eliminating the flaws in administrative regulations to introduce social justice (compare: Hausner 2008b, p. 11-12).

In the last century in the industrialized world, the three main types of formal and legal social economy corresponded to three main types of organizations: cooperative enterprises, mutual assistance societies and associations, whose form and legal status differ significantly in different countries (Defourny, Develtere 2008, p. 21). Social economy requires a great deal of value and principles. These are: solidarity, entrepreneurship (Kościelniak, Skowron-Grabowska, Nowodziński 2017, p. 14), commitment, responsibility and mutual assistance. The principle of creating effective mechanisms of empowerment and independence of individuals, organizations and communities is the most important. Social economy can also be seen as a set of organizations linked by the idea of achieving social objectives using market instruments. The institutions that derive from the so-called. old social economy (example: cooperatives) and non-governmental organizations as well as completely new forms (example: social cooperatives).

Individuals perceive the role of this trend in the socio-economic and cohesion policy. Social economy in various forms appear in almost all countries of the world, both poor and rich, more or less democratic, religiously tolerant and theocratic. Also a fully commercial business is trying to act in the social economy to reach its products and services to the poorest. Also in the environment of NGOs looking for economic mechanisms of self-reliance for their actions and effective solutions for their charges, social economy is becoming increasingly popular. This makes the idea of social economy as a promising way of solving social problems and is becoming more and more popular. It should be used as an important element of the anachronistic modernization often of the models of the welfare state (more: Wygnański 2009, p. 5). "Today we turn to the social economy in response to the crisis and the criticism of the "welfare state". It is not by accident but by the rule that where "welfare state" has grown and public health systems have become popular, the traditional forms of social economy have weakened and diminished, particularly in relation to all mutual societies" (Hausner 2008a, p. 4). Social economy does not have to be "rich" and "profitable," but it must be capable of generating an economic surplus in order to fulfil its social mission. Only then will it become an alternative to traditional social policies, referring to "redistribution" rather than to "production" (see: Hausner 2008a, p. 4).

In social enterprise there are processes of formation of a specific feedback. It operates through the use of economic resources based on trust and cooperation based on social relationships, in other words, from social capital, but at the same time its activity increases the capital. Therefore, social enterprise is an essential element of social economy. Its purpose is not only the production of goods and services but also the activation of social capital, innovation and entrepreneurship, but also the inclusion in the sphere of economic and social life of persons and communities so far excluded. It is an element of market economy, but a specific element. Its mission and objectives are largely located outside of the commercial market. Unlike a strictly commercial company, it participates in a market economy on completely different terms. A social enterprise not only generates additional goods and services but, more importantly, generates additional demand from the people involved. Social enterprises do not aim at market expansion, but without them, the market could not expand and develop over time. A social enterprise cannot, of course, be the most important form of market economy, but it is necessary as a complementary form without which a market based on a pure competitive game would exclude many of them from the market (*Kompendium wiedzy ...*, p. 3).

Social entrepreneurship is just one way to define an economic activity that combines social and economic goals. Social economy does not work against the free market, but tries to draw from it instruments for achieving social goals. The adjective "social" in economics points to the fact that a market economy is not an end in itself, but always has a social character. The area of activity of social economy entities lies in two spheres: offering social services and creating jobs for people with disabilities. In each case, the composition of these variables depends on the conditions and capabilities of each organization. "Acting in this area not

only generates surpluses that can be used to achieve social goals, but also their activities generate specific social values. So, in short, we are talking about social economy subjects that they work "not for profit", it is not just that the profit generated cannot be shared among the participants of the organization, but also that profit-making is not their goal, and that it is to create certain values. If there is a profit, then it is a secondary effect, not a goal" (Hausner 2008a, p. 4).

Social economy is an increasingly important part of the economy and it is the creator of a large number of jobs in the country and in the world. This is particularly true for services, including social services, which, unlike products, cannot be produced in low-cost countries. Already in the EU, the social economy sector is a collection of almost a million institutions that together account for about 11 million jobs and generate about 10% of GDP. In Poland we can talk about the collection of over 90 thousand. Institutions providing over 0.5 million jobs (*ManifESt ...*, 2008).

According to the research (Hausner (ed.) 2008c, p. 26), the most important development factors - forms of support for social economy enterprises are according to the interested parties:

- direct subsidies - for 90% of entities is the most desirable form of supporting their activities,
- preferential loans and loans - an indication to enable these companies to use certain funds, particularly when liquidity is lost.

On the other hand, a small proportion of the surveyed companies is interested in other forms of support (example: preferences for obtaining public contracts (26%), free information and advisory services (22%), and finally the possibility of using loan guarantees or guarantee funds (18%)).

In contrast, the basic barrier categories include:

- the accumulation of negative social and economic characteristics in non-industrialized regions,
- lack of confidence in the actions taken by these companies,
- low level of social activity and entrepreneurship in many local communities,
- negative attitude towards social enterprise as an organization acting in the sphere of social exclusion,
- perception of social enterprises as suppliers of low quality goods and services,
- lack of confidence on the part of other parties to create partnerships and cooperation for the realization of social and commercial goals,
- lack of cooperation between these companies on the local market.

The surveyed people often point to the image of social enterprises as a major obstacle preventing or significantly impeding business activity (75%). Many respondents state that by hiding the social nature of their business, it is much easier to find a worker or a customer. It should be noted that only a few entities expressed interest in introducing mechanisms that would form the basis of closer commercial business cooperation between market actors and social enterprises.

It should be noted that the labour market is a market of a specific commodity, i.e. labour. This commodity, in comparison with other market items, has one unique characteristic of subjectivity. A particular subject in the labour market is the individual employee who makes individual decisions about the direction of education, the specific type of job, the specific employer or the change of place of work (Słocińska 2013, p. 156). One should also pay attention to the very special labour market, which is the labour market for people with disabilities or other socially excluded. The local social environment should be equally friendly and for these people. This is also the case with the principle of internal justice, which is mentioned in the reflections on sustainable development. As indicated by the research (Gadzinowska 2016, p. 136-137), as the main obstacle to the employment of people with disabilities in our country, the respondents themselves are reluctant to employ the disabled. In addition, the respondents point to problems with commuting to workplaces and non-adaptation of workplaces for people with disabilities. Among the significant obstacles to the functioning of the disabled on the labour market are the bureaucracy (documentation connected with the PFRON subsidy), lack of legal regulations concerning people with a disability certificate, lack of coordinated cooperation between institutions acting for the benefit of persons with disabilities.

Sustainable development in the aspect of social policy

Sustainable Development is very often closely associated with the protection of the natural environment. Ecology is an important factor, but the issue of sustainable development is much broader and concerns the human environment in many areas. A. Pawłowski (Pawłowski 2009, p. 988) distinguishes seven such areas: 1 - ecological area; 2 - social area; 3 - economic area; 4 - technical area; 5 - legal area; 6 - political area; 7 - ethical area. This is related to the views of writers on social economy, where local development is also most often interpreted within well-defined areas, showing the relative homogeneity of the phenomena they create. The basic areas are: economic, social, cultural, political, ecological, spatial. There is no theoretical justification for the hierarchy of the above components. Their rank is the consequence of the assumed assumptions, referring to the purpose of the evaluation, and above all the specifics of the examined territorial unit (Kudłacz 2008, p. 108).

The ecological area, which is relevant to the environment, is an important element of the general human environment, and its dominant position is the result of rather a certain fashion for ecology and the importance of environmental protection in recent years. It is not the result of the natural hierarchy of individual areas, but is due to the perceived threat of water pollution, air degradation of forests, etc., which may be the future of man and of all nature on Earth.

The natural environment of man is not only the natural environment but also the social environment. Man is a social being. It was through the ability to interact with other members of the community that it was possible to create a modern civilization. So the discussion of which of the aforementioned areas is more or less

important seems unnecessary and suppose that the social area is equivalent to all the others. Let us remember, however, that, in line with the idea of sustainable development, we make the best use of, and at the same time, let the future generations reserve the most important resource, human capital, in the best possible condition.

The ethical and social planes are closely linked. This plane not only refers to the proper (ethical) use of man from natural resources, but also to the social environment. It must be noted that the moral capital of many social circles is decisive in both the strength and weakness of individual regions. The sense of social bond, kindness, honesty, patriotism, and finally resistance to corruption are the characteristics that distinguish individual territorial units and represent their significant assets in a competitive market. This territorial unit should be an attractive place for the aforementioned stakeholders, both in terms of nature and society. Many territorial units do not have special natural values, yet they are attractive regions for inhabitants as well as for investors. These regions are distinguished by their economic value, which is most often accompanied by access to all cultural, health and commercial services. In plain language: in these cities or regions, all social groups (including socially dysfunctional) are better off than elsewhere.

The concept of sustainable development is a way of ensuring harmony between economic growth, in terms of purely economic and environmental improvements. Moreover, this strategy extends the concept of the environment to such elements as access to education, health care system and cultural development for all social groups (including people in various socially handicapped ways). These elements also create quality of life alongside the surrounding nature. Defining the environment and emphasizing the need to improve its quality changes in the way of measuring the level of social wellbeing. Using only economic measures of well-being does not reflect many important social factors (Brendzel-Skowera 2009, p. 102).

The idea of sustainable development is best expressed by the 1987 Report of the World (WCED), which states that sustainable civilization is possible at the current level of civilization, and that this way of meeting the needs of the modern generation does not diminish the needs of future generations. From this definition it follows that:

- the issue of meeting the needs of present and future generations,
- the need to meet needs must have lasting character in the multi-generational dimension.

Justice for the modern generation aims at reducing global inequalities between the rich north and the poor south, while on a regional scale it aims to compensate for disparities between the various social groups. Intra-generational justice, on the other hand, is meant to provide equal access to all inhabitants of the individual territorial units, which meet all human needs (material and immaterial job satisfaction) and to education, culture, health care etc.

In contrast, intergenerational justice speaks of the need to preserve both the natural environment and the economic and social environment in a state that will

allow future generations to create attractive living conditions or invest in a given area (and globally, worldwide).

Any initiative for sustainable development should depend to a large extent on the will of the stakeholders of a given territorial unit and in relation to their values. It is the community of a given area that decides what it means for sustainable development. The concept of multigeneration means, in general terms, the long-term maintenance of the required characteristics of people, entire communities and individual organizations and the surrounding environment. Consequently, no definition of sustainable development can be applied to all communities (see: Dobrzańska 2007, p. 50).

The balance between inner-generational justice and intergenerational justice indicates that the use of particular environmental resources (natural, economic, social) to ensure that the present generation does not feel that their lives are under worse conditions to preserve resources for the benefit of future generations. We cannot talk about sustainability - even if we maintain the highest standards of environmental protection or optimum use of economic and human capital - if the stakeholders of a given territorial unit do not feel adequate satisfaction from life, work or investment. It is therefore necessary to adopt such parameters of economic and social development that will not lead to social dissatisfaction and the feeling of not meeting the needs of individual people and entire communities (compare: Chrzan 2015, p. 118).

Management of territorial unit (TU) in the aspect of social economy and sustainable development

The management of a territorial unit is, inter alia, increase the competitive capacity of a distinct space, which may be a city, a municipality or a region. The space should be equipped with efficient technical and social infrastructure as well as institutions supporting business activities. It should have strong and extensive internal and external relationships. It is also a well-managed space for which a long-term, strategic development program exists and is being implemented. The ultimate goal of any business is not to make money, but to meet social needs. There is no organization that does not meet any social needs. However, the need is associated with demand, which is accompanied by equivalent purchasing power. As a consequence, the needs of people or communities with low purchasing power are not met and even ignored.

In such cases, the local authority (state or local government) must take over the role of the provider of goods and services that meet the needs. The problem, however, is that in areas where there is a purchasing power deficit, local authorities are struggling with low budget deficits. So it closes. The essence of local development can therefore be - in the social economy - "taking matters into their own hands". A territorial unit is a place where the needs of each resident should be met. This should be managed properly. In order to meet such a task, specific rules should be met, such as the appropriate qualifications and competences of officials, attention to the positive image of TU, reliability, lack of tolerance for corruption

and nepotism. However, local self-government is not capable of satisfying the needs of its inhabitants without proper social commitment. Social involvement can in turn be understood as the citizen's own contribution to solving the problems of the community to which they belong (compare: Niewiadomski 2016, p. 67).

In the studies devoted to the management of territorial units (starting with the state and the municipality ending), the term "governance" is often used. The concept of "governance" has in its essence much more to do with management than to that of traditional administration. It can be defined as a self-organizing network functioning in the intergovernmental space - in the sense of state governments as well as local governments (Cichobłaziński 2016, p. 30). The decentralization of power in most European countries is the result of not only a kind of political fashion but also the need to improve the effectiveness of economic and social decisions. Local authority, like a private owner, performs better (more effectively) tasks than the central authority. Due to the knowledge of the specific nature of a given unit of local government. The consequence of a decentralization policy is to compete for regions or cities with limited resources on the market, with stakeholders - current and potential residents, tourists, investors and finally buyers of products from a given place on the map of the world. Local authorities are seeking not only to raise as much money as possible but also to create the best, recognizable brand of the product (Chrzan, Łazorko 2010, p. 224).

Among the masses of goods and services available on the market significant success opportunities are only those that arise in the minds of buyers. It is therefore necessary to build and maintain a positive image of a particular product brand in the minds of consumers, branding. The territorial unit is a different offer from the average market product, but in many marketing matters it uses similar techniques to other products. This also applies to branding. The term "city branding" means the ability to choose and strengthen the position of a city in relation to it, by creating a specific image that is both a source of economic and symbolic added value. Making a city is neither a necessity nor a fashion. It is a trend that, if it is well understood and skilfully used, can make a significant contribution to improving the city's situation, exploiting its potential, and accelerating its pace of development. Attractive image means that tourists visit the place, entrepreneurs have more confidence, so they are more willing to invest, and new (generally wealthy) residents settle in the promoted area (Chrzan 2011, p. 9-28).

Due to its role in the social economy of a given territorial unit, the inhabitants can be divided into the following groups:

- persons whose activity contributes to the implementation of social policy is not aimed at achieving their own benefits and is a kind of hobby, derives from "local patriotism";
- people whose activity is geared towards achieving individual benefits and contributing to their goals;
- persons / entities that carry out actions for the implementation of social policy due to their functions or carrying out statutory tasks.

The first group is made up of individuals and groups of people. Consciously, deliberately or spontaneously they undertake actions contributing to the execution of the respective tasks within the area of the given city (municipality, etc.) and beyond (eg in the web space). The second group consists mainly of entrepreneurs, organizers, co-operatives who undertake or organize activities of a commercial and social character (eg cooperatives of various types). The third group of inhabitants who play an important role in the implementation of social policy are politicians/civil servants working in local governments or political organizations, as well as politicians working in a broader forum but coming from a given city and for whom it is a political base. There are also professional associations or non-governmental organizations.

Different types of capital are needed - production, financial, environmental, intellectual, human and social. Such a process is strongly dependent on regional social bonds and networks of co-ordination, determined by reciprocity, interdependence, cooperation and power (self-government). It seems that intellectual capital managers should strive to obtain information that enables them to assess the impact of intellectual capital on the economic performance of the regions. Regional strategies, and in particular innovation strategies, set many goals for which the implementation of intellectual capital is required. At the same time, implementation of the strategy contributes to a greater or lesser extent to the development of specific elements of intellectual capital (see: Kozak, Pachura, Nowicka-Skowron 2013, p. 85; Hausner 2008a, p. 14).

Management of TU is most influenced by socio-economic changes, some megatrends that take place all over the world, but in Poland they have especially impressed on the behaviour of average citizens and managers of all levels representing different types of institutions. These socio-economic trends, which are relevant for this study, include: increased competition and competition between territorial units and increased social and economic awareness of society.

The proper management of a territorial unit, in general, should lead both to improving material living conditions as well as satisfaction from all spheres of life. The point is that in a given territorial unit, happy people, material and spiritual rich, will live and work. This key objective of TU management can be achieved in a variety of ways. For example, through marketing activities addressed to the residents as customers, to link their lives and activities with the place. And this can be achieved by providing them with appropriate development opportunities and the conditions for their individual successes to be the success and development of the entire local community. Social economy can in this case be realized by creating favourable circumstances for the creation of various types of cooperatives, especially social co-operatives. This goal can also be worked out through actions targeted at other stakeholder groups, such as entrepreneurs or other wealthy and influential people (academics, athletes, actors), to encourage them to engage with a place to make some material or intellectual enrichment. community. If the actions of local governments fail, if the needs and aspirations of individual stakeholder groups are not met, they will probably be associated with another, competing area. The actions of local authorities should also be directed to other external clients

arriving and leaving their money, such as tourists, participants of sporting events, cultural events, scientific symposia, various fairs and business meetings, spa services, etc. Another group of addressees of marketing activities of the authorities Territorial units should be the purchasers of products produced in a given location (compare: Chrzan 2011, p. 9-28).

Growth, stagnation or economic recession are manifested not only by the causes of global socio-economic phenomena, but also by the functioning and management of individual regions. In the age of globalization, therefore, local action is no longer important. Global dynamic processes, together with the global financial crisis, reinforce regional interest, particularly local. Local development is therefore dependent on the actions of both local and state-owned entities. However, local development depends primarily on how the local government, the district, the municipality and their resources manage. The constructive actions of the local authorities are developing the region, which, in turn, contributes to its attractiveness to the local community, but not only. The attractive region, the more developed municipality is more interesting also for tourists or external investors (Kabus, Nowakowska-Grunt 2016, p. 41). Regional development is an economic process, consisting in the transformation of the internal and external factors and resources of a given region into goods and services. Its main condition is economic growth and the goal of raising the standard of living of the community in various aspects. Growth means quantitative changes, and development - in addition to qualitative and structural changes (Brendzel-Skowera, Puto 2011, p. 127). Knowledge economy management forces other public administration representatives to take over. Public administration should make greater efforts to create economic network links in the area of local economy. The current tendency in public management is the growing relationship between the public and private sector and a significant increase in the state's participation in socio-economic life, and above all the need to meet many of today's challenges, such as economic efficiency and social justice (Odzimek 2015, p. 78).

Thus, like other economic operators, TU has to include marketing in its management. Just as we are dealing with banking marketing, tourism marketing and sports marketing, we are dealing with territorial marketing. Taking into account the social aspect to be considered, the marketing of territorial units will in a sense resemble internal marketing. According to A. Basdereff, "territorial marketing covers all strategic and technical approaches that organizations, , with the ethical principles leading to the fulfilment of a particular mission" (Szromnik 2006, p. 37). T. Markowski defines territorial marketing as a "market oriented concept of city, municipality or regional management by local government and its partners to meet current and future needs of internal and external users" (Markowski 2006, p. 108).

A territorial unit is usually a self-government unit, which means that the local authority operates under the authority of the local community, derives from it and operates on its behalf; there should therefore be no conflict of interest between the management of the area and its inhabitants. Addressing the expectations of a territorial unit as a whole cannot be contradictory to meeting the needs of

individual inhabitants or communities, even - or even especially - if they are representatives of power. Reality shows, however, that the representatives of local authority who implement their political program (career path) do not always implement the social policy objectives of their city (voivodships, municipalities, etc.).

Conclusions

When people realize that neither the state nor the big business will meet their needs, they must step up themselves. One of the pioneers of local economic development, Sam Aaronovitch of The Local Economy Policy Unit, put it this way: "There is no escape from self-help!" (Birkholzer 2006, p. 28).

The management of a territorial unit is closely related to social marketing, understood as the effective use of marketing tools in order to influence the attitudes of the final recipient in the interests of the good of the community. As part of its social marketing activities, Financial outlay for solving specific social problems. It has also recently been noted that the flow of these funds to certain non-profit institutions. Thanks to these activities, local communities have the assurance that help will reach the most needy, and that administrative costs will be lower.

The main goal of managing territorial units is to invest in such development factors that will accelerate this development as much as possible. It is also important to improve the situation on the labour market in order to reduce unemployment, especially among the people with disabilities. Such entrepreneurial approach contrasts with the earlier position on city and region management, which essentially consists solely in the provision of public services and the creation of public infrastructure. TU must also demonstrate the ability to adapt to changing environments and the ability to exploit opportunities so as to gain and retain factors that have a positive influence on its development and operation. Competitiveness can be seen in the category of obtaining sustainable advantage by entities operating in a given area and as a process of competition of public authorities for access to the indicated benefits (compare: Czarnecka 2012, p. 64-66).

The concept of a social market economy has emerged as a criticism of both capitalism and the centrally controlled economy. The cause of the emergence and dynamic development of social economy organizations, including the emergence of social entrepreneurship within them, should be seen not only in public services and the market sector of many social needs (growth of structural unemployment and new poverty), their inadequate recognition (traditional constraints social policies in the area of counteracting social exclusion of people with low qualifications, refugees, minorities, disabled people). Their activities are also the result of the development of needs, for which the social economy organizations such as associations, foundations, social and ordinary cooperatives, not the public or private sector, meet their best interests, because of their rooting in the local environment and often better knowledge of their needs (Leś 2008, p. 45). Managing the TU through its strategic dimension should unite local communities to meet their needs in key areas. It can be concluded that the actions of the

territorial authorities have succeeded if the stakeholder groups concerned are satisfied with the life and activities of the territorial unit and the expectations of newcomers or entrepreneurs are met.

To sum up, one can therefore point to three sets of objectives to be achieved by managing a territorial unit:

- 1) improvement of living conditions and economic activity for the stakeholders of a given territorial unit;
- 2) increasing the attractiveness and competitiveness of the area in competition to attract investors, tourists, elites, etc.;
- 3) shaping the positive image and competitiveness of the territorial unit as a producer of products on the global market.

Literature

1. Brendzel-Skowera K. (2009), *Bariery w realizacji koncepcji zrównoważonego rozwoju w Polsce*, "Nierówności Społeczne a Wzrost Gospodarczy", z. 14, p. 102-109.
2. Brendzel-Skowera K., Puto A. (2011), *Przedsiębiorczość w rozwoju regionalnym*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie", nr 2, p. 127-137.
3. Cichobłaziński L. (2016), *Procesy decyzyjne w samorządzie terytorialnym w koncepcji Multi-level Governance*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie", nr 20, p. 26-35.
4. Chrzan E. (2011), *Charakterystyka marketingu terytorialnego*, [in:] Łazorko K., Niedzielska A. (red.), *Kreowanie wizerunku miejsca w koncepcji marketingu terytorialnego*, Wydawnictwo Politechniki Częstochowskiej, Częstochowa, p. 9-28.
5. Chrzan E. (2015), *Marketing terytorialny w kontekście rozwoju zrównoważonego*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie", nr 20, p. 113-122.
6. Chrzan E., Łazorko K. (2010), *Wielopłaszczyznowa kreacja wizerunku miasta*, [in:] Pabian A. (red.), *Zarządzanie publiczne. Uwarunkowania – kierunki – techniki*, Wydawnictwo Politechniki Częstochowskiej, Częstochowa, p. 223-239.
7. Czarniecka A. (2012), *Wizerunek jako czynnik wzrostu konkurencyjności gminy*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego. Ekonomiczne Problemy Usług", nr 97(724), p. 61-71.
8. Defourny J.P., Develtere P. (2008), *Ekonomia społeczna: ogólnowiatowy trzeci sektor*, [in:] Wygnański J.J. (red.), *Przedsiębiorstwo społeczne. Antologia kluczowych tekstów*, Fundacja Inicjatyw Społeczno-Ekonomicznych, Warszawa, p. 15-42.
9. Dobrzańska B.M. (2007), *Planowanie strategiczne zrównoważonego rozwoju obszarów przyrodniczo cennych*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, Białystok.
10. Gadzinowska Ż. (2016), *Oddziaływanie programów wspierających aktywizację osób z niepełnosprawnością na zmianę ich sytuacji na rynku pracy*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie", nr 22, p. 134-146. DOI: 10.17512/znpcz.2016.2.12
11. Hausner J. (2008a), *Ekonomia społeczna i rozwój*, "Ekonomia Społeczna. Teksty", nr 12.
12. Hausner J. (2008b), *Ekonomia społeczna jako kategoria rozwoju*, [in:] Hausner J. (red.), *Ekonomia społeczna a rozwój*, Małopolska Szkoła Administracji Publicznej Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie, Kraków, p. 9-26.
13. Hausner J. (red.) (2008c), *Przedsiębiorstwa społeczne w Polsce. Teoria i praktyka*, Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Krakowie, Kraków.
14. Kabus J., Nowakowska-Grunt J. (2016), *Uwarunkowania rozwoju lokalnego na przykładzie powiatu częstochowskiego*, "Turystyka i Rozwój Regionalny", nr 5, p. 39-47.

15. *Kompendium wiedzy o ekonomii społecznej. Materiały informacyjne*, Podkarpacka Akademia Ekonomii Społecznej, <http://www.procarpathia.pl/> (accessed: 15.06.2017).
16. Kościelniak H., Skowron-Grabowska B., Nowodziński P. (2017), *Przedsiębiorczość i innowacyjność w perspektywie zarządzania strategicznego*, [in:] Jelonek D., Byłok F. (red.), *Wielowymiarowość współczesnego zarządzania organizacjami*, Wydawnictwo Wydziału Zarządzania Politechniki Częstochowskiej, Częstochowa, p. 13-21.
17. Kozak M., Pachura P., Nowicka-Skowron M. (2013), *Zarządzanie kapitałem intelektualnym regionu – podejścia, metody, narzędzia*, "Organizacja i Zarządzanie. Kwartalnik Naukowy", nr 4(24), p. 83-100.
18. *Krajowy Program Rozwoju Ekonomii Społecznej. Projekt: czerwiec 2012*, Zespół ds. Rozwiązań Systemowych Ekonomii Społecznej, Grupa ds. Strategicznych, Warszawa, www.pozytek.gov.pl/download/files/KPRES.pdf (accessed: 15.06.2017).
19. Kudłacz T. (2008), *Rozwój lokalny*, [in:] Hausner J. (red.), *Ekonomia społeczna a rozwój*, Małopolska Szkoła Administracji Publicznej Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie, Kraków, p. 101-123.
20. Leś E. (2008), *Gospodarka społeczna i przedsiębiorstwo społeczne. Wprowadzenie do problematyki*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa.
21. *ManifEst – Ekonomii Społecznej*, 27 czerwca 2008, Gdańsk, [http://www.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/files/ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/public/manifEst_ekonomii_spolecznej.pdf](http://www.ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/files/ekonomiaspoleczna.pl/public/manifest_ekonomii_spolecznej.pdf) (accessed: 15.06.2017).
22. Markowski T. (2006), *Marketing miasta*, [in:] Markowski T. (red.), *Marketing terytorialny*, Polska Akademia Nauk, Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju, Warszawa, p. 105-136.
23. Niewiadomski K. (2016), *Zaangażowanie społeczności lokalnej w zarządzaniu gminą*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie", nr 20, p. 67-76.
24. Odzimek T. (2015), *Zarządzanie rozwojem lokalnej gospodarki w perspektywie funduszy europejskich na lata 2014-2020*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie", nr 20, p. 77-86.
25. Pabian A. (2013), *Zarządzanie przedsiębiorstwem w koncepcji sustainability*, [in:] Kucęba R., Jędrzejczyk W., Smoląg K. (red.), *Rozwój nauk o zarządzaniu. Kierunki i perspektywy*, Wydawnictwo Politechniki Częstochowskiej, Częstochowa, p. 197-205.
26. Pawłowski A. (2009), *Teoretyczne uwarunkowania rozwoju zrównoważonego*, "Rocznik Ochrona Środowiska", t. 11, cz. 2, p. 285-994.
27. *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future, Chapter 2: Towards Sustainable Development*, <http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-02.htm> (accessed: 15.06.2017).
28. Słocińska A. (2013), *Czynniki społeczno-cywilizacyjne zmieniające współczesny rynek pracy – ujęcie interpretatywne*, "Studia Ekonomiczne. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach", nr 161, p. 153-161.
29. Szromnik A. (2006), *Marketing terytorialny – koncepcja ogólna i doświadczenia praktyczne*, [in:] Markowski T. (red.), *Marketing terytorialny*, Polska Akademia Nauk, Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju, Warszawa, p. 37-103.
30. Szromnik A. (2008), *Marketing terytorialny. Miasto i region na rynku*, Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa.
31. Wielgórka D. (2016), *Zarządzanie środowiskiem w zakładach pracy chronionej w aspekcie zrównoważonego rozwoju*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie", nr 24, t. 1, p. 177-185. DOI: 10.17512/znpcz.2016.4.1.17
32. Wygnański K. (2009), *O ekonomii społecznej – podstawowe pojęcia, instytucje i kompetencje*, Stowarzyszenie Czas Przestrzeń Tożsamość, Szczecin.

ZARZĄDZANIE JEDNOSTKAMI TERYTORIALNYMI W ASPEKCIE GOSPODARKI SPOŁECZNEJ I ZRÓWNOWAŻONEGO ROZWOJU

Streszczenie: Obecnie, w odpowiedzi na kryzys gospodarczy wynikający z nadmiernie liberalnej wolnorynkowej polityki i krytyki „państwa opiekuńczego”, zwracamy się w kierunku ekonomii społecznej. Z kolei najczęściej wskazywanym celem zrównoważonego rozwoju jest wzrost dobrostanu społecznego i indywidualnego oraz harmonijne ułożenie relacji między człowiekiem a naturą. Ekonomiczne aspekty rozwoju lokalnego powinny zawsze być powiązane z aspektami społecznymi, ponieważ istotna jest ich współzależność. Cel niniejszego artykułu stanowi wykazanie, na podstawie badań literaturowych, jak ważne jest uwzględnienie w zarządzaniu jednostkami terytorialnymi idei ekonomii społecznej i zrównoważonego rozwoju.

Słowa kluczowe: zarządzanie jednostkami terytorialnymi, ekonomia społeczna, zrównoważony rozwój