Development of social responsibility among students of pedagogical universities

Uzakov Akram Avazovich

Tashkent State Pedagogical University

Abstract: The article discusses the definition of responsibility, defines the structure and its components. And also an analysis of the works of specific authors on the problem of responsibility, a variety of approaches and the ambiguity of the characteristics of this category. The functions of responsibility are considered: sense-forming, normative-regulating, directing, coordinating and mechanisms of perception of responsibility, a heuristic mechanism, an evaluative mechanism, a mechanism of due attitude, a reference mechanism, a motivational mechanism - a mechanism of self-control. Cognitive, motivational, volitional, activity-based components are considered.

Key words: responsibility, ability to act, ability to manage, own activity, duty, cognitive, motivation, behavior,

Analysis of research in the humanities allows us to conclude that responsibility is a multidimensional phenomenon, and therefore its study is necessary at an interdisciplinary level.

The etymology of the term "responsibility" indicates, first, that this word appeared relatively recently; secondly, that it has roots in the word "broadcast", which goes back to the Old Slavonic "veche", and means "advice, agreement, consent"; thirdly, that this term in Russian encyclopedic literature is considered in the context of the culture of the Russian people, and is more often understood as: the need, the obligation to give someone an account of their actions, deeds. In this regard, to be responsible means: to have rights and obligations, in any sphere, to have a highly developed sense of duty, to be zealous for their duties; fourthly, with the exception of certain shades in English, German and French, its interpretation is associated with the fulfillment of an obligation, duty, with the need to account for one's actions

The philosophical understanding of "responsibility" reflects the objective, historical specific nature of the relationship between an individual, a collective, a society, expresses the social and moral and legal relations of an individual to a community, which are characterized by the fulfillment of their moral duty and legal norms

In ethics, "responsibility" is defined as a category that characterizes a person from the point of view of his fulfillment of the moral requirements of society, the degree of participation of the person in the improvement of social relations.

In jurisprudence, the content of the concept of "responsibility" depends on the section of law in which it is used (criminal, disciplinary, equity, material, administrative, civil). Closer to us is "civil liability", which is understood as the established legal consequences of non-fulfillment or improper fulfillment

by persons of the stipulated duties associated with the violation of the subjective civil rights of another person.

Sociology is one of the few areas that pays the most attention to the concept being analyzed, and in it "responsibility" is seen by many authors as the acceptance or imposition of certain obligations on a person or group, on this basis, the presentation of requirements to the relevant person or group.

In most cases, sociologists represent the structure of responsibility as the interconnection of several components: a person's understanding of his place in the system of social relations, his awareness of the need to recognize and comply with norms that have spontaneously emerged or established by society, assessments of his actions in terms of the consequences for yourself and others, willingness to take sanctions in case of violations.

In psychology, "responsibility" is viewed as a concentrated control over the acts of an individual's activity, a criterion for their fulfillment of standards, which are projected using differentiated forms, as observation and assessment of social behavior.

An analysis of the works of specific authors on the problem of responsibility also allows us to see the variety of approaches and the ambiguity of the characteristics of this category. Some define it as a person's ability to perform a duty, others (T.F. Ivanova) reveal it as a volitional

quality associated with the moral and value orientation of the individual (A.I. Golubeva, L.S. Slavina), reflecting the individual's tendency to adhere to generally accepted social norms in his behavior, to fulfill his duties, as a willingness to give an account of his actions to the public society and ourselves.

G.V. Kovaleva defines "responsibility" as an integral quality of a personality that determines a person's behavior on the basis of his awareness of the dependence of his activity on generally accepted goals and values (53).

N. Ya. Golubkova, N.I. Skorbilina, in turn, understand responsibility as a component of social behavior, along with social well-being and social identification [13], as a personality quality that is formed and developed in the educational process; as an integral quality that determines the direction of all human life.

N.P. Dubinin, in the context of the forensic approach, sees the meaning of "responsibility" in influencing the consciousness and will of the person who committed the crime, to correct and re-educate him, to return him to the ranks of honest citizens [38].

There is also another point of view, the authors of which (A.F. Nikitin) define "responsibility" close to the concept of duty as an obligation, as a successful conscious fulfillment of social or moral norms by a person (83).

S.F. Anisimov defines "responsibility" as a set of objective requirements imposed by society on its individual members in the form of moral principles, norms that express social necessity.

Based on the interpretation of the translation of the word "responsibility" (responsibil¬ity) as a person's ability to respond, the ability to be responsible for their actions and the actions of those people who are in the zone of his control, the team of authors headed by A.A. Kozlov suggests, firstly, to agree that responsibility always presupposes self-sufficiency, that is, the individual's own involvement in activity; secondly, in this regard, highlight three zones of independence, which can be graphically depicted in the form of three concentric circles:

a) the inner circle sets the zone of independence carried out

without outside help - "I can do it myself";

b) the middle circle provides for the connection of the nearest environment

as accomplices "I can do with colleagues, friends

mi, relatives ";

c) outer circle - actions through intermediaries (acquaintances, teachers,

specialists in the field), that is, "I can, but with appropriate help with

parties ".

Thirdly, the opinion of the authors regarding the signs of the formation of responsibility is important. In this case, they include: a) the ability to act and do it for a long time; b) the ability to manage not only their own activities, but also the actions of others; c) the ability to delegate authority; d) the ability to independently solve their own problems, using the capabilities of the state, environment; e) the ability to visualize problems, create small films about how everything can turn out, but always with a happy ending (115, 360).

Responsibility can also be considered as one of the aspects of relations between participants in public life, characterizing the relationship between the individual, society and the state, individuals among themselves and including the subject's awareness of the social significance of his behavior and its consequences, the obligation to act within the framework of the requirements of social norms, regulating public relations

N.V. Bordovskaya, J.L. Kolominskiy, A.A. Rean in his works emphasize that, firstly, responsibility is the most important characteristic of a personality, it is what "first of all distinguishes a socially mature person from a socially immature one". Second, based on the locus of control theory, they consider two types of responsibility.

Responsibility of the first type is the case when a person assumes all responsibility for what happens to her in life. "I myself am responsible for my successes and failures. My life and the life of my family depend on me. I must and can do it "- this is the life credo and postulates of such a person. Responsibility of the second type is associated with a situation when a person is inclined to consider responsible for everything that happens to him or other people, or external circumstances, a situation. Parents, teachers and, in the future, colleagues, bosses, and acquaintances often act as "other people" who are held responsible for both failures and successes. It is easy to see that in the language of everyday concepts, the second type of responsibility is designated only as irresponsibility.

On this score, there are interesting results of experimental psychological research. According to our data (A.A. Rean), among socially immature adolescents, the proportion of those who have responsibility of the second type is 84%, while only 16% are inclined to take responsibility for themselves (that is, they belong to the first type) ... This is in stark contrast to other results obtained in our own studies. In this case, adolescents were examined, who basically made their professional choices, who have certain life goals and a clear prosocial orientation. Here, according to the coefficient of responsibility, the picture is reversed - 72% of respondents have responsibility of the first type ("I am responsible for myself") and only 16% have responsibility of the second type ("Let someone else answer"). The results of the two studies "coincide" almost "exactly the opposite."

Attribution of responsibility according to the first option, linking failure with the lack of one's own efforts, places responsibility on the individual and requires increased activity. At the same time, faith in one's ability to overcome difficulties is not questioned. Attribution of responsibility according to the second option, also placing responsibility for failure on the person himself, associates failure with an "objective" factor - lack of abilities. This version of internality leads to a decrease in motivation, a refusal to be active in overcoming failure and, ultimately, to a decrease in self-esteem.

These contradictions are removed with a slightly different view of the problem, which consists in the

introduction of an attributive pattern, conventionally called by us "good internal control". We believe that it is useful to distinguish internality - externality not only by situational (behavioral) areas, such as the area of achievement, the area of failure, the area of industrial relations, etc. Theoretically and practically, it is important to distinguish internality - externality by causal (deterministic) areas: a) responsibility for the causes of failure and b) responsibility for overcoming failures. The first area of responsibility faces the past, the second area of responsibility faces the present and future. "Good internal control", therefore, is not a one-dimensional characteristic, but can be presented as a multilevel education (Fig. 1). Such "good internal control" allows the subject to maintain self-confidence, an active position and a sense of mastery of the situation, without acquiring an accompanying feeling of all-encompassing guilt and emotional maladjustment. At the present time, there are already experimental data confirming this model.

It is easy to see that this model is not at all identical to the primitive notion expressed by the formula: "Internal in the field of achievements - external in the field of failures" or, in other words: "I am responsible for successes, for failures - chance, circumstances, other people ". Of course, this model also takes place in real life. But, firstly, it is not "good" at all, and secondly, it is not internal, in fact. The model of "good internal control" is conceptually and structurally more complex, and also compares favorably with its positive practical (behavioral) potential. Thus, these authors emphasize, responsibility is a necessary component, an attribute of a mature act. But all life is made up of actions, or even "life as a whole can be viewed as a certain complex act" (MM Bakhtin). Closest of all, please, to the ideas of the fundamental significance of the phenomenon of responsibility in the structure of personal maturity, presented here, are the ideas of humanistic (in a broad sense) and existential psychology. The outstanding scientist-humanist of the twentieth century E. Fromm believed, for example, that care, responsibility, respect and knowledge are the totality of the qualities of a mature person. Another well-known personologist of humanistic orientation V. Frankl also gives responsibility a significant place in his concept and claims that spirituality, freedom and responsibility are three foundations, three existential of human existence. It is very important that you cannot recognize a person as free without recognizing him as responsible at the same time. Human responsibility is a responsibility arising from the uniqueness and originality of the existence of each individual. As M. Bakhtin noted, only a person who has realized this uniqueness and unrepeatability is capable of a responsible act. And even more, it is in the responsibility to life that the very essence of human existence is included (V. Frankl). Obviously, responsibility is associated not only with the essence of being a mature person, but also with success and ways of self-actualization.

The fact is that social maturity and its component - responsibility - is formed only in adequate activity. The formation of responsibility is directly related to giving the individual freedom in decision-making. The question of the degree of freedom should be decided taking into account age and other specific characteristics and circumstances. But the principle itself remains unshakable. At the same time, the correct thesis that it is impossible to recognize a person as free, without recognizing him at the same time and responsible, needs the following obligatory addition of the opposite nature: it is impossible to recognize a person as responsible without recognizing him at the same time and free.

The formation of responsibility goes hand in hand with the development of individual autonomy and the provision of freedom of decision-making in relation to oneself. When we want to form or develop responsibility in a person, but at the same time block the development and manifestation of autonomy, as well as freedom of decision-making, it resembles an anecdotal situation in one of the draft chapters of Nabokov's novel "Pnin", where the main character learns to drive a car from a textbook ... lying in a

hospital bed with severe sciatica! You cannot teach a person to swim without letting him into the water. Unfortunately, this practice not only takes place, but is also extremely common. To the question: "Do we encourage independence and autonomy in the process of education and training?" - the answer is "no" rather than "yes". In the family, this is expressed in such a type of upbringing as overprotection. At school there is the same overprotection, and not only in education, but also in teaching. Encouragement of initiative, autonomy in learning activities, of course, have a place. But they are the exception rather than the rule. Such a behavioral position of adults, as research shows (A.A. Rean), finds a convenient and solid support in the system of their socio-perceptual stereotypes, in their perceptions of students as incapable, for the most part, to the manifestation of autonomy, independence in activities. Empirical research also shows that educators value student discipline much more than individual independence. These considerations allow them in the future to draw three conclusions that are most important for our research: responsibility is a necessary component, an attribute of a mature act. Generalization of data from various experimental studies allows us to state that internality (or the dominant tendency of personal responsibility) correlates with social maturity and prosocial behavior. Externality is correlated with insufficient social maturity, and under certain conditions it is a risk factor for antisocial behavior. Social maturity and its component - responsibility - is formed only in adequate activity. The formation of responsibility is directly related to giving the individual freedom in decision-making. The formation of responsibility goes hand in hand with the development of individual autonomy and the provision of freedom of decision-making regarding oneself.

A.I. Orekhovsky, relying on Marxist-Leninist ethics, reduces the understanding of "responsibility" to the factor of the moral necessity of social development [89].

We, taking the positions of all of the above considered by the author, understand by "responsibility" the quality of a person, responsible for the acceptance and fulfillment of certain obligations based on the requirements of society.

Based on this list of approaches, we can single out some areas and trends in responsibility research. They can be represented as a spectrum of vectors, one of which historically goes from the collective to the individual, and the other - from the external to the internal, and lead to the formation of conscious personal responsibility.

A more thorough study of the concept of "responsibility" in the future allowed us to identify its types. A.I. Orekhovsky and many of his supporters propose to consider such types of responsibility: economic, political, moral, social.

N.I. Skorbilina suggested distinguishing external and internal, individual and collective, personal and social. This point of view in recent years is the most common in the humanities.

Further analysis of the category "responsibility" also indicates the presence of different points of view among the researchers of this phenomenon regarding the structural elements that make up its essence.

T.F. Ivanova defines the components of responsibility as a whole range of qualities and skills of an individual: honesty, fairness, adherence to principles, readiness to be responsible for the consequences of one's actions. The named qualities, as the author notes, cannot be successfully realized if the person does not develop emotional traits: the ability to empathize, sensitivity towards other people. Considering also that the performance of any duty requires the manifestation of a number of volitional qualities, the importance of persistence, diligence, perseverance, endurance should be emphasized. Thus, we can conclude that "responsibility" manifests itself not only in character, but also in feelings, perception, awareness, worldview, in different forms of personality behavior and, therefore, their formation and development should be paid special attention to practitioners.

A number of authors define responsibility structures differently. They include in its components:

1) the ideological and moral component - a person's understanding of the relationship between personal and public interests;

2) emotional-strong-willed - awareness of the emotional attitude to the facts and phenomena of the surrounding reality, to their own choice;

3) an effective component is the purposeful overcoming of difficulties. Thus, based on the position of this author on the issue of the structure of responsibility, we can define it as the relationship of three components: cognitive, motivational and behavioral (13).

There is no doubt the thought of K. Muzdybaev that "responsibility" serves as a means of internal control (self-control) and internal regulation (self-regulation) of a person's activity, which performs the due at its discretion, consciously and voluntarily. This allows us to understand the essence of responsibility through the processes of self-control (as a personal test of oneself) and self-regulation (as the direction of self-development, movement, with the aim of putting the system in order).

As the analysis of a number of studies shows, self-control, in turn, can be disclosed in the following positions:

- self-control (as the ability to control one's actions, steps) has three components: courage, compassion, patience;

- self-control (as a developed ability of a person to control his actions and deeds, without harming himself, others and contributing to the solution of the assigned tasks) presupposes the presence of a set of knowledge, attitudes, judgments, beliefs of a person, where self-control is presented as forms of management of this type of behavior

K. Muzdybaev [80,43] also emphasizes that the subject of control is the individual himself, and the social environment, and society as a whole. However, the object of control and responsibility can be not only norms and role responsibilities. Making plans, making decisions, a person weighs whether these goals are feasible for him or if he can only hope for a chance. A person cares about what has already happened: who is responsible for the outcome of an event - himself or fate, a case that is not amenable to the control and management of force. And it is not uncommon for such personality strategies to show through his tendency to see the source of control over his life primarily in the external environment or in himself. This property is called the locus of control in psychology.

1. If a person for the most part takes responsibility for the events taking place in his life, on himself, explaining them by his behavior, character, abilities, then this shows that he has internal (internal) control. If he has a tendency to ascribe responsibility for all to external factors, finding reasons in other people, in the environment, in fate or event, then this indicates the presence of external (external) control. The internality and externality of the locus of control are stable personality traits, formed in the process of socialization.

2. Thus, in the modern world, people who tend to take responsibility for events in their lives and in

the environment are, apparently, better adapted than those who seek to ascribe responsibility for everything to external factors. The locus of control concept reveals important psychological mechanisms of people, it allows you to influence their formation in the interests of the individual and society.

3. V.N. Kudryavtsev [58; 105] in his research also understands responsibility in close connection with the concept of social control. He characterizes the latter as a set of norms, institutions, relations aimed at ensuring the behavior of people in accordance with the interests of a given social group, society as a whole. Social control includes institutional, value and behavioral aspects, is based on a system of norms and values in the field of morality, law, religion, aesthetics and various forms:

4. - at the level of society - formal and informal control operates;

5. - in small groups - informal control;

6. - at the level of the personality - self-control, the means of which are the value orientations of the individual, the norms of behavior learned by him, socio-psychological attitudes, feelings and emotions.

7. In its development, social control goes through the following stages: a) personification of social norms; b) prevention of deviations from social norms; c) revealing the facts of violations of the norm; d) analysis of the committed act and its assessment; e) application of sanctions.

8. Understanding responsibility as a means of internal self-regulation, which:

9. 1. Represents the relationship of consciousness as a whole.

10.2. Retains stability and constancy over a long period of time.

11.3. Plays a large role in social and labor activities.

12.4. Serves as an expression of the relationship between subject and object, E.V. Bondarevskaya [17] sees the peculiarity of moral consciousness in the fact that it penetrates into all spheres of human activity and behavior and ensures the unity of their manifestations in accordance with the requirements of public morality. This is the main role of moral consciousness in the formation of an integral personality, and the essence of moral regulation.

For its implementation, the author believes, a person has a complex multilevel system of internal mechanisms, or processes that occur in his moral consciousness and provide a stable connection between external requirements expressed in the norms of public morality, behavior, and internal attitudes.

In the structure of responsibility, as an element of individual moral consciousness, E.V. Bondarevskaya proposes to include three types of components: normative (moral knowledge, moral concepts, principles, ideas); evaluative (evaluations and self-evaluations, ideologically conscious evaluation criteria used by a person in practice); regulatory (moral feelings, attitudes, beliefs, regulation of human behavior, ideas must be melted in the furnace of every person's consciousness).

MI Bobneva [14] considers social norms to be the most important means of social regulation of behavior. In the most general sense of the word, normative regulation of behavior means that an individual, or a group as a whole, is prescribed, given a certain, proper type of behavior, its form, one or another way of achieving a goal, the realization of intentions, etc., is given the proper form and nature of relations and interactions of people in society, and the real behavior of people and the attitude of members of society and various social groups is programmed and evaluated in accordance with these prescribed standards - norms. Adherence to social norms that meet the ideals of society is the result of a complex psychological process of development of consciousness, moral convictions and value systems of a person, skills of social behavior, the result of restructuring the motivational system, a system of internal regulators of behavior.

In the study of AF Nikitin [83,15], responsibility and self-regulation are understood in close connection with the concept of law. Law ensures the implementation of the requirements of morality, and morality contributes to a stricter implementation of legal norms. Both law and morality, the author notes, are a set of norms that regulate social relations and shade responsibility. Between law and morality as indicators, responsibility is general and specific. They are distinguished by the fact that morality covers all social and personal relations, while law regulates only the most important, affecting the essential interests of people and society.

The norms of law are enshrined in laws, and moral rules are gradually formed in the public mind. In case of violation of legal norms, responsibility is possible in the form of state coercion or public influence, and ignoring the requirements of morality is fraught with moral condemnation of society. Moreover, the duration of legal responsibility is limited to a period clearly defined in the law, and moral responsibility often continues beyond the period provided by law.

The norms of the law become mandatory regulators of human behavior immediately after their appearance, and moral principles begin to influence human behavior after he realizes them, makes them part of his consciousness. Responsibility is an obligation, it is something that is very close in meaning to the concept of duty.

Returning to the characteristics of the concept of responsibility, one should also consider its functions:

1.   Sense-forming - the manifestation of responsibility is closely related to communist ideology and morality. Take a responsible social position can only be someone who understands why he is doing this or that business, understands his duty, his responsibilities in any circumstances and in any situation.

2.   Regulatory - an expression of moral attitudes

3.   of the given society. Since the whole complex of moral requirements is concentrated in moral responsibility, which orientate a person in the choice of actions necessary for the benefit of society, the consciousness of responsibility appears as one of the methods of moral regulation of social relations.

4.   The guideline is manifested in the fact that a highly developed sense of responsibility gives rise to new needs in a person, which evaluate her behavior from the point of view of certain moral values of a given society and at the same time act as a control mechanism associated with the manifestation of a person's needs, her actions. kov.

5.   Coordinating - connected with the fact that responsibility is a synthesis of a socially significant goal, ways and means of achieving it.

- A.F. Plakhotny in his research considers it expedient to talk, in addition to functions, and about the mechanisms of perception of responsibility. He suggests the following:

- - a heuristic mechanism, which is of great importance in the professional and creative complex of the individual, generates doubt and criticism in it, prompting to search for new solutions in the field of cognition and practice;

- - an evaluative mechanism, which is of great importance in the world-outlook-value complex, thanks to which a person expresses his attitude to material and spiritual values;

- - the due diligence mechanism addresses responsibilities and requirements

- tions that society and the collective present to their members.

- The mechanism assumes a person's perception of social requirements;

- - a reference mechanism, which means that every relation

- measured by personal standards;

- motivational mechanism - as an integral and unified system of stimulation of needs, interests, etc.;

- - The mechanism of self-control, in which there is a synthesis of both factors that organize behavior, and worldview and value components (92).

Thus, considering responsibility as a problem of the humanities, we can draw a number of conclusions:

1. Responsibility is a multidimensional phenomenon and is understood as a quality of a person responsible for accepting or imposing on her certain obligations based on the requirements presented by society.

2. Responsibility is revealed in modern literature on the basis of the following scientific approaches: philosophical, sociological, legal, psychological, pedagogical.

3. Responsibility serves as a means of internal control (self-control) and internal regulation (self-regulation) of the activities of the person, which performs the due at its discretion, consciously and voluntarily.

4. Responsibility has a complex structure. Its functions are meaning-forming, normative-regulating, guiding, coordinating; mechanisms of perception (heuristic, evaluative, due attitude, reference, motivational, self-control); types: external and internal; individual and collective; personal and social.

The problem of social responsibility of the individual has always been relevant and sanctified in the philosophical, sociological, legal, psychological and pedagogical literature.

We can distinguish in the study of this problem the points of view and approaches of foreign and domestic researchers.

R.J. Spadey and S.H. Bell understands responsibility as a management process that is inherent in everyone and that does not necessarily belong to appointed leaders, as is commonly believed.

V. Frankl [124] sees spirituality, freedom and responsibility - as three existentials of human existence. They do not just characterize human being as the being of a human being, but rather they even construct it in this capacity. Spirituality is not just a characteristic, but a constructive feature. Freedom can be represented in relation to three things

More information on this source For more information, enter the source:

1) to drives (a person has drives, but drives do not own them);

2) to heredity (a person has freedom in relation to his inclinations);

3) to the environment (as far as the environment is concerned, here too it is found that it does not define a person. The influence of the environment depends more on what a person makes of it, how he relates to it).

The aspect of responsibility in this regard is seen in the fact that a person bears it for pleasure and value, attraction and meaning; carries it both before his conscience and before the superpersonality into which the conscience is reborn. C. Beccaria in the context of the forensic approach sees social responsibility as a legal phenomenon, as a personal free choice by an individual of a certain option of behavior that violates the rights and legitimate interests of citizens, the legal order established by the state.

L. Kolberg [13] understands responsibility as a result of moral judgments, according to its three main levels of development: pre-conventional, conventional, post-conventional.

1. The preconventional level is highly egocentric. The morality or immorality of the child's judgments

is based mainly on the principle of benefit, actions are evaluated according to their physical consequences. Stability of moral assessments is given to the actions of adults, which are perceived by the child absolutely uncritically, as an attribute of the act to which the adult reacts.

2. The conventional level of development of moral judgments is achieved when the child accepts the assessments of his reference group. The moral norms of this group are learned and observed uncritically, like the truth in the last substance. The law is enforced in order to gain approval or to avoid punishment. These rules can be quite general, and, being unworked by the child himself, they are not the result of his free choice, but are accepted as the norm of that human community with which the child is identified.

3. The postconventional level is rarely reached even by adults, but it is in principle accessible, starting from adolescence, or rather, from the moment of the appearance of hypothetical-deductive thinking. This is the level of development of personal moral principles, which may coincide or may differ from the norms of the reference group. It is about finding a universal foundation for human dignity.

An analysis of foreign sources shows that the formation of social responsibility in English-speaking countries (in particular Great Britain) is embedded in the education system itself. In particular, in the studies of S. Harris, G. Hightshoe, M. Witt and others, the idea was expressed that the entire system of English education and upbringing is aimed at making the child feel responsible for his actions. Therefore, the upbringing of a socially responsible attitude to the environment and to oneself is placed in the rank of state policy and is a priority in education.

The picture of the study of the problem of responsibility by foreign authors will not be complete if one does not consider American historiography on this issue, E.N. Bobkov. She emphasizes that a number of researchers (Beard C, Kirn E., Stevenson O.K., Zuerske M.) believe that it is the American nation that has the highest degree of responsibility, realism, practicality, and readiness for partnership. All these qualities, as noted in the analyzed works, are formed under the following conditions:

1.   Lack of support from someone in the development of activities.
2.   The presence of competition.
3.   Complete freedom of action and responsibility for the result.
4.   High efficiency working.
5.   Borrowing economic achievements.
6.   Transferring the best experience.

Thus, in the American literature, the ways of forming social responsibility are considered as the inclusion of personality in difficult conditions of existence.

Domestic researchers also understand social responsibility differently and see different ways of its formation.

K. Muzdybaev defines social responsibility as the tendency of a person to adhere to generally accepted norms in his behavior, to use role responsibilities and his readiness to give an account of his actions.

A.F. Plakhotny singles out social responsibility as a category for designating a measure of free manifestation by a social subject of his duty and the right to choose in specific conditions the optimal variant of attitude to reality, based on the progressive interests of society. Social responsibility is an indicator of the social maturity of an individual, and is its integral characteristic, which determines human behavior on the basis of awareness of the dependence of activities on

generally accepted goals and values.

G.V. Kovaleva defines social responsibility as an integral quality of an individual, an indicator of her social maturity considers it to be an integral characteristic that determines a person's behavior on the basis of an awareness of the dependence of activity on generally accepted goals and values.

T.N. Sidorova considers social responsibility as an integral quality of the individual that determines the behavior and activities of a person on the basis of his awareness and application of the necessary dependence of this activity on social goals and values.

T.N. Golovatenko's social responsibility serves as an indicator of personality development, namely, the criterion of its social maturity, which is expressed in the need and self-realization of oneself in society.

A.F. Nikitin understands social responsibility as an obligation, it is something that is very close in meaning to the concept of duty.

S.F. Anisimov sees social responsibility as a set of objective requirements imposed by society on its individual members in the form of moral principles, norms that express social necessity. In moral responsibility, as a focus, moral assessment of actions, and forms of action of goals, and means, and achievements (results) converge.

By analogy with the category of "responsibility", the structure of social responsibility is also represented in different ways in the humanities.

As you can see, its main components are: cognitive, motive

tional, behavioral.

Based on the analysis of the works of domestic and foreign researchers, we can say that, firstly, social responsibility in the humanities is understood as objectivity, the historically specific nature of the relationship between an individual, a group and society from the point of view of conscious implementation of the mutual requirements imposed on them in the interests and for the benefit of each subject of this interaction; secondly, the social significance of the process of forming such responsibility is based on the ideas of humanism, recognition of the dignity of each person, his / her ability to perceive social reality in different ways; the right to error and its correction, presupposes independence and involvement in action; thirdly, the signs of its formation are: personal motivation for accepting the responsibilities imposed by the community; understanding their content, the moral aspect of the required actions; readiness to make independent decisions and take actions in accordance with the situation, set goals, calculated consequences.

The analysis of the state of the problem, the experience of its solution also allows us to determine the understanding of social responsibility as an integrative quality of a person, which is an indicator of his social maturity and determines human behavior based on his awareness of social norms, values and self-limitation of his own actions in society, as a personal obligation voluntarily accepted by a person to carry out a specific task and ensure its satisfactory completion. We will proceed from the premise that responsibility is closely linked to freedom of decision-making, duties and rights. The structure of such responsibility is provided by a combination of four components:

-        cognitive - a system of knowledge assimilated by a person about the essence of rights and obligations, about the norms and rules of human behavior in society, about ways to regulate relations between people, with authorities and institutions of society, which is actively formed in adolescence in the process of teaching academic disciplines, participation in social practice;

-        motivational - a hierarchy of motives of socially responsible behavior, which develops in socially useful activity, in the process of social interaction;

-        volitional - a system of actions and incentives to consciously regulate their own activities;

-        active - the readiness of a person to make a conscious choice of a certain line of behavior, his ability to make decisions, evaluate their consequences, determine the necessary restrictions in behavior on the basis of a formed life credo and developed self-awareness.

REFERENCES:

[1]   Bobkova E.N. Pedagogical conditions for the upbringing of social responsibility in older students: Dis .... cand. ped. sciences. - Kostroma, 2004, -157s.

[2]   2.Bogatskaya E.Yu. Pedagogical conditions for the education of students of a technical university of responsibility as a component of their professional competence: Author's abstract. dis .... cand. ped. sciences. - Rostov-on-Don, 2005.- 27 p.

1.   Bondarevskaya EV, Kulnevich SV. Pedagogy: personality in humanistic theories and educational systems. - Rostov-on-Don 1996.-560 p.

[3]   Dubinin N.P., Karpets I.I., Kudryavtsev V.N. Genetics, behavior, responsibility.-M., 1989.-351 p.

[4]   Kudryavtsev V.N. Law, deed, responsibility. - M., 1986.-346 p.

[5]   Lavrova OV Social responsibility of business in a social state // Social policy of the state. - N. Novgorod, 2002 .-- S. 59-63.

[6]   7.Муздыбаев К. Психология ответственности. - Л., 1983. - 293 с.

[7]   Ореховский А.И. Ответственность и ее социальная природа: методологический аспект. - Томск, 1978. - 230 с.

[8]   Основы военной психологии и педагогики // Под ред. Барабанщиков А.В. - М., 1988. - 326 с.

[9]   Социальная работа: Введение в профессиональную деятельность. М., 2004. - 368 с.

[10]   11.Франкл В. Человек в поисках смысла. - М., 1990. - 368 с.

[11]   Фромм А., Гордон Т. Популярная педагогика. - Екатеринбург, 1997. - 608с.

[12]   Шеремет Ю.В. Развитие мотивации военно-профессиональной деятельности у курсантов вузов: Дис.... канд. пед. наук.-М., 1990. — 188 с.