Abstract. The transformation of social responsibility takes place all over the world. There is lack of responsibility in Ukraine which therefore causes the range of serious social effects. Responsibility is located on the edge between individual and social, so it has dual nature, has the features of both social and individual. The task of a modern science is to study formation and raising mechanisms of social responsibility. It is important to research how reflection levels regarding responsibility are formed. The peculiarity of the responsibility experience lies in its social nature. Responsibility as a moral motive for social action points at high level of human moral conscience and socialization. In a wide range of responsibility types, value responsibility is the closest in line with the moral one that it is realized through a moral requirements complex.
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Introduction
Responsibility is a moral conscience feature and a law category. In this article we focus on the moral aspects of responsibility, considering them from a sociology stand.

Ethic agenda incorporates in sociological discourse without any special revision. Ethics is a close discourse to sociology. Indeed, the most popular dictionary definition of ethics is “Ethics is a philosophical study of essence, objectives and reasons of morale and morality. In its turn the morality dictionary definition suggests studying problems of social nature. Morality in a wide sense is a special form of social responsibility and a social relations type. In its narrow sense morality is a range of human principles and behavior standards towards each other and a community. The aforesaid morality agenda is also a study sphere and a subject of sociology. Ethics is reviewed and restated in sociological categories. This is true particularly within phenomenological theory and methodology.

In the process of an interdisciplinary synthesis of ethics and sociology, the part of the meaning put in a notion is not only missed but on the contrary expands. The notion meanings become more comprehensive. New peculiarities of different aspect content are revealed from the one side in relations ethics from the other in sociology of interpersonal interaction.

Responsibility is one of human moral features that enables him/her to be a social personality and reveals its sociality. Although responsibility is usually studied within ethics, philosophy or psychology, sociological dimension is also possible and even necessary. Researchers consider it in connection with society problems in different contexts: ecological, political, interpersonal, managerial, pedagogical etc. There are some fluctuations in research interest to the responsibility phenomenon: either many works on this problem appear simultaneously or there is a research silence and nothing is done in this sphere for quite a long time. For example, we can say that there was heightened interest to the responsibility problem after the world war (see, e.g. E. Levinas’s works). The latest boom can be clearly seen at the end of 70’s - early 80’s (the foreign works of G. Yonas, K. Apel or K. Muzdibaev in the USSR) (Yonas 2004, Apel 2001, Muzdibaev 1983).

We believe that at the end of the first decade of 21 century a scientific interest to the responsibility problem raises. Political discourse is rich in appellation to responsibility. This problem becomes especially acute in reference to a collective responsibility of environmental conservation and anthropogenic danger.

Defining responsibility
Among widely-spread dictionary definitions of responsibility there is a social implication of this human feature. In a modern Russian dictionary of literary language the following definition is set. “Responsibility is a given or taken by somebody obligation to report in some activity and take the blame for possible effects.” (Yevgenjeva 1959). This definition implies a certain instance to which a person reports and for which he/she
feels blame if an action damages something or somebody. This instance can be represented by an anonymous or definite company or another person who is referent to a responsible person.

Almost the same definition is given by a Great Thesaurus of Modern Ukrainian Language: “Responsibility is a given or taken obligation to be in charge of a certain work sector, business, somebody’s actions and words”. And a responsible person is “the one who takes responsibility for a certain work sector, business etc.” (Busel 2004).

The link between responsibility and other possible moral human features, that are socially relevant, is set. “Conscience is recognition and feeling of responsibility based on self-estimation of duties performance”. As well as in the above mentioned definition a certain instance is indirectly implied, that makes a person feel responsible in some limits. In the next definition a social environment is only implied, but not mentioned directly too: “Responsibility is the correspondence of a personal moral activity to his/her obligation considered from the possibility stand” (Kon 1981). In the set definitions there is a limitation of purely ethnic human features that have inner social content. It proves again the necessity of ethics sociologization and to add more clear social character to it. The deepening of notion contents, explanation of their meanings is one of the science methodology tasks. In this case methodological meaning of ethics sociologization lies in revealing purer social aspects of ethnical categories which once were only suggested. From its latent position the responsibility sociality turns into clear understanding.

Latent responsibility implication is kept in many other notions e.g. norm notion. Norm can be seen as defused responsibility which is preconditioned by society needs in human behavior streamlining. Responsibility is an element of individual and group behavior normative regulation. Other elements of this system are law norm, technical rationality, organizational communication tools, etiquette, religion etc. The responsibility source is society-state. Responsibility is an inner base of community self-organization. From the stand of fundamentalism any aspect can be regulated through norm and legal liability. Responsibility weakening is connected with social norms crisis. Crisis volume and scale specifies the level of society responsibility weakening. Norm violation leads to responsibility distortion that is to such behavior that originated from society needs.

It is important to distinguish between social and society responsibility. In the first case (social responsibility) a responsibility subject is organizations, certain communities and an object is problems of a society and social needs. In the latter case (society responsibility) on the contrary a subject is a society which has responsibility attribution for people who form this society. Here is an extra delicate difference, thus in any case we understand social responsibility. It is responsibility socialization that is an object of sociological study of this individual and communal feature.

**Sociological understanding of responsibility**

An important aspect of responsibility sociological understanding is population differentiation on type, character and responsibility level. On the basis of sociological research (Stepanenko 2009) carried out in Ukraine in the last years and per se by the author in Zaporizhzhya city, we can define a social picture of individual responsibility: it is an educated able-bodied man (25-55 years), a city dweller, a representative of a middle or high class. A person with such social and demographic traces shows the highest responsibility rates (about 30-39%) compared to other people (20-25%).

The strongest indicator which differentiates a community on the basis of responsibility criterion is education. A little weaker is self-identification with a middle class. The weakest indicator is gender. But the strongest differentiation indicator is not of status line, but the one of political culture level and socio-political activity. Among the people who stated that “they can pretty often influence authorities and decision making process” on the local level (in a city and village) 70% consider themselves to be responsible, while 17,4% think they are responsible among those who will never be able to influence authorities.

Bigger responsibility indicators referring to their locus control, that is a place where a person is, is a city or village. As for a state the responsibility indicators in general are noticeably smaller.

A person with primary and not completed secondary education marks his/her responsibility with 23,2% probability and with higher education 39,3%. With rising of education level the indicator of people who state their responsibility also increases.

It is clear that this declaration is a certain abstraction which is not supported by any action. It happens not because a person is passive, but because the mechanisms and influence role-models of a definite person on decision making at a state and local levels are still very weak and underdeveloped.
Another aspect of responsibility from a sociological standpoint is defining its functioning peculiarities in this or that society. Responsibility is defined as a human ability to perform duties. Two interconnected tendencies in responsibility functioning are characteristic of a crisis society. On the one hand, crisis motivates people to take their obligations with more responsibility. Urge to get out of crisis and keep vitality in difficult conditions makes people mobilize their volitional and moral features. The desire to overcome barriers, to reach a stoical position, to fulfill duties referring relatives, a society, and oneself despite the difficulties is increased.

On the other hand, since crisis has a system nature, it enhances not only economic sphere of a society, but also a cultural and moral sphere. So, we can speak about responsibility crisis, obligations crisis and in general about a moral relations crisis. Let’s consider this aspect closer.

Morality crisis

The reason for moral relations crisis lies in breaking set connections among people, identity crisis, life complication, loss of benchmarks, etc. It is important to study and describe the effects of a certain mechanism which shows responsibility and irresponsibility. Ironically responsibility appears when its lack leads to social deformations. Just like we remember about a master when something breaks down or functions badly, we remember about responsibility when destructions, dysfunctions and deviations are revealed. A well-functioning society is the result of effective, solid responsibility which penetrates into pores of social organism. There is latent, routine responsibility which is aimed at daily efforts to maintain order in business referring to all spheres of activity. When there is lack of responsibility, social deformations appear.

It is thought that social character is a functional structure function. Civil life environment forms a social character, bringing it in accordance with time and social environment requirements. It doesn’t mean that social character features will always have the ones, strengthening social vitality. Defects in social organization cause the defects in social character. Therefore, a vicious circle appears. Poor life conditions cause the lack of responsibility and irresponsibility in its turn raises the negative aspects of these life conditions. Exit from a vicious circle lies in moral overcoming, mobilization of personal social nature, acting counter to the situation and formed deviant behavior pattern. The demonstration of moral firmness and responsibility charges others with positive energy and becomes a source of crisis overcoming.

In a normal society social character makes external necessity an the inner one through the obligations and responsibility mechanisms, but in a crisis society this mechanism malfunctions. External conditions rather determine the lack of responsibility and trust.

Group and individual irresponsibility

Individual irresponsibility becomes socially relevant and risky if it is inherent to a great number of people, critical mass that noticeably influences society state. Social irresponsibility that is social problems negligence or group demonstration of irresponsibility is a special sphere of sociology attention. We treat the claims, directed on anonymous public or elite, to raise responsibility skeptically. First, it is suggested on default since its necessity is clear and evident. Secondly, it is in vain because it is difficult to create any educational influence on people masses. People are urged to take survival measures i.e. to reveal their responsibility, recognition of approaching danger or catastrophe in action but not to take some specific measures to raise responsibility. Manilov’s dreams “ I wish everybody would demonstrate conscience and responsibility in their activity” are naïve and vain. Emotional appeals to void “to bring up people respecting responsibility” may only irritate public and produce blunt and senseless discourse. To reveal social mechanisms which cause irresponsibility or urge to responsibility is more interesting and beneficial.

Peculiarities of responsibility/irresponsibility sociological study

Responsibility/irresponsibility sociological study both theoretical and empirical sets the task to understand the sources, essence and its manifestation in different situations of a social life. Latent manifestations of irresponsibility are also interesting.

Responsibility can be seen as a social activity and a daily routine determinant. The process of reflection levels formation referring to responsibility is important. Responsibility as a positive quality can be declared openly and readily in accordance with reality or contrary to it. It can be the result of self-esteem or false confidence as for real activity effects. People will not speak about their irresponsibility; they will try to prove the opposite. In case of possible responsibility lack people try to blame others for the negative results of activity.

The object sphere of irresponsibility phenomenon changes constantly with its context change. To determine the irresponsibility volume clearly, define its content, structure and object without context
accurately is impossible. Semantic field of irresponsibility notion is dynamic. However, a semantic nuclear of this notion concentrates vividly around the following definition: a failure of an individual or a group to perform accepted (or given according to a social status) responsibility.

There are situations especially in politics when irresponsibility is attributed to others arbitrarily and groundlessly. This notion became general; it is used to accuse political rivals, authorities, elite and other objects of competition and rivalry. One is to be careful when branding opponents with irresponsibility. Something that is not within influence either individually or efficiently cannot be a responsibility object. Accusing authorities, politicians, elite of being irresponsible arbitrary is a sign of unfounded approach to a discussion and political rivalry.

Similar to negative dialectics irresponsibility is seen as the absence of a definite quality namely responsibility. Irresponsibility both as a phenomenon and a quality can be seen interconnected. Absence or lack of this quality acts as a phenomenon.

The analysis of factors which precondition responsibility is vital. The first and very important condition of responsibility formation is psychological health. Meanwhile it refers not only to individual psychic but a group and social one. If psychic health of a society is damaged, the responsibility formation and functioning mechanisms are also damaged. In this respect we can refer to the book “Social madness” by E. Golovaha and N. Panina (Golovaha and Panina 1994).

When a social body is ill, social psychic and soul are also ill. It means that social responsibility cannot be on the right level. The peculiarities of responsibility experience lie in its social nature. We mean social experiences and emotions that originated in a society. Social experience is emotional acceptance of values and ideals important for a society. Social emotions mediated by social role-models lie in emotional treatment of norms and behavior patterns accepted in a society. Emotional experience of their responsibility is a result of successful socialization and is an important precondition of responsible action and treatment to business. Next, verbal and logical responsibility understanding that is views, judgments, intentions to a person and his/her environment is significant. Through this a person can reflect on responsibility level and state in a society. It is this level which gives possibility to get answers on questionnaire and interviewers’ questions about responsibility. Data of annual social monitoring, carried out by Sociology Institute NAN of Ukraine prove that Ukrainian society suffers from mass mutual distrust to each other, to political institutions and authorities. People tend to cheat each other, violate laws, act in their interest at the expense of others etc. Under conditions of social distrust lack the responsibility feeling will also be faulty.

Responsibility as a moral motive of social action indicates a high level of personal moral conscience and socialization. A society expects this very treatment of business. Responsibility can exist in the form of unconscious psychosocial complexes. A latent source of the subjection to a personal feeling of responsibility is its sacral implication. Through intuition a person feels that responsibility is an important condition of society vitality and respectively of a person. Irrational by nature necessity to act with responsibility gives a society a chance to keep marginal level of its self-preservation. It is sacral perception of life that preconditions inner and subconscious human urge to act with responsibility towards public and society in general sometimes despite their desires.

Sociological approach stipulates the necessity to operationalize the notion of responsibility. Theoretical responsibility operationalization parameters comprise such notions and qualities: general (as moral attribution) and definite responsibility (personal responsibilities in accordance with his/her roles and statuses); will and social internationalization of an individual; social maturity; subjectivity and identification with a community.

Social responsibility functions are complicated by an additional system of notions. Responsibility urges to a socially important action, deed and activity; serves as a unifying basis, principle, power around socially important value; forms life sense and bench-marks (e.g. to bring up a child taking responsibility for his/her destiny, to find a new way to protect the environment or save resources).

Responsibility provides interpersonal communication, since it is mutual responsibility for keeping and maintaining communication urges individuals to search (create) common meanings in signs and symbols. Responsibility sets limits for activity and concern (a person performs only that segment he/she is responsible for, the rest is not obligatory). These limits are set by a person or by others, but these limits form margins of human activity. Responsibility connects a person with a society and adds social content to life and activity.

In this respect E. Fromm noticed: “Self-consciousness and ability to prognosticate resulted in rousing fear, will and responsibility. A person feels will inside to make and carry out his/her plans. He/she is happy
not to be a slave but a master; he/she rejoices the world and oneself. But the feeling of responsibility limits this joy. A person knows he/she is in charge of the deeds. He/she knows what is good and what is bad. This knowledge becomes a burden. No breather has such load. A human feels a sad division of the soul. This division in human nature is more difficult to endure than birth sufferings. (Fromm 2006). One of the consequences of the division is human disruptiveness.

E. Fromm sees pessimism in an attempt to prevent the impact of modern technological civilization on responsibility state. According to E. Fromm irresponsibility source is alienation, consumerism, bureaucracy, and organization and computer domination. An active person treats the world with interest therefore stimulating responsibility. Passivity leads to carelessness which is directly connected with irresponsibility. E. Fromm repeatedly addresses the problem of bureaucracy irresponsibility. “Bureaucrats are afraid of personal responsibility and want to hide behind their rules; their safety and self-respect rest on their devotion to rules but not to the laws of human heart” (Fromm 2006). Carelessness, indifference to organization goals, human hostility to their organization cause irresponsibility.

In his book “The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness” E. Fromm states: “An individual loses his/her responsible part in a social process; a person becomes utterly “conforming” creature” (Fromm 2006). Irresponsibility epidemic - is a typical feature of modern life. To offset the negative impact of technologism on moral responsibility, according to E. Fromm it is necessary to chose social humanization as a way out.

Conclusion
Irresponsibility is characterized by counter features: an authoritarian person, infantilism, alienation, egosim, non-socialization, absence of a subject etc. The system vitality is preserved if the responsibility of someone is compensated by the efforts of the other. The latter takes obligations of an irresponsible person, acting as a “rescuer”, as the one who is the most interested in maintaining organization vitality and positive result of joint action. The ability of a society to compensate irresponsibility of somebody at the expense of additional activity of others, that is to solve the problem in a situation of social interaction.

Irresponsibility is social void since a person is absorbed into asociality vacuum. Irresponsibility breaks the connections of the social. Such overcoming of dependence makes a person useless for a society and environment. In other words it deprives a person of sociality. Responsibility is dependence on a society which makes life meaningful and a person makes it important in a social construction chain and in the process of vitality maintenance. On the basis of empirical research we can conclude that population responsibility to a society and for it is relatively low. It in some way reflects outting of authoritarian conscience of a socialist epoch. Rejection of responsibility to and for a society is a human reaction to a low level, in people’s mind, of state responsibility for population wellbeing. Responsibility has become one of the most actual moral qualities that is demanded by a society from its citizens. Irresponsibility like a virus infects a society, threatening social organism integrity and its self-protection. Great attention to responsibility state in various social spheres and institutions results in a range of research of this phenomenon. Responsibility/irresponsibility study in sociological discourse allows to reveal additional aspects of a person and society.
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