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Abstract: The article studies on the basis of empirical material embracing sociological research made in Zaporizhzhya – one of Ukrainian industrial centers – the problem of state and type of responsibility among citizens particularly and in Ukrainian society in general. Research method: questioner survey on the basis of representative sampling among adults. Research results: the information set demonstrates the people’s reflection of their attitude to their responsibility in a society. Empirical results are supported by theoretical interpretation and generalizations.
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Introduction
Responsibility determines as individuals ability to perform duties. Two mutually related trends characterized in responsibility functioning for crisis Ukrainian society. On the one hand, crisis stimulates people to more responsible attitude to their duties. The pursuit of way out of crisis and life saving ability in difficult conditions makes people mobilize theirs volitional and moral qualities. An aspiration to overcoming obstacles increases and responsibility aspiration relatively close people, society, ourselves increases as well, contrary to difficulties. The crisis has a systematic character and covers not only socially-economic sphere but it also covers culture and moral sphere, on the other hand. That's why we should speak about responsibility crisis, duty crisis and moral relations between crisis in general. The reasons in such moral crisis relations between people lies in rupture of relations, which was formed earlier, in identification crisis, in life complication, life guidance loss and etc. It's important for contemporary sociology science to research and describe consequences, which appears from specific manifestation mechanism of responsibility and irresponsibility.

Method
We set a task - to identify the level of influence on societal individual’s liability for duties in different spheres of life. The social responsibility can be differentiated according to different objects of responsibility depending on a sphere of life of person and the level of sociality. In other words, person’s responsibility for the situation in their country can be designated as societal responsibility. Also we can designate such responsibilities as liability for ours family, close people, work, health and etc. It's evident, that now we speak about the other level of responsibility. Some question arises: is the level of societal responsibility connected with responsibility for objects of the medium and the lowest level of sociality? The answer on this question would be more convincing if we take data from empirical research. Let's consider these problems on empirical research material, which was done by the author in Zaporizhzhya in 2013 year. This research was done due to the representative sample method for adults by questionnaire (interviewed 700 people, who are over 18 years old).

Results
Responses on personal responsibility and assessment of responsibility of surrounding people unambiguously showed that humanity perceive surrounding people like irresponsible i.e. socially free individuals refuse to take responsibility for society. Individualized society or individuals society thinks that person is a sovereign personality and perceive others like separate individuals, who don't care about society destiny and theirs country. And consequently such people don't take responsibility for order in their country. The further analysis shows that the irresponsibility syndrome touches societal level in general. If we would consider the sphere of close socially surroundings and close to humanity social environment and some activities we realize that moral isolationism insight is unambiguously weaker.
Societal irresponsibility connected with irresponsibility according to close social surroundings relations, but this second level of irresponsibility shows unambiguously weaker. So, among societal responsible respondents, only 58,1% are responsible for theirs close people, and among societal irresponsible respondents are responsible- 53,6%, that is less. Respectively, 33,5% and 33.9% for these categories designated the medium level of responsibility. Low level of responsibility among societal responsible people for close societal surroundings showed - 6,5% and 12,6% of societal irresponsible. As we can see here, the level of correlation is high, but still we can't claim that societal irresponsible people are so irresponsible relating to theirs close people at the same time. In this case, we can say about some trend, which exists. The syndrome of social irresponsibility consist in people opinion not to feel free to take responsibility for the situation in the country and in the same time such people have a low indicator of the subjective responsibility relating to others aspects of sociality and theirs life-world.

The syndrome of social irresponsibility manifests itself distinctly according to the close human activities and to his/her work. Thus, only 43% among societal responsible people have the feeling of the subjective responsibility to work, and among societal irresponsible people manifests responsibility to work - 23,5%, that is twice less. Here some certain continuum manifests. Social responsible people at the medium level manifests the medium level of responsibility according to their work - 29,8%. Such relations manifests in the whole system of societal responsibility interconnection and responsibility to work. Let's look at the example: among societal responsible respondents 19,4% are subjective irresponsible relating to their work, and among societal irresponsible the amount of such respondents are clearly more - 24,6% . Societal irresponsible people concentrate more not on low level of responsibility to work but on the medium level. So, most of the social irresponsible respondents concentrate on the medium position of continuum ( or a scale) relating to work - 51,9%. People, who has the medium position in societal responsibility are more and theirs responsibility to work is - 54,5%. The degree of the medium irresponsibility is getting lower (i.e. degree of responsibility is getting higher) because of sociality level decreasing. That is, an extremely irresponsible people on societal level who are on the close social level according to work manifest already theirs subjective irresponsibility significantly less. The trend and elements of irresponsibility syndrome is saving. Persons transfer theirs insight of responsibility to surroundings. If some individuals don’t feel the need to be responsible for the situation in the country, then they think that other people are indifferent to affairs of state as well. Among people, who think that others are responsible for the affairs of state and manifest a high level of responsibility more often, consider themselves responsible - 64,6%, those people, who don't think that they are responsible - 16,7% ( we understand it like this: " People who are around me have high level of responsibility, and I don't want to assume responsibility for the situation in the country" - this is a demonstrative opposition of ourselves to surroundings, a self-conscious recusancy, a mental basis of escapism). The first position not simply conformist, but civil: "I am responsible for the situation in the country and surroundings are responsible for the situation in the country as well". Unfortunately, we have few model citizens, only 6,8% in this sample. Only 1,7% that is less, it is people, who are confident nonconformists, and they sharply stand in the opposition to surroundings opinion. The majority of people keep low, medium and moderate positions. Generality of people don't think that they are responsible for the situation in the country, and also they consider surroundings like irresponsible people as well. Among respondents, who claim, that the majority of people manifest very low level of responsibility relating to the affairs of state - 77,6% are societal irresponsible. The majority of the people concentrated on extremely low indicators of societal responsibility. Individuals, who think that, they are irresponsible classifying surroundings to irresponsible as well relating to affairs of state - 31,4% in other words - one third. Still, 22,5% people, who are confident, that all people around (surroundings) have irresponsible relation to affairs of state are relate to the situation in the country in some measure. Still, we have pretty enough people - 14,8% who manifest an average societal responsibility for the affairs of state and at the same time, these people suppose that surroundings have an average estimate of responsibility too. Common diagnosis which is getting from research is negative. Substantial part of people (approximately one third) has an extremely low indicator of responsibility, because of lack of a good example outside, people deprived of the citizenship model. Only 7% of respondents can be rank to people, who has a model citizenship position. Individuals who stoically claim their responsibility against the background of others irresponsibility approximately 7%. Nonconformists amount approximately 4%. ("Surroundings are responsible and I don't want to take responsibility").
Here we can see the characteristic of the people, who evaluate their responsibility against the background of surroundings. It's shown data above, which shows people, who evaluate their responsibility against the degree background of state responsibility for the benefit of citizens. It's evident, that estimates are different. People can justify their irresponsibility at the first case, because of others irresponsibility ("I am the same, nevertheless"), but at the second case, people motivate theirs irresponsibility, because of violation from government side of some conditional social moral public contract due to, people are ready to be responsible for the government upon condition, that the government is responsible for the people.

Let's consider how is societal responsibility/irresponsibility correlated with personal problems, which relate to health. As we know, responsibility deficit for health takes people to excessive alcohol taking, smoking and extremely way of life. Health neglect - it's a part of mentality, which leads to depressive trends in a demographic situation in the country, also this is an evidence of common low level of culture. Only one quarter of people among those, who have been interviewed, assumes presence of private responsibility feeling for us and our health. We are not talking about responsibility for ourselves, this is another category. It means here the subjective estimate in the sphere of private responsibility for us and our health. Generally, we can note here that for population a moral estimate of responsibility for health is pessimistic. Showing personal irresponsibility, people are irresponsible relating to society as well. Among people, who assess, that surroundings have low level of responsibility for their health is - 40,5% who are societal irresponsible and only 15,3% are societal responsible. It's obvious interconnection between personal and societal responsibility.

Most of the people (43%) are concentrated on the medium point of personal responsibility and on the medium and low societal liability. Only 9,1% of respondents are characterized on high personal and societal responsibility coincidence. Personal and societal responsibility coincidence is characteristically for the same amount of respondents - 9,9% . In this way, it's possible to say about certain trend of positive connection of personal and societal responsibility levels but this connection is relative enough as well.

Attention should be paid, that responsibility for personal sphere of life estimates by respondents significantly higher than responsibility for societal and organizational responsibility.

Let's consider how responsibility profile in is different spheres of persons live changes under the influence of theirs responsibility. Societal responsibility doesn't influence on family, doesn't increase responsibility level in organizational sphere, but having low societal level reduces responsibility in organization twice, however a positive balance is kept. In the sphere of government responsibility increases (5times) and reduces responsibility having low societal responsibility.

Sensitivity of societal responsibility is high mostly in the government sphere and doesn't influence on family. In the medium degree influences on organizational sphere. High societal responsibility influences much relating to ourselves and our health. Societal sphere renders a significant influence on private sphere paradoxically. It can be reverse dependence here: having high personal responsibility a societal responsibility increasing as well. Family relations is still autonomous.

Conclusions
Responsibility is getting one of the most topical moral qualities which society demands from theirs citizens. Deep scientist’s interest in developing of condition of responsibility in different spheres and society institutions generates a series of researches. Responsibility/irresponsibility consideration in sociological discourse allows discover additional aspects of its person’s quality and society. Material of empirical research persuasively showed, that different levels of responsibility are connected between. However some zones of relative autonomous exist in which societal responsibility can be in minimal level, but responsibility which is on macro-level can be high enough. Primarily, for this zone family is characteristically.
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