

PAPER

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF STUDENTS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Ergashev Ikhtiyor Saypidinovich ^{1,*}

¹C.Phil., Senior Lecturer of the Department of Specialization, Social-Humanitarian and Exact Sciences, Andijan Faculty of Tashkent State University of Economics Andijan, Uzbekistan

*Ikhtiyor@gmail.com

Abstract

The article examines the essence, structure and functions of personal responsibility, reveals the process of educating students' social responsibility. The peculiarity of responsibility as a quality of personality is that it acts as an extremely integral quality in the system of its qualities. Therefore, the formation of responsibility and its implementation are possible only through the education and self-education of all other positive qualities.

Key words: freedom, necessity, responsibility, structure and functions of responsibility, individual and social responsibility, responsibility as an integrative quality of personality, education and principles.

Introduction

Currently, there is an urgent need to develop social and professional responsibility in students, as this quality is one of the most important factors in the economic and social development of society. Social responsibility of an individual is understood as the degree of readiness to fulfill one's duties and bear responsibility for the possible social and psychological consequences of one's actions. The study of social responsibility in both scientific and practical terms is relevant today throughout the world.

The diversity in the interpretation of this concept allows us to see both the breadth of consideration and the complexity in the field of application of the basic principles of social responsibility, such as: legal (regulatory), economic, environmental, ethical, psychological, etc. Social responsibility is a multidimensional phenomenon, covering different aspects of the economic system, elements of management and socio-psychological aspects.

Methods

When we hear "**responsibility**", sooner or later our consciousness associates it with another social category – justice. In mass perception, these two categories are inextricably linked and are very often understood as identical and synonymous. Responsible

behavior is usually assessed as fair. In other words, those who currently occupy an unfavorable position in society are primarily interested in justice.

Considering the reasons why an individual finds himself in such a position, we can highlight the violations committed in the system of social interaction, deviations from the built and debugged system of social values and norms as the main ones. Initially, all people are equal. And only their entry into society leads to the emergence of inequality. It is impossible to get rid of this inequality: there are no ideal social systems, in any case, at some point some mistake will be made that will disrupt the functioning of the well-oiled social mechanism. Of course, in some societies the very possibility of such mistakes is reduced to almost zero, while in others their absence is almost impossible.

But, in any case, the slightest failure in the system of social interaction, values and norms leads to the emergence of injustice. The cause of this failure may be an irresponsible action taken by a specific representative of society, a separate social group, or society as a whole.

Considering the problems of justice and equality, we should not forget that some manifestations of social inequality are inevitable, but this does not mean the absence of the need and opportunity to strive for a social ideal built on respect for the absolute equality of each and every one before the values and norms existing in society.

Results and discussion

Analysis of the results of the study showed the presence of significant differences as to the degree of social responsibility among students of different specialties. Students of agricultural specialties showed a higher level of social responsibility, while managers and students, as it turned out, were less willing to bear social responsibility. We conclude that special programs are needed to train socially responsible students of construction specialties.

These programs should be aimed at improving students' awareness of responsibility for the results of their own moral choices in professional activities. We propose that more practice-oriented techniques in the educational process, such as the study of relevant cases and sets of special, more generalized situations of moral choice that have been developed based on the analysis of real-world situations from the practice of professional activity should be included.

Freedom and necessity are philosophical categories expressing the relationship between human activity and the objective laws of the real world. Freedom and necessity are opposites that presuppose each other, like, for example, good and evil. The German philosopher G. Hegel noted that "freedom that would not have any necessity within itself, and necessity alone without freedom are abstract and, therefore, untrue definitions.

Freedom is essentially concrete, eternally determined within itself and, therefore, at the same time, necessary." The initial condition of true human freedom is the knowledge of various necessities: natural, social, individual. Even Socrates emphasized the decisive role of knowledge in the implementation of freedom. Knowledge of various necessities exists in the form of requirements, various kinds of social and individual norms. And in order for a person's actions to be free, he must carry them out in accordance with these norms, that is, on the basis of knowledge of necessity. For example, it is impossible to productively build human relations with people, ignoring the requirements of moral standards. A student cannot become what he or she is called to be by ignoring their abilities and inclinations.

Human freedom also implies the right to choose the goals of activity, means and conditions for achieving them. The objective basis for choice is that different kinds of needs manifest or can manifest themselves in different conditions. Therefore, when choosing an option for their activity, a person deals, on the one hand, with the spectrum of their needs and capabilities, and on the other – with the requirements (needs) of the environment (team, society) and the opportunities that exist in this environment. The right to choose implies the ability of a person to set any goals and choose any ways to achieve them. The creative nature of freedom is expressed in the right to choose.

But human freedom is not limited to the right to choose. Freedom also depends on the content of the choice. In the limit, two mutually exclusive options are always possible. The first option is the choice of the method of activity in accordance with the knowledge of objective necessity, manifested in the form of moral, legal and other norms and requirements. The second option is the choice of the method of activity based on ignoring certain social and individual norms.

The first option is free, the second is unfree. It is important to note that in each of the extreme alternative options for choosing a method of activity, there are, respectively, both righteous and unrighteous options for the method of activity. For example, fraudsters have dozens of ways to appropriate other people's money.

The opposite of freedom is unfreedom, which includes two aspects. The first aspect of unfreedom is associated with activity that is carried out on the basis of ignorance of necessity, on its false knowledge, or on a conscious disregard for knowledge of necessity. The second aspect of unfreedom is associated with coercion, with

dependence. Dependence is subordination to others (another) in the absence of independence, the right to choose, the ability to self-determine.

True human freedom also presupposes his responsibility for the results of his activities and the consequences of these results. Freedom without responsibility loses the property of social usefulness, since it turns into self-will, arbitrariness, permissiveness, licentiousness. In general, freedom without responsibility is expressed in the following words: **"What I want, that I do."**

What is responsibility? In the **"Philosophical Dictionary"**: "Responsibility is a category of ethics and law, reflecting a special social and moral-legal attitude of an individual to society (humanity as a whole), which is characterized by the fulfillment of his moral duty and legal norms. The category of responsibility embraces the philosophical and sociological problem of the relationship between a person's ability and possibility to act as a subject (author) of his actions" [17].

We do not agree with this interpretation of responsibility in everything.

1. Why is responsibility limited only to the attitude of an individual to society? After all, there is a responsible attitude of an individual to himself (I to I), for example, for organizing his nutrition, his health, etc.

2. Why is the category of **"responsibility"** considered only as a category of ethics and law? All applied sciences, including technical and pedagogical ones, are connected with normative requirements for an individual in one way or another. It seems to us that the category of **"responsibility"** is most likely interdisciplinary.

3. A subject can be not only a responsible person, but also an irresponsible one.

4. In addition, the subject of responsibility is not only an individual, but also other subjects, for example, individual organizations, the state, etc.

In the **"Dictionary of Social Pedagogy"** responsibility is defined as "the ability of an individual to understand the correspondence of the results of his actions to the set goals, the norms accepted in society or a group, as a result of which a feeling of involvement in a common cause arises, and in case of discrepancy – a feeling of unfulfilled duty" [12]. This definition of responsibility, in our opinion, is one-sided, since responsibility in it is actually associated only with its epistemological aspect, that is, with the knowledge of necessity as a duty. But knowledge of necessity, as noted, is only a prerequisite for freedom, and therefore responsibility. The main thing in both freedom and responsibility is real activity in accordance with the recognized necessity.

S. M. Kunitsina writes: "By responsibility we mean an integrative quality of personality, determining the activity of the subject on the basis of free choice and foresight of its results" [11]. We consider this definition of **"responsibility"** to be erroneous, since such a quality of a person as irresponsibility can be included under it. For example, criminal activity of a person is also a form of activity of the subject, which is carried out on the basis of free choice and a certain prediction of its results.

According to L. V. Krylov, "Responsibility as a philosophical category reflects the nature of the relationship between the individual, the collective and society from the point of view of the social implementation of mutual demands made on them" [15]. In our opinion, this definition does not define the concept of **"responsibility"** but the concept of **"mutual responsibility"**. But the basis of mutual responsibility of subjects related to each other is their responsibility.

In our opinion, it is of fundamental importance to understand both freedom and responsibility to identify their relationship with the concept of duty. Duty in the **"Philosophical Dictionary"** is defined as a moral requirement that takes the form of duty when

it turns into a personal task of a certain individual in relation to his position in a specific situation. In this case, the individual acts as an active subject of morality, who himself is aware of and implements moral requirements with his activities.

We proceed from the fact that the concept of "duty" is derived from the concept of "ought". And true ought is the objective "demands" of objective natural, social and individual laws, translated into the language of social and individual norms, which in relation to the individual act as demands, duties, functions expressed in verbal form. True ought in all types of human activity is duty.

It follows from the above that irresponsibility is the opposite of responsibility. If a responsible person is characterized by the ability and willingness to know his duty and regulate his activities based on his knowledge, then an irresponsible person is characterized by the lack of willingness to know his duty and regulate his activities with normative consciousness, duty.

The reasons and forms of manifestation of irresponsibility are varied. Let us name only some of them.

- A person's ignorance of the normative foundations of a particular activity and unwillingness to overcome it.

- With knowledge of the norms, various requirements for one's activity, either their complete non-use in one's activity, or the lack of consistency in following them. The reason for this is that a person's mastery of normative knowledge has not been brought to the point of conviction in its vital value, and the use of this knowledge has not turned into a habit.

- A peculiar form of manifestation of a person's irresponsibility is the absolutization of responsibility or hyper-responsibility. This occurs when a person's demands on himself lead to self-flagellation, not taking into account his states, capabilities and forgiving nothing. Being "armored" from head to toe with responsibility, he sometimes loses the ability to adequately respond to phenomena in specific circumstances and act in them. Therefore, responsibility must have its own measure. Responsibility must ensure human freedom, and not suppress it.

- The possibility of irresponsibility also lies in the use of normative knowledge depending on the consideration of specific conditions of implementation in any activity. All true normative knowledge reflects some aspects of real, stable relationships of people in their activities in certain conditions of space and time. The use of these norms is productive if it is carried out taking into account these conditions. But real relationships of people are constantly changing, as a result of which they cannot always be "driven" into the Procrustean bed of the norms regulating them. In other words, norms can conflict with real life. If in these circumstances a person continues to act in accordance with existing norms, then he takes the path of formalism, bureaucracy and will inevitably harm the essence of the case. As a result, responsibility is transformed into irresponsibility.

- Irresponsibility is also associated with human rights. If a person's exercise of his rights (for example, a university teacher or a student), and, if necessary, their protection, is an expression of his responsibility, then failure to exercise his rights, and, if necessary, refusal to protect them, is a manifestation of his irresponsibility. Human rights are associated primarily with individual responsibility (irresponsibility).

- Another form of manifestation of irresponsibility is the following. A person's responsible attitude to activity is a guarantee of achieving success, good luck and correlates with his rightness, approval of his activities and reward for its results. If a responsible person, due to the mistakes he made, does not achieve the results he expected, then he voluntarily admits his guilt, considers himself guilty and repents, experiencing a feeling of regret about what happened.

Conclusion

The student's responsible attitude to the development of his/her activity project, on the one hand, is based on the responsibility he/she has previously developed in the form of his/her positive qualities (conscientiousness, creativity, self-criticism, etc.) and on the standards of the project culture (methods, technologies), and on the other hand, the project accepted by the student as a management decision itself becomes a certain norm regulating the student's activity and predetermining his/her responsibility for the implementation of the project, for its results and consequences.

This is explained by the fact that the project acts not only as a means to achieve the goal, but also as an internal regulator of his/her activity. And the essence of responsibility, as noted, consists in the subject's readiness and ability to regulate the activity in a culturally appropriate manner, aimed at creating benefits for himself/herself and others without causing harm to anyone.

We believe that the social responsibility of students, their ability to fulfill their professional duty in the future are formed, first of all, in the process of fulfilling their academic duty. In our opinion, the criterion of students' responsibility in educational activities at a university aimed at preparing for future professional self-realization is their active inclusion in all types of their exoteric independent activities (educational and cognitive, research, educational and practical, and socio-cultural) and in all types of their esoteric activities (self-knowledge, self-management, self-educational, and self-healing activities) and achieving certain positive results in each of them that are objectively significant (valuable) both for society and for the students themselves, and without causing harm to either their immediate environment (primarily teachers and other students) or themselves.

Each type of independent student activity has its own positive results and consequences, by which one can determine the level of their responsible attitude to the activity. For example, in educational and cognitive activities such criteria are: the ability to learn, to be critical of the information consumed, a high level of discipline during lectures and practical classes, systematicity and a high level of preparation for practical classes, timely passing of tests and exams, etc., in research activities - independence, conscientious study of the literature necessary for the production of a scientific product, a creative attitude to solving a given problem, compliance with the norms of scientific ethics [4].

The formation of social responsibility in students is a determining condition for their entry into society and productive professional self-realization with the aim of creating benefits for others and themselves. Social responsibility also determines the conscious regulation of their activities by students. We proceed from the fact that professional and personal growth, self-development of students depend, first of all, on the growth of self-education in their activities as spiritual work. Social responsibility of students and their responsibility in general is an integrative result and an indicator of their upbringing and a criterion for the formation of their personal and professional subjectivity.

References

1. Artemeva, V. A., Veselova, E. K., Dvoreckaya, M. Ya., Korzhova, E. Yu. Social responsibility and innovativeness of the personality of students with work experience and without work experience in the specialty. [Bulletin of the Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University], vol. 8, no. 5, p. 73–90. 2018.
2. Baranovskaya, L. A. The formation of student social

- responsibility in the sociocultural educational space: PhD Thesis. Chita, 42 p. 2012.
3. Bichta, C. (2003) Corporate socially responsible industry (CSR) practices in the context of Greek. *Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, vol. 10, pp. 12–24. 2010. (In English)
 4. Blagov, Yu. E. *Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of the Concept*. SPb.: Graduate School of Management Publ., 272 p. 2008. (In Russian)
 5. Bratuhina, E. V. Student Responsibility, Social Responsibility and Social and Professional Responsibility: A Retrospective Analysis. [Problems of modern teacher education], p. 52–58. 2014.
 6. Garriga, E., Mele, D. Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping and territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 53, pp. 51–74. 2004.
 7. Leonyiev, D. A. *Psychology of personality in the works of domestic psychological*. Pb: Piter Publ., 200 p. 2000.
 8. Maimunah, I. Corporate social responsibility and its role in community development: an international perspective. *The Journal of International Social Research*, vol. 2 (9), pp. 199–209. 2009.
 9. Muzdibaev, K. *Psychology of Responsibility*. M.: Librokom, 248 p. 2010.
 10. Muzichkova, Yu. E. *Entrepreneurial personal social responsibility model*. 2010.
 11. Mokina L. V. Situational tasks as a means of forming representations of social responsibility in future lawyers: author's note. dis. ... cand. ped. science. Ekaterinburg, 2012.
 12. Feldshteyn D. P. Peculiarities of personal development of adolescence in the context of social and economic crisis // *World of psychology and psychology in the world*. 1994. № 3.
 13. Saenko, L. K. Student Social Responsibility: Survey Results. [Bulletin of the North Caucasus Federal University], no. 1 (46), p. 262–266. 2015
 14. Secchi, D. Utilitarian, managerial and relational theories of corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 9 (4), pp. 347–373. 2007. (In English)
 15. Krylov L. V. Theoretical aspects of the formation of social responsibility among university students // *Bulletin of KSU named after N. A. Nekrasov*. 2008, No. 4.
 16. Veselova, E. K. Moral aspects of the formation of professionalism among university students. 2012.
 17. Khill N. Dumay i bogatey. M. : Fair-PRESS. 1998. 272 s.
 18. Ergashev I. S. Mas'uliyat tushunchasining zamonaviy talqinlariga falsafiy yondashuv. Qo'qon DPI. Ilmiy xabarlar 2024. 4-son. 570-b.