

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 11 Volume: 79

Published: 30.11.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Mashraboy Vakhidovna Khalimova

Andizhan State University

PhD in Psychology, Assistant-Professor,
Head of the chair of “General Psychology”
Republic of Uzbekistan

THE PROBLEM OF RESPONSIBILITY IN FOREIGN PSYCHOLOGY AND ITS ROLE IN THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Abstract: This article addresses the problem of accountability in social psychology. Responsive psychology has been interpreted by foreign scholars and their impact on the moral development of the city.

Key words: Factors of moral responsibility, social behavior, autonomous subjective responsibility, association, personality management.

Language: English

Citation: Khalimova, M. V. (2019). The problem of responsibility in foreign psychology and its role in the moral development of the individual. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 11 (79), 520-522.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-79-106> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.11.79.106>

Scopus ASCC: 3200.

Introduction

Social psychology is achieved by analyzing different approaches and research in understanding the concept of responsibility. The views of foreign scientists are grounded in this regard. Piaje focuses on building an internal framework of responsibility through the development of external social norms, taking into account the stages of child's moral development. The author considers responsibility as part of the overall process of the child's moral development. In the theory of moral responsibility famous J.Piaje identified two main stages of responsibility formation: objective and subjective. The first occurs in the development of social behavior (through games), and the second reflects a high level of personality development [1, p.40].

This problem is highlighted in L. Kolberg's scientific research. The author emphasizes the importance of active creative engagement of the individual with the environment as a key factor in the development of moral consciousness.

Research methods.

The analysis of the hypothesis of the hypothetical moral dilemma by the reversal of two commonly accepted moral norms by the subjects

identified five stages of development of moral consciousness:

1. “Objective responsibility”.
2. “Subjective liability”.
3. “Exchange of devices”.
4. “Social system and ethics of conscience”.
5. Understanding societal responsibility.

In addition to understanding the formation of responsibility as a process of personal interaction with the environment in the Kolberg's concept, it also places emphasis on responsibility as a regulator of social behavior. It identifies a number of stages of responsibility development:

1. Autonomous subjective responsibility
2. Responsibility as a social event
3. Moral responsibility.

Researcher F.Hayder outlined the basic principles of the concept of the kalal attribute. This direction is more common in foreign psychology and reveals the subjective aspect of responsibility. The Caucasian attribute is the phenomenon that occurs when people try to explain the causes of certain events in their daily lives. Therefore, the concept is aimed at analyzing the behavior and characteristics of the manifestation of the responsibility of the “street man”.

Impact Factor:

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| ISRA (India) | = 4.971 | SIS (USA) | = 0.912 | ICV (Poland) | = 6.630 |
| ISI (Dubai, UAE) | = 0.829 | PIHHI (Russia) | = 0.126 | PIF (India) | = 1.940 |
| GIF (Australia) | = 0.564 | ESJI (KZ) | = 8.716 | IBI (India) | = 4.260 |
| JIF | = 1.500 | SJIF (Morocco) | = 5.667 | OAJI (USA) | = 0.350 |

The three basic assumptions underlying the concept are F.Hayder. It allowed Hayder to conclude that people tend to link the cause to an actor (“Actor”) or to the environment.

For instance, “The first is that the appropriate behavior of a person's social behavior depends in large part on how that person perceives and explains the world around him.

The second is that people want to predict and manage their environment, their environment. This desire can be realized if they are able to correctly identify the causes of other people’s behavior and to identify the root causes of social events. Third, there is some similarity between the perception of social and physical objects”[2. p.196].

The events, therefore, are the ratio of the external forces and resources of the individual. F. Hayder said that the responsibility for each of these two factors depends on the individual’s assessment. After all, a person can be held responsible only for the events and their consequences. F. Hayder sets out five levels of responsibility:

1. The association is responsible for any outcome related to or related to a person.
2. The reason - Responsibility for “cause” by a person. If a person is a prerequisite for an event, it will be recorded even if it is impossible to predict the outcome.
3. Prophecy - Responsibility applies to any event that may be anticipated, even if it is not related to the objectives.
4. Intent is the responsibility for what a person initiated and what he or she wanted to do.
5. Reasoning - The responsibility for what is happening is shared with the environment and partly explained [2, p.196].

The personal contribution to what is happening from the first to the fifth levels is more burdensome, but at the fifth level of coercion is taken into account, which reduces the level of responsibility. Numerous studies have focused on the factors that influence the occurrence of responsibility. This includes investigating situations in which you need to help, intercede, and help the stranger. Thus, the studies of Bibb Latane and John Darley [3, p.4] are dedicated to determining how much passengers meet their specific requirements (tell us what time it is, what is your name, show your route, and so on). Researchers found that the nature of the request, as well as the form and sequence of the response, influenced the response and the response rate. Additional passenger location in addition to a more flexible survey. One of the areas in this series of studies is the study of responsibility. Allen experimented on subway trains using the “missing passenger” model. With the help of both the experimenter and the assistant, the situation of misinformation has been created. “Passenger - Experimental” near the “real” passenger. The disinfectant of the passenger acted as a related

variable, as evidenced by the witness's testimony and his non-interference in the situation. Allen's second series of experiments was conducted with a series of disinfectant altered behaviors, particularly inaccurate behaviors, so it is inconceivable to assume that this person is the same. As the result of a series of experiments was the formation of two situational factors - the factors determining responsibility:

“In the first case - direct appeal, forming the relationship between the witness and the crazy passenger”

In the second case - the risk of the situation due to superficial actions or direct threats of disinfectants [5, pp.169-171].

According to Sh. Schwartz’s concept, positive behavior in aid situations is largely influenced by shared social norms and personal experience, as well as the “personal norms” that result from the interconnectedness of personal responsibility. Personal responsibility is defined here as “... a certain sense of ability to control the performance of an action and its outcome” [6, p.175]. A person’s willingness to act in accordance with norms is determined by his / her thoughts about what will happen to other people and how well these effects fit into his or her own standards, as well as his or her level of responsibility. Because personal norms are linked to my image, breaking norms leads to a loss of guilt and self-confidence, and compliance leads to increased pride and self-esteem [7].

Researcher J. Rotter summarized the idea of referring to external factors or internal bases in the concept of personality management. Two types of control: internal and external - are used to explain the behavior of an individual based on the person’s property [8] to link the causes of the event to external or internal sources. Internal control is an indication of responsibility for events, their explanation from the point of view of personal contributions, and their impact on development and outcomes [9]. Responsibility for what is happening outside environment, responsibility for the environment and other external factors is evidence of external management [10].

In conclusion, it is important to note that in social psychology, the question of accountability should be pursued in the early stages of human development, both objectively and subjectively by ethics. As we see, social psychology is achieved by analyzing different approaches and research in understanding the concept of responsibility in nowadays. Therefore, the views and ideas of foreign scientists are grounded in this regard. For example, Piaje focuses on building an internal framework of responsibility through the development of external social norms, taking into account the stages of child’s moral development. This author considers

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Impact Factor: | ISRA (India) = 4.971 | SIS (USA) = 0.912 | ICV (Poland) = 6.630 |
| | ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829 | PPIHII (Russia) = 0.126 | PIF (India) = 1.940 |
| | GIF (Australia) = 0.564 | ESJI (KZ) = 8.716 | IBI (India) = 4.260 |
| | JIF = 1.500 | SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667 | OAJI (USA) = 0.350 |

responsibility as part of the overall process of the child's ethic development.

References:

1. Piage, J. (2006). *Moral judgment in a child*. (p.480). Moscow: Academic project.
2. Latane, B., & Darley, Zh.M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Zhournal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, pp.215-221.
3. Latane, B., & Darley, Zh.M. (1970). The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help? (p.131). New York.
4. Muzdybaev, K. (1983). *Responsibility of the individual in the production team*. Socio-psychological problems of the production team. (pp.133-145). Moscow.
5. Muzdybaev, K. (2010). *Psychology of responsibility*. Ed. V.E. Semenova. Ed. 2nd, add. (p.248). Moscow: Book House "LIBROCOM".
6. Muzdybaev, K. (1992). The idea of justice Sociology. No. 11, pp. 94-101.
7. Mukonina, M.V. (2002). *Types of professionally responsible attitude of hazardous workers in different organizational - economic conditions*. Dis ... cand. psychol. sciences. (p.185). Moscow.
8. Andreeva, I.N. (2008). On the formation of the notion of "emotional intelligence". *Issues in Psychology*, no. 5, pp.83-95.
9. Valueva, E.A. (2009). *Diagnosis of emotional creativity: J. Customizing Everill questionnaire*. In the book: D.V. Lucin, D.V. Ushakov (Ed.), Social and emotional intelligence: From processes to dimensions. Moscow: RAS Institute of Psychology.
10. Vygotsky, L.S. (1999). *Reflection and speech*. Moscow: Labyrinth.