

UDC: 159.923.2 : 316.6

**PSYCHOLOGICAL SUBSTANTIATION OF CIVIL RESPONSIBILITY OF
PERSONALITY**

Doctor of psychological sciences, senior researcher, docent,

O.Y. Furman

Ternopil National Economic University, Ukraine, Ternopil

The article analyzes the approaches to psychological understanding of concepts “responsibility” and “citizenship”, substantiates the content and structure of the civil responsibility in unity, determinism and complementarity of cognitive, emotional-motivational, behavioral-volitional, moral-spiritual components. The aforementioned structural components reflect the functional-dynamic expression of phenomenology of civil responsibility of personality. At the same time, cognitive, activates the flow of intellectual-search activity, the second describes the readiness to act in specific situations and promotes awareness of the actual public needs, the third ensures the functioning of specific practical activity, system of attitudes to perform the duties, the fourth produces self-awareness of oneself as a human who is guided, make decisions to realization and is ready to distribute public values against the background of own inner freedom not only as the subject of these values but also as a person and individuality of separate worldview models of behavior and activity. Also determined that the important features of expression of civil responsibility as an integral trait-property of personality are such as active life position, conscious attitude to perform somebody’s civil duty, independence and persistence, self-analysis, self-control, self-organization, honesty, readiness to be responsible for own acts etc. High civil responsibility appears as an active, full of meaning and sense of life which is subject directs to the constant improvement himself as a citizen of the country, reveals social self-

realization through erudition, social orientation and public position. Besides singled out preconditions that influence the formation of civil responsibility of personality(civil society, civil society consciousness and self-awareness). Overall proved that there is a direct dependence between the forms and organizations of civil society and the level of people's responsibility for what is happening in the country. The deeper expression of citizenship has the people, the more effective civil responsibility of each. Civil consciousness is formed in civil society, represents by itself inherent to human way of relating to objective reality and at the same time is a form of reflection of the reality with help of objectivated in the word socially produced knowledge, regulates the activity of the human and enables to predict the result of its action as a conscious goal. Civil self-consciousness of the personality is focused around the processes of awareness of itself as the carrier of civil values and attitudes to itself as to the subject of these values. The process of self-awareness mainly is carried out on a personal level of implementation civil tasks and social actions and also during interacting with others, as a result there is a conscious attitude of the person to own needs and abilities, appetences and motives of behavior, worrying and thoughts, actions and deeds. With what domestic, economic, social and political instruction mature generation appears in the eyes of young people, with the same descendants will come to their children.

Key words: responsibility, citizenship, personality, civic consciousness and self-consciousness, civic responsibility and its psychological structure, civil society.

Доктор психологічних наук, старший науковий співробітник, доцент, Фурман О.Є. Психологічне обґрунтування громадянської відповідальності особистості / Тернопільський національний економічний університет, Україна, Тернопіль

У статті проаналізовано підходи до психологічного розуміння понять “відповідальність” та “громадянськість”, обґрунтовуються зміст та структура громадянської відповідальності у єдності, взаємоспричиненні та взаємодоповненні когнітивного, емоційно-мотиваційного, поведінково-вольового, морально-духовного компонентів. Вищезазначені структурні компоненти відображають функціонально-динамічний вияв феноменології громадянської відповідальності особистості. Водночас перший – когнітивний – активізує перебіг інтелектуально-пошукової активності, другий характеризує готовність діяти у конкретній ситуації та сприяє усвідомленню актуальних громадянських потреб, третій забезпечує функціонування конкретної практичної активності, системи ставлень до виконання обов’язків, четвертий продукує самоусвідомлення себе як людини, котра керується, приймає до зrealізування та готова розповсюджувати громадянські цінності на фоні власної внутрішньої свободи не лише як суб’єкт цих вартостей, а й як особистість та індивідуальність окремих світоглядних моделей поведінки і діяльності. Також визначено, що важливими ознаками вияву громадянської відповідальності як інтегральної риси-властивості особистості є такі, як активна життєва позиція, усвідомлене ставлення до виконання свого громадянського обов’язку, самостійність й наполегливість, самоаналіз, самоконтроль, самоорганізація, чесність, готовність відповідати за власні вчинки тощо. Висока громадянська відповідальність постає у вигляді активного, наповненого смыслом і сенсом, життя, яке суб’єкт спрямовує на постійне вдосконалення себе як громадянина країни, виявляє соціальну самореалізацію через освіченість, суспільну спрямованість та громадянську позицію. Крім того, виокремлено передумови, що впливають на формування громадянської відповідальності

особистості (громадянське суспільство, громадянська свідомість і самосвідомість). Загалом доведено, що існує пряма залежність між формами та організованостями громадянського суспільства і ступенем відповідальності населення за те, що відбувається у державі. Чим глибший вияв громадянськості має народ, тим дієвіша громадянська відповідальність кожного. Громадянська свідомість формується у громадянському суспільстві, являє собою властивий людині спосіб ставлення до об'єктивної дійсності і водночас є формою відображення реальності за допомогою об'єктивованого у слові суспільно виробленого знання, регулює активність людини та дає змогу передбачити результат своєї дії як усвідомлену мету. Громадянська самосвідомість особистості фокусується навколо процесів усвідомлення себе як носія громадянських цінностей та ставлення до себе як до суб'єкта цих вартостей. Процес самоусвідомлення здійснюється переважно на особистісному рівні виконання громадянських завдань та соціальних дій, а також під час взаємодії з іншими, у результаті чого й виникає усвідомлене ставлення особи до власних потреб і здібностей, потягів і мотивів поведінки, переживань і думок, дій і вчинків. З якими побутовими, економічними, соціальними та політичними настановленнями зріле покоління постає в очах молоді, з такими самими нащадки прийдуть до своїх дітей.

Ключові слова: відповідальність, громадянськість, особистість, громадянська свідомість й самосвідомість, громадянська відповідальність та її психологічна структура, громадянське суспільство.

Introduction. The general formulation of the problem and its connection with practical tasks. Humane, democratic and socially

oriented society is formed and approved only by responsible citizens when everyone reports to others about their everyday activity. Of course, it concerns both the authorities, including its state structures and private corporations, and obviously – separate human, in particular. It is clear: the more responsible will be leaders of the country, the more effective will we have the development of Ukraine to exit from the social-economic crisis today.

Hence, for now becomes important civic responsibility of mankind for their present and temporarily distant future. What it will be – harmonious, stable, with high security level or conversely, aggressive-emotional – primarily depends on the life position of every citizen and those socio-political processes which are allowed to happen in the country by people.

Analysis of recent researches and publications in which a solution of the problem is started. Special attention to the phenomenon of responsibility was paid by many scientists. In particular, S.L. Rubinstein [1] had demarcated it on retrospective aspect (responsibility for fulfilled action) and perspective (for what should be done); K.O. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya [2] had developed a theory of responsibility in which she considers the relationship of initiative and responsibility as certain forms of subject activity, substantiates the idea of a voluntary, self-discipline, self-reliance, independence of the last one. At the same time K. Muzdybayev [3] had analyzed the evolution of responsibility and concludes about its sociality and highlighted the essential features of this phenomenon (justice, punctuality, sensitiveness, persistence, courage, etc.); J. Piaget focused emphasis on the studying of internal responsibility as on important basis of moral development of the human; L. Kohlberg by singling out stages of deployment moral consciousness, directed attention to the analysis of objective and subjective aspects of responsibility; J. Rotter by differentiating internal and external locus of control, was convinced that the first is inherent

to the person who takes responsibility for any event, and the second characterizes a person who has a tendency to ascribe own achievement or troubles to external circumstances that is luck (bad luck) or to other people. In this context, T.M. Sydorova [4] and other, defending the concept of J. Piaget, considers this problem in terms of the interdependence of internal and external factors in the context of age becoming of personality; M.V. Savchyn [5] with the theoretical-methodological positions substantiates the structure of responsibility and also considers this problem in the teaching-upbringing, social-psychological and political aspects; S. V. Baranova carries out analyzes of professional responsibility under conditions of the joint management activity [6]; T.H. Gayeva [7] characterizes moral responsibility as the quality of the subject activity and so on. At the same time the problem of citizenship was highlighted in the works of M.Y. Boryshevskiy [8], L.A. Snihur [9], T. Pantiyk [10], V. Komissarov [11] and other prominent scientists.

Difficulty of the implemented by us research is that both civic responsibility and methodological thinking (see. [12]) can't be transmitted as a knowledge or be broadcast as norms of culture. It can be cherished at least on two conditions: by prolonged existence near a young personality living carrier of such responsibility and by the real implementation by her significant responsible doings.

Singling out unsolved before parts of general problem to which the article is devoted. According to a well-known in psychology quaternary principle, are substantiated the structural components of civic responsibility of personality in unity: cognitive, emotional-motivational, behavioral-volitional and proposed by author the fourth component – moral-spiritual and also are analyzed preconditions of becoming of civic responsibility by a similar principle: civil society, civil consciousness and self-consciousness

and already formed civic responsibility which actually integral personality trait.

Formulation of the purpose and tasks of the article. The purpose is in the essential characteristic of civic responsibility as a socio-psychological phenomenon of modern reality. Research tasks: a) is being proposed content characteristics of the concepts of "responsibility" and "citizenship", b) is being substantiated preconditions of becoming of civic responsibility of the personality, c) are being singled out its structural components (cognitive, emotional-motivational, behavioral-volitional, moral-spiritual) and also d) is being analyzed indicated responsibility as an important social-psychological phenomenon of modern society.

Presentation of the main material research. Let's note that responsibility and citizenship, as we know, are certain personality traits that are formed in the process of its socialization. At the same time, actually, the category of "responsibility" in socio-humanitarian science is substantiated both in a relationship with the content of concept "personality", and in interdependence and with cognitive conditions of the human, its behaviour, duty to others etc. "In different scientific fields thinkers understood responsibility as freedom of choice, liberty and means of existence as a way to implement vital position or self-realization his own essence by personality" [6, p. 49, 50]. That's why it is considered as a form of human activity or a group of people in the process of social interaction.

Citizenship – a complex personal characteristics (quality) which integrates in itself an interrelated formation in consciousness and self-consciousness which are arisen on the basis of mastering by the human a system of civic values [8]. Citizenship – is "an integral part of the cultural identity of individuals, and the factor that causes the formation of individual/collective orientation systems" [13, p. 44], or the moral quality of a person, in which were integrated its spiritual, mental and psycho-physiological

functions. A person who has this quality, links his behavior, all his life with interests, with the fate of the country, is aware of its responsibility to the nation and people, keeping, however, his freedom and sovereignty. "High civic consciousness is derived from the need to establish harmonious relations between the interests of the personality and the country. A mature citizen is aware of his personal interest in the progress of the country, seeing in it also an improvement of personal life "[10, p. 67].

The development of this phenomenon depends on the socio-psychological expectations, self-image, self-esteem, positions of educators, mental experience of the people (M.Y. Boryshevskiy, L.A. Snihur). Formation of citizenship, including responsibility, happens in the school and adolescence as a result of cognitive-practical work of person in a certain environment. In general, civic responsibility manifested through the system of formed relations of the citizen to the society and the country, civic norms and values. It appears in life in the form of civil position of the human which, according to O.V. Kyrychuk, implements into varieties of social-communicative, public-useful, social-political activity. Among the important features of civic responsibility of personality, let's single out these: active life position, conscious attitude to the fulfillment of his civic duty, independence and persistence, self-analysis, self-control, self-organization, honesty, readiness to answer for his own acts etc.

According to the concepts of M.V. Savchyn [5], K. Muzdybayev [3], V.V. Tretyachenko [6], L.A. Snihur [9], M.Y. Boryshevskiy [8], V.V. Baranova [6] and other scientists in the structure of responsibility and citizenship are singling out such components: cognitive, emotional-motivational and conative. To the indicated structure of analyzed phenomenon adding a fourth component – the moral-spiritual component. This is no accident. As we know, on the ground of substantiated levels of development of moral judgments of L. Kohlberg, K. Helkan has singled out

and described the stages of responsibility development. In his opinion, the criterion of the highest responsibility here is an aggregate of appropriated norms and principles of public morality. Such perfection of the personality inseparably associated with appropriate its spiritual neoplasms.

So the first cognitive component in phenomenology of expression of civic responsibility, activates the flow of intellectual-search activity of the personality, the second – the emotional-motivational – describes the readiness to act in a specific situation and promotes awareness of current civil requirements, the third – conative – ensure the functioning of specific practical activity, system of attitudes to the duty fulfillment and the fourth – the moral-spiritual – produces self-consciousness of himself as a man who is guided, takes to realization and ready to distribute civic values against the background of his own internal freedom not only as the subject of these values, but as personality and individuality of certain worldview models of behavior and activity. So, civic responsibility as an integral personality trait contains complex structural components which mutually intersect between each other and provide stability to its behavior.

At the same time today, the problem of formation civic responsibility of personality, got complicated by contradictory processes of formation of the Ukrainian state creation, is actual since it related to the processes of democratization and humanization of all spheres of public life of the country. It is well illuminated as in the "Concept of civic upbringing of the personality in the conditions of development of Ukrainian statehood" (M.Y. Boryshevskiy, O.V. Sukhomlynska and other) and in the "Concept of civic education in Ukraine" (I. Zhadan, L. Mysyk and other).

It is known that an important favorable condition of formation civic responsibility of the personality is the availability of civil society and democratic state. In the first case, voluntary organizations, unions etc. are created on the ground of "independent, free from state intervention, citizen

development, expressing their own activity, initiatives and needs" [13, p. 46]. In addition, civil society unites people and the state, creates preconditions for the satisfaction of his material and spiritual needs, personal and public interests. At the same time it "is able to be a partner and opponent of the state, create the space for civic initiative and act as an important sphere of individuals socialization" [13, p. 46]. "Civil society, in contrast to the political structures, is guided in its behavior and activity oppositely to other motives than representatives of the state. Among these motives, very first, differs moral, scientific and even religious" [11, p. 82]. In their aggregate production-legal activity is being functioning that semantically enrich the various forms of human activity, determines the main directions of making by citizens physical, mental and moral efforts.

Civil society – all those citizens who live on the territory of this country and oppose the legitimately elected government. Depending on how this government works in the public interest, representatives of civil masses either counteract it until insubordination (e.g. the square of Dignity, February 2014), or cooperate with the government (if it dedicated and serves national interests).

In any case, civil society isn't likened to the state and at the same time does not exist without the last one as its peculiar opposition. It is "society of citizens who have rights and freedoms, covers aggregate of institutions and relations as a result of human activity, aimed at meet their interests and needs; it's a political community of people who are involved in the formation of the government, affecting the determination of state policy and carry out control over it" [13, p. 47]. Instead, the state – is "a type of political organization" [13, p. 54], which holds a system of political norms and rallies the population that lives in a certain territory and submits to political power. Ownership will to the country appears in human because of the acquisition of citizenship status. In a broad sense of the word democratic state – it is

such a form of public management in which the power really belongs to the people or rather its best representatives; then the subject of delegated power is the people that in the case of Ukraine, still remains the strategic intent.

In general, the word "citizen" is derived from the Russian and Ukrainian "thunder" and denotes social individual who awakens to a joint, general affairs. In this sense, when a person becomes a citizen who is responsible for everything that happens around, then in his identity, through carried out behaviour, activity, communication and deeds, wakes up "a cell" of civil society. That's how citizenship is confirmed, which foresees a responsibility as a subject tangent of each to multi-aspect daily life of the country.

One of the most important worries of modern Ukrainian – "transitional" and unstable – society – the problem of its self-awareness, self-identity and self-organization in a qualitatively new geopolitical and socio-cultural contexts. Definition of strategic and tactical guideline of social development, development of a model of "desired state" of social structures and institutions, finding out effective conditions, factors and means of its achievement – the main task as of Ukrainian social scientists, politicians, statesmen so as the youth and people in general.

The problem for Ukraine is not in searching a political ideal but in a need of help of modern youth to form a democratic culture of the nation. The value of democracy is not that it is the power of all but that it grants the freedom to the citizens of all age groups. In this analytical context, samples of political experience are a public self-government, Magdeburg Law, the Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk. At the same time to prevent threats of bureaucratic arbitrariness are called the system of public control, liberty, press freedom, unbiased journalists.

Socio-psychological analysis of the state of Ukrainian society makes it possible to claim that in Ukraine after the Orange Revolution or events on

the Square (2014), civil society doesn't reveal itself fully because it is controlled by government. According to this, there is a place of limitations the space of active joining of population to civil society life that naturally doesn't stimulate the deployment of the process of their personal responsibility at all levels of social interaction – from family to organizations, communities, unions, parties etc. Overall, there is a direct dependency between the forms and organization of civil society and the degree of responsibility of the population for what is happening in the country. The deeper expression of citizenship has the people, the more effective is a civic responsibility of each.

Under conditions of existence of complete civil society and a democratic state, new generation of personalities would be able to form and reveal a high level of civic consciousness and self-consciousness and thus, could increase their responsibility. This assumption enabled to determine the basic prerequisites of formation civil responsibility of the personality. The first – is the presence of civil society, which, as we know, integrates the individual and the state and, at the same time, isn't equated and isn't separated from it. It covers that "mass of the population, which is guided on the one hand, by ideological motives, and on the other – what is the main – everyday, scilicet legal, aesthetic, scientific, moral, and is the basis of real social life" [11, p. 84, 85]. In other words, civil society enables such life activity of each citizen which with its aims, content and forms organizes the flow of both public, including political, everyday life and any other intersubject or intergroup interaction.

The second – is a civil consciousness, which is formed in civil society and represents by itself inherent human way of relating to objective reality and at the same time a form of reflection of reality by means of objectivated in the word socially produced knowledge, regulates its forms of activity and enables to predict the result of its actions as a conscious goal. As a basic

precondition this consciousness relates to the facts, phenomena and processes of social life and helps specific individuals "to orient in the political reality (cognitive function) and regulate their relations with the surroundings (practical function)" [13, p. 165].

At the same time the specific basis of formation of civil consciousness of the personality in present stressful (international, political, economic etc.) situation in Ukraine may be: a) forms of joint and individual political activity that allows to realize the desires, interests, needs, motives of every citizen; b) the socio-political practice, such as participation in elections (agitators, observers, members of precinct commissions) and others. As a result, is formed experience, which appears as a personal position or intellectual self-determination that aimed at mastering and defending canons and rules of social-political life.

It is noteworthy that the civic consciousness as the third prerequisite of formation of civil responsibility of the personality is focused around processes of understanding "himself as a carrier of civic values and attitudes to himself as the subject of these values" [9, p. 10]. The process of self-awareness is carried out mainly on a personal level of implementation civil tasks and social actions, and also during interacting with others, as a result of what appears a conscious man's attitude to his own needs and abilities, instincts and motives of behavior, feelings and thoughts, actions and deeds. In addition, "the development of consciousness and self-consciousness, – wrote H.S. Kostiyk, – is an intransitive condition of formation of human as a social creature ..." [14, p. 142]. In this regard, S.L. Rubinstein claims that an important moment which is centered in the context of the psychological study of personality, there is a problem of self-consciousness, because of the level of its formation depends how it will be responsible for its actions [1].

Finally, let's note that developed civil responsibility which appears in complete civil society through the establishment of civic consciousness and self-consciousness enables internal growing for everyone, create their own destiny and future of the country, appears as the most general property-personality trait in which integrated and complement components such as cognitive, emotional-motivational, behavioral-volitional, moral-spiritual. Legitimateness of functioning of four-component structure of civil responsibility of the personality and argumentativeness of its basic preconditions are in unison with the principle of quaternary and reflect functional-dynamic expression of responsibility of the personality in society.

Conclusions and prospects for further researches in this area.

1. Civil responsibility is a significant indicator of the personal maturity of the human. At the time of the youth for the first time is revealed the ability of a person actively and consciously participate in society life, defend the principles of civic interaction, be aware of his role in society. Clearly, that an important meaning here have as a family and processes of state, patriotically oriented education and upbringing, which are carrying out an influence on the formation of complex forms of self-improvement of the future generation (development of self-activity, civic consciousness and self-consciousness: its national, legal, ecological, valeological aspects (M.Y. Boryshevskiy), the formation of the duty, initiative, inner freedom, etc.).

2. Civil responsibility of each of us is a cornerstone of today and tomorrow as well. That's why there is the problem of searching the content and functions of "far-reaching civil responsibility" (by H. Jonas) which would give an idea of its unpredictable consequences not only under condition of "here-being, but also of yes-being". This moral quality as a high form of activity of personality appears in a result of integrating many other features (belonging to freedom, empathy, self-discipline and other). Namely it

supports the readiness of the personality to improve and develop spiritually. Thus in this case an important place takes far-reaching form of civil responsibility which covers the present, the future and appears as an actual problem of nowadays.

Література:

1. Рубинштейн С. Л. *Бытие и сознание. Человек и мир: кн. для психологов, философов* / С.Л. Рубинштейн. – СПб.: Питер, 2003. – 512 с. – (Серия «Мастера психологии»).
2. Абульханова-Славская К.А. *Стратегия жизни: монография* / К.А. Абульханова-Славская. – М.: Мысль, 1991. – 196 с.
3. Муздыбаев К. *Психология ответственности* / К. Муздыбаев. – Л.: Наука, 1983. – 240 с.
4. Сидорова Т.Н. *Особенности социальной ответственности у старшеклассников* / Т.Н. Сидорова // *Вопросы психологии*. – 1987. – № 5. – С. 56-62.
5. Савчин М.В. *Психологія відповідальної поведінки* / М.В. Савчин. – К: Україна-Віта, 1996. – 130 с.
6. Баранова С.В. *Соціально-психологічна характеристика відповідальності особистості* / С.В. Баранова // *Психологічна культура особистості в умовах глобалізації світу: монографія* / В.В. Третьяченко, С.В. Баранова, Ю.О. Бохонкова, Л.В. Вереїна та ін. – Луганськ: Світлиця, 2006. – С. 49-96.
7. Гаевая Т.Г. *Моральная ответственность как качество личности: автореф. дисс. на соискание учен. степени. канд. психол. наук: спец. 19.00.05 «Социальная психология»* / Т.Г. Гаевая. – М., 1984. – 18 с.
8. Борышевский М.И. *Теоретические основы самосознания* / М.И. Борышевский // *Психологические особенности самосознания подростка*. – К.: НИИ психологии УССР, 1980. – С. 5-34.

9. Снігур Л.А. Психологія становлення громадянськості особистості: автореф. дис. на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора психол. наук: спец. 19.00.07 «Педагогічна та вікова психологія» / Л.А. Снігур. – Київ, 2005. – 32 с.
10. Пантук Т. Громадянська освіта та виховання як необхідні складові загальної культури особистості / Т. Пантук // Молодь і ринок. – 2007. – № 8. – С. 65-68.
11. Комісаров В. Громадянське суспільство: виднокола істини чи форма політичної маніпуляції / В. Комісаров // Психологія і суспільство. – 2007. – №1. – С. 81-85.
12. Фурман А.В. Методолог – професія майбутнього / А.В. Фурман // Психологія і суспільство. – 2016. – №1. – С. 16-42.
13. Рагозін М.П. Демократія від А до Я: словник-довідник / М.П. Рагозін. – Донецьк: Донбас, 2002. – 203 с.
14. Костюк Г.С. Навчально-виховний процес і психічний розвиток особистості / Г.С. Костюк / Під ред. Л.М. Проколієнко. – К.: Радянська школа, 1989. – 608 с.

Reference:

1. Rubinshteyn S.L. (2003). *Bytie i soznanie. Chelovek i mir [Being and consciousness. Man and the world]* / S. L. Rubinshteyn. St. Petersburg: Piter [in Russian].
2. Abulhanova-Slavskaia K.A. (1991). *Strategiya zhizni: monografiya* / K.A. Abulhanova-Slavskaia [Life strategy]. – Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].
3. Muzdybaev K. (1983). *Psihologija otvetstvennosti [Psychology liability]* / K. Muzdybaev. Leningrad: Nauka [in Russian].
4. Sidorova T.N. (1987). *Osobennosti socialnoy otvetstvennosti u starsheklassnikov [Features of social responsibility at senior pupils]* / T. N. Sidorova. *Voprosy psihologii – Questions of psychology*, 5, 56-62 [in Russian].

5. Savchyn M.V. (1996). *Psihologija vidpovidalnoyi povedinky [Psychology of responsible behavior]* / M.V. Savchyn. Kyiv: Ukrayina-Vita [in Ukrainian].
6. Baranova S.V. (2006). *Socialno-psihologichna charakteristika vidpovidalnosti osobystosti / S.V. Baranova // Psykholohichna kultura osobystosti v umovakh hlobalizatsii svitu: monohrafiia / V.V. Tretiachenko, S.V. Baranova, Yu.O. Bokhonkova, L.V. Vereina ta in. [Socio-psychological characteristics of the individual responsibility]. Psihologichna kultura osobystosti v umovah globalizaciyi svitu – Psychological personality culture in a globalizing world (pp. 49-96). Lugansk: Svitlycia [in Ukrainian].*
7. Gaevaya T.G. (1984). *Moralnaya otvetstvennost kak kachestvo lichnosti [Moral responsibility as the quality of the individual]* / T.G. Gaevaya. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis. Moscow [in Russian].*
8. Boryshevskiy M.Y. (1980). *Teoreticheskie osnovy samosoznaniya [Theoretical fundamentals of self-consciousness]* / M.Y. Boryshevskiy. *Psihologicheskie osobennosti samosoznaniya podrostka – Psychological features of self-consciousness of a teenager (pp. 5–34). Kyiv: NII Psychology USSR [in Russian].*
9. Snigur L.A. (2005). *Psihologiya stanovlennia gromadianskosti osobystosti [Psychology of personality formation citizenship]* / L. A. Snigur. *Extended abstract of doctor's thesis. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].*
10. Pantiuk T. (2007). *Gromadianska osvita ta vyhovannia yak neobhidni skladovi zagalnoyi kultury osobystosti [Civic education and training as essential components of the overall cultural identity]* / T. Pantiuk. *Molod i rynok. – Youth and market, 8, 65-68 [in Ukrainian].*
11. Komissarov V. (2007). *Gromadianske suspilstvo: vidnokola istyny chy forma politychnoyi manipuliaciyi [Civil society: horizon truths or form of political manipulation]* / V.O. Komissarov. *Psykholojiya i suspilstvo – Psychology and society, 1, 81-85 [in Ukrainian].*

12. *Furman A.V. (2016). Metodoloh – profesiya maybutnioho [Methodologist – profession of the future] / A.V. Furman. Psykholohiya i suspilstvo – Psychology and society, 1, 16-42 [in Ukrainian].*
13. *Ragozin M.P. (2002). Demokratiya vid A do Ya: slovnyk-dovidnyk [Democracy A to Z: Dictionary Directory] / M.P. Ragozin. Doneck: Donbas [in Ukrainian].*
14. *Kostiuk G.S. (1989). Navchalno-vyhovnyi proces i psykichnyi rozvytok osobystosti [The educational process of mental and personality development] / G. S. Kostiuk. (L. M. Prokollenko Ed.). Kyiv: Radianska shkola [in Ukrainian].*