Research on Prosocial Behavior of Russian Youth

Statement of the problem in the context of security of the individual and society
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Abstract—The article actualizes the problem of the formation of prosocial behavior in the younger generation as an important factor of socialization. It is shown that in modern conditions there was a transformation of value orientations and self-concept with the establishment of individualism and egocentrism, once alien to Russian society. The article presents the results of a pilot study of indicators of youth socialization: prosociality (altruism) and self-centeredness, aggressiveness, suggestibility and conformism. The study involved university students. The study revealed a high level of egocentrism and a low level of altruism among most students, as well as a high level of conformism. In the student environment, there is a tendency to conventional identity — conventional norms (norm-agreements, norm-rules). These trends can lead to serious dysfunctional consequences for the individual and society as a whole.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In modern sociocultural practice, the process of socialization, the formation of social identity (national, civil, religious, political, etc.) of the young generation is complicated by the consumer attitude towards the lives of many young people; insufficient level of social protection of young people, expressed in the difficulties of material, domestic order; erosion of traditional moral values. Modern youth, focused on their "I", their needs and interest, personal comfort, often not interested in the problems of their homeland, their compatriots, their neighbors.

Present in Russian society, the western ideology of individualism contributed to the development of a young person's individual self-concept, aimed at self-development, self-actualization, self-realization, development of an independent understanding of view of the self, while collectivism characteristic of Russian culture and education developed an interdependent understanding of view of the self in the context of social relationships. As a result, in the last decade there has been a breakdown of public consciousness with the assertion of social individualism. The state began to show respect for the active life position of the modern young generation, its independence, the desire to stand out and advance in society [1]. Certainly, the affirmation of this value in the upbringing of young people became the foundation of sociopolitical and economic development, but in Russia individual self-realization began to acquire a destructive character, to disintegrate society. Modern youth, focused on their "I", their needs and interest, personal comfort, often not interested in the problems of their homeland, their compatriots, their neighbors. Academician D.I. Feldstein in a report at the general meeting of the Russian Academy of Education on December 18, 2012, describes the problems of psychological and pedagogical sciences in the space-time situation of the 21st century, cites the following example: “One high school student posted the following post tomorrow: “If a war begins tomorrow, I will immediately surrender to captivity,” which caused a lot of enthusiastic responses. What is in front of us - shocking? Maybe. However, according to various sociological polls, more than half of the high school students surveyed are ready to leave Russia at the first opportunity" [2]. And there are a lot of such examples. According to a sociological survey conducted by the Center for Social Forecasting in May 2009, only 7.7% are ready to sacrifice their personal interests, if it is necessary for the good of the country “unconditionally." Aggression is often a model for young people, with a feeling of permissiveness. Biblical commandments: "Love", "Help your neighbor" - are completely forgotten. They do not help the weak, but try to make the most of his helplessness in their own interests. Thus, the values of their own well-being, concentration on their own
needs became dominant. Individualism occupied a vacant niche of values and was the result of the collapse of unifying values in the context of new unifying values that were not formulated. The dominance of individualistic values limits the social prospects of the country, because in the egoistic space there is no place for spiritual wealth. As a result, the modern young generation of our society was divided into multiple social, political, national and religious groups, which significantly weakened the national security of the state as a whole [3].

In modern conditions, in the context of ensuring the national security of the country, an order has been formed to develop the psychological foundations of the problem of the formation and development of pro-social norms and attitudes among children, young people and the general population, including altruism, anti-extremist personal position, non-violence position, humanitarian position, tolerant consciousness, culture of volunteering and so forth.

At present, a complex transitive process is unfolding in Russia with the actualization of national interests, the development of a new national policy strategy focused on the formation of a safe society and state based on conservativism and traditionalism, which are in a careful and positive attitude to the values of their own people, its foundations and way of life.

The strategy of the state national policy of the Russian Federation until 2025 and a number of other doctrinal and regulatory acts of the second half of 2012-2018, actualize the following national interests, the subjects and objects of which should be citizens: demography (respect for the family and family traditions); patriotism and citizenship, national-state identity; social activity and self-government; volunteering and volunteering; implementation of a healthy and safe lifestyle.

The geopolitical, social, ideological, and cultural life of Russian society is changing, new social organizations are created and reanimated, which perform the functions of social institutions (All-Russian Popular Front, Union of Volunteers of Russia, Russian School Movement of Students, Aviation and the fleet , "Cossacks of Russia ", " All-Russian Voluntary Society "Sports Russia" , etc.), more and more the Russian Orthodox Church is involved in public life, broadcasting the traditions spiritual and moral values.

2018 in Russia has been declared the Year of the Volunteer (volunteer), within the framework of which the tasks of involving the population in helping people with disabilities, large families and orphans are actualized; in environmental and humanitarian actions; to participate in emergency response, etc.

Thus, the negative sociocultural transformations occurring in modern society, and, as a result, the psychological transformation of the individual and her lifestyle convincingly require searching for factors of successful socialization as a whole and the development of safe prosocial behavior.

Prosocial behavior is formed in preschool and primary school age and continues to develop in middle childhood, adolescence and adolescence. Therefore, various educational systems (school, boarding school, lyceum, college, university, etc.) are faced with the task of shaping the development of safe prosocial behavior, including preparing for a safe existence in modern society, shaping society-oriented behavior. building abilities to withstand social risk factors. Children and adolescents need to be taught to control their asocial inclinations.

II. THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

In modern literature there are certain prerequisites for the consideration of certain aspects of safe prosocial behavior in the system of psychological knowledge. The most well-known concepts of pro-social behavior of a personality should be attributed to the model of pro-social behavior proposed by Z. Lindenberg; decision-making model to assist in the event of a crisis / emergency situations Latane and Darley; the procedural model of Schwartz and Howard; the model of prosocial actions in relation to people in distress Hastings, Zahn-Waxier; motivation model of prosocial behavior in the context of personal security J. Wilson and R. Petruska.

In special psychological literature, pro-social behavior is defined as actions aimed at the welfare of society and taken by an organization, an individual person disinterestedly, without relying on reward. Understanding what is good for society depends on the cultural values of the person [4].

Prosocial behavior is considered to have social consequences; as actions intended to benefit the other person, society [5]. However, such behavior (actions) is impossible without the initiative impact of subjects on the environment, a special case of which is social activity. Social activity of an individual implies not only her participation in public life, but, above all, an initiative-creative attitude to the areas of her social activity [6]. Social activity is largely associated with the conditions that are set by society, therefore the possibility of the manifestation of an individual’s activity is reflected in the system of its attitudes, values, and, in general, ideas, the formation of which is determined by the entire system of socialization [7]. Social behavior is a projection of sociocultural matrices (i.e. norms and values of consciousness) and prescriptions dominating in a certain social and production environment [8, 9].

There are dynamic (situational) and substantial (personal) determinants of prosocial behavior. Dynamic determinants are determined mainly by the situation or the environment. Dynamic determinants include: help orientation, assessment of costs and benefits from assistance, mood, responsibility diffusion, social norms, environmental conditions, lack of time. The meaningful determinants are the structural units of the personality, its characteristic features. Among the substantive determinants, there are: features of the will, moral decision making, altruism, empathy [10].

Yu.O. Mazur (2008) developed a pro-social behavior model that includes:

- positive ideas about the individual about themselves associated with the ability to solidarity and sympathy, as well as determining attitudes towards others, which is reflected in the ability to empathize, in cooperation
and mutual assistance, in the ability to resolve conflict and difficult situations;
- the system of life values that determine the strategies of interaction with the world;
- the ability of an individual to realize himself in the path of altruistic, socially significant activities [11].

After analyzing the motivation of volunteers, in particular those who care for people with AIDS, D. Clary and M. Snyder identified six reasons for this:
- moral reasons: the desire to act in accordance with universal values and non-indifference to others;
- cognitive reasons: the desire to get to know people better or to acquire skills;
- social reasons: to become a member of the group and earn approval;
- career considerations: experience gained and contacts useful for further career advancement;
- protection of your own self: desire to get rid of guilt feelings or escape from personal problems;
- increase self-esteem: strengthening self-esteem and self-confidence [12].

III. METHOD

We conducted a study aimed at identifying the level of development of the following determinants of prosocial behavior among students' youth: altruism, egocentrism, aggressiveness, suggestibility and conformism. The study involved 108 students enrolled in the areas of undergraduate training in Pedagogy, Psychology, Psychological and Pedagogical Education. The average age of 20 years.

The study of the level of prosociality of students was carried out using the method of “Diagnosis of the personal installation altruism-egoism” and the method of “Diagnosis of personal egocentrism” (Fetiskin N. P., Kozlov V. V., Manuilov G. M.).

To determine the level of aggressiveness among students, the method “Determining the propensity for deviating behavior” was used (the Propensity Scale for Aggression and Violence) (Orel A. N.).

To assess suggestibility and conformism, we used the method “Assessment of suggestiveness (suggestibility)” (Eliseev O. P.) and the method “Determining the propensity for deviating behavior” (Propensity scale for overcoming norms and rules) (Orel A. N.).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The diagnostic results are presented in Table I.

The study revealed a high level of egocentrism and a low level of altruism for the majority of students (Figure 1, 2). That corresponds to the tendencies of growth of individualism indicated by us in Russian society.

| Indicators                  | Average value | Standard deviation | Minimum value | Maximum value |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Level of altruism           | 7.9           | 2.4                | 3             | 14            |
| Level of egocentrism        | 14.9          | 6.8                | 2             | 27            |
| Tendency to aggression      | 7.7           | 4.4                | 1             | 17            |
| Suggestibility level        | 30.6          | 9.2                | 15            | 63            |
| Level of conformism         | 6.6           | 3.5                | 1             | 15            |

Fig. 1. The level of altruism among students (method “Diagnosis of the personality installation altruism-egoism”)

Fig. 2. The level of egocentrism among students (method “Diagnosis of personal egocentrism”)

The study showed that only about half of the students have a low level of suggestibility.

Also suggestibility correlates with such a socio-psychological indicator of personal development as conformism. Conformity can manifest itself not only as following generally accepted social norms, but also introducing destructive ideologies under the influence of real or imagined (informational) pressure. The results of students' diagnostics of conformism using the method “Determining the propensity for deviating behavior” (A. N. Orel) (Propensity scale for overcoming norms and rules) showed that most
students can be attributed to the conformal personality type (Figure 3).

The study showed that every third student is prone to aggression (the method “Determining the propensity for deviating behavior” (A.N. Orel) Scale of tendency towards aggression and violence) (Figure 4).

The performed correlation analysis using the Pearson correlation showed the presence of a reliably strong direct correlation between conformism and egocentrism ($r = 0.73, p \leq 0.01$). This fact testifies to the fact that in the student environment one observes a conventional identity - conventional norms (norms-agreements, norms-rules). Students generally share national interests, ideas of civic patriotism and love for the motherland, familiarizing with the national culture, including religion. They are ready to take part in mass events (National Unity Day, Victory Day, Crimean Spring, etc.), movements (volunteering, Orthodox youth, Young Guard, etc.). However, as a rule, such group rules are used by students to achieve personal goals that are consistent with accepted and prestigious norms in the group (education, material assistance, career growth, etc.). This fact indicates that the social determinants of prosocial behavior (social approval, career considerations, etc.) dominate among students. Thus, altruism and the provision of assistance is due to external social pressure and is a product of the transformation of egoistic motives.

Our results are consistent with trends identified in studies conducted by European sociologists. As the monitoring shows, which has been conducted by an American sociologist for more than 25 years, Professor R. Inglehart, in democratic countries with a high level of economic development there is a steady increase in the importance of “post-materialist” values - the ability to freely choose a lifestyle and express oneself [13]. According to U. Beck, morality is well developed in new generations, and it is not limited to national borders. According to U. Beck, young people show selfish altruism [14]. Selfish altruists include, for example, those who build their careers and at the same time find time to help homeless or disabled people. And this is not a self-sacrifice, but partly a calculation, a combination of curiosity and a desire to help, as well as a desire to learn another world and something new about yourself [15].

V. CONCLUSION

What are the perspectives today of the rooting of the values of egocentrism and conformism in the public consciousness? From our point of view, these trends indicate the possibility of modern intrapersonal conflict between social norms and their own desires, needs, and motivations. Prolonged frustration of these drives can lead to serious dysfunctional consequences for the individual and society as a whole. The explosive power of “driven inside” unfulfilled needs, the motivations of a young person can be used by interested communities (nationalist, anti-social movements).

In this regard, today social institutions (family, education, public organizations, religion, science, art, etc.) face the task of creating secure prosocial behavior, positive civic, ethnocultural and universal identity through the development and implementation of appropriate programs. The formation of prosocial personal behavior is designed to ensure the integration of knowledge and skills, socially significant qualities (responsibility, social activity, tolerance, patriotism, empathy, altruism, cooperation, etc.) into a single system that determines the psychological readiness of the individual to implement actions that benefit another person and society as a whole.
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