

Criteria For Evaluating The Socio-Economic And Moral-Ethical Consequences Of Socially Hazardous Behavior

Mamatnazarov Lazizbek Turakuliyevich

Independent Researcher at the Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract. This study provides a comprehensive methodological analysis of evaluating the socio-economic and moral-ethical consequences of socially hazardous (risk-taking and deviant) behavior at the intersection of deviancology, sociology, economics, and jurisprudence. The research elucidates the multi-tiered impact of risk behavior on macro- and micro-economic metrics, including direct fiscal burdens, indirect human capital degradation, labor market segmentation, and the blocking of social mobility through the "poverty and deviance trap." Furthermore, the article explores the qualitative parameters of moral-ethical decay, such as axiological anomie, institutional mistrust, intergenerational transmission of destructive behavior, and the erosion of collective responsibility. Integrating foundational theories from Durkheim, Merton, Becker, Putnam, Weber, and Frankl, the paper proposes a holistic Risk Behavior Impact Index (RBII) across four structural blocks: economic-fiscal, demographic-public health, socio-institutional, and moral-axiological. The findings emphasize transitioning from punitive-repressive measures toward human-centric, institutional, and preventive policy frameworks.

Keywords: socially hazardous behavior, risk behavior, socio-economic impact, moral-ethical evaluation, human capital erosion, labor market segmentation, social capital, axiological anomie, Risk Behavior Impact Index (RBII), preventive mechanisms.

Introduction. At the intersection of modern deviancology, sociology, economics, and jurisprudence, the problem of scientifically and methodologically evaluating hazardous (risk-taking) behavior and its multifaceted consequences has acquired paramount relevance. Excessively hazardous, destructive, addictive, and antisocial actions formed within society cause not only the individual-psychological deformation of the personality, but also the functional crisis of social and economic systems, as well as the erosion of society's moral and spiritual foundations. To deeply understand the phenomenon of hazardous behavior and to provide an objective assessment, it is necessary, above all, to comprehensively analyze the sociodynamics of this phenomenon, the methodological criteria for measuring its consequences, and their real integration across institutional, economic, and moral-spiritual domains.

From a socio-economic perspective, labor market segmentation and the reinforcement of social inequality serve as critical criteria for evaluating the consequences of hazardous behavior. The population group (particularly youth) inclined toward or

drawn into hazardous and deviant behavior is pushed into the lower and informal segments of the labor market. This situation leads to an irrational allocation of labor resources in the economy and the expansion of the informal (shadow) sector. The growth of the shadow economy, in turn, weakens the state's tax base and restricts the capacity to finance social infrastructure.

At the same time, the indicator of blocked social mobility stands out as one of the primary evaluation criteria. Hazardous behavior restricts the opportunities for legitimate vertical mobility (career, education, social status) not only for the individual, but also for their family members. This creates a self-perpetuating "poverty and deviance trap" in society, through which destructive and hazardous lifestyles are transmitted across generations.

In the moral-ethical domain, a vital previously unemphasized factor is the weakening of the sense of collective responsibility and the escalation of hyper-individualism. The mass dissemination of hazardous behavior minimizes society members' moral responsibility toward public order, the environment, and future generations. Prioritizing personal interests and transient incentives over general societal welfare leads to a total collapse of moral regulation.

Furthermore, the formation of moral apathy and cynicism in society serves as a distinct evaluation criterion. The systematic repetition of hazardous, destructive, and illegal actions, combined with the inefficiency of institutional or public interventions, induces "learned helplessness" and moral indifference among the population. When individuals encounter immoral or hazardous situations, they tend not to correct them, but rather display indifference or adapt, which ultimately weakens society's social immunity.

Evaluating the consequences of socially hazardous behavior must encompass not only direct financial and demographic indicators, but also deep-seated phenomena such as labor market deformation, restricted social mobility, and the moral health of society.

Research Methodology and Approaches (Methods). An analysis of scientific sources and theoretical concepts demonstrates that formulating criteria for evaluating the consequences of hazardous behavior requires relying on classical and contemporary sociological, economic, and criminological paradigms. Émile Durkheim and Robert Merton's theories of anomie demonstrate that the imbalance between institutionalized goals and the legitimate means to achieve them in society serves as a primary source for forms of hazardous behavior [1, pp. 112–118]. In a state of anomie, hazardous behavior transcends the individual level and escalates into a systemic crisis causing widespread social and economic damage. The typology of deviance proposed by R. Merton—specifically the models of innovation, retreatism, and rebellion—allows for the quantitative and qualitative differentiation of the socio-economic damage caused by hazardous actions [2, pp. 210–215].

Results and Analysis (Results). The criteria for evaluating the socio-economic consequences of hazardous behavior primarily rest upon identifying direct and indirect economic losses. The criteria for evaluating direct economic damage include

healthcare system expenses, state budget allocations for maintaining law enforcement and judicial systems, and expenditure required to cover material property damage resulting from poisonings, traffic accidents, vandalism, and crime. Gary Becker, in his fundamental research *Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach*, applied microeconomic modeling to analyze hazardous and illegal behavior, developing a formula for the "optimal quantity" of resources and "social losses" spent by society to prevent and combat infractions [3, pp. 169–175]. According to Becker's concept, every unit of hazardous behavior incurs specific real and opportunity costs for society.

The criteria for evaluating indirect economic consequences are significantly more complex and multi-factorial in nature. Here, the erosion of human capital and demographic losses emerge as central criteria. Hazardous behavior—including suicidal acts, alcoholism, substance abuse, and systematic violations of occupational safety and traffic rules—leads to disability and premature mortality, directly reducing a nation's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) generation capacity. According to the methodology of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), lost economic productivity due to individuals prematurely exiting the labor market owing to hazardous behavior is calculated based on the discounted value of human capital [4, pp. 85–92]. In this framework, an individual's expected work life expectancy, average wage, and level of economic activity serve as integral indices.

One of the most important indicators for evaluating social consequences is the weakening of social capital and the decline of institutional trust. According to Robert Putnam's social capital theory, mutual trust, social networks, and civic norms in society constitute the foundational pillar of economic and social stability [5, pp. 67–74]. The proliferation of hazardous, asocial, and destructive behavior intensifies social disorganization and alienation. Citizens lose their sense of safety in public spaces, while levels of institutional and interpersonal trust decrease. This, in turn, leads to a sharp increase in economic transaction costs (security guards, surveillance systems, legal guarantees, insurance premiums).

The criteria for evaluating moral-ethical consequences rely on qualitative analysis and axiological (value-based) approaches. The first criterion for evaluating consequences in the moral-ethical sphere is an axiological crisis and the anomie of the value system. According to Max Weber's theory of "social action" and "value-rationality," a society can develop sustainably only when it is organized around moral order and specific ethical norms [6, pp. 145–152]. The widespread spread of hazardous behavior leads to the disruption of traditional and modern humanistic values, as well as moral taboos. When destructive behavioral forms are normalized, particularly through mass media and digital networks, moral relativism and nihilism take root in society. In this process, the boundaries between "good and evil," "lawful and unlawful," and "responsibility and indifference" become blurred.

The second crucial criterion for evaluating moral-ethical consequences is the destruction of the family institution and intergenerational deformation. The family is the primary normative institution and anti-deviance filter that transmits moral values

and social norms from generation to generation. Hazardous behavior displayed by parents or other family members (violence, addiction, irresponsibility) causes moral and cognitive deformation in children and youth. As demonstrated in Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory, hazardous and aggressive behavioral patterns are acquired by subsequent generations through cognitive imprinting [7, pp. 180–186]. This leads to the transgenerational repetition of destructive moral models and spiritual decay.

In the comprehensive evaluation of hazardous behavior, the criterion of psychological and spiritual deprivation also occupies a distinct place. At the individual level, chronic risk-taking actions lead the personality into an existential void, resulting in the loss of moral purpose and the meaning of life. As Viktor Frankl demonstrated in his logotherapy and existential analysis framework, the loss of life's meaning ("noögenic anomie") drags the individual into chronic addictions, auto-aggression, and moral degradation [8, pp. 95–102]. According to Frankl, in societies that have lost their moral and spiritual anchors, hazardous and addictive behavior acquires an endemic character.

Discussion. Under the conditions of contemporary digital society, the socio-economic and moral consequences of hazardous behavior have entered a new stage of transformation. In the information space, the "virtualization" and "viral dissemination" of hazardous actions are observed. According to Manuel Castells' network society theory, digital infrastructure rapidly popularizes hazardous and destructive behavior models (cyberbullying, online gambling, destructive subcultures) [9, pp. 210–218]. Its economic consequence manifests in increased expenditures for digital security and reduced digital labor productivity, while its moral consequence manifests as the loss of anonymity and ethical responsibility ("deindividuation").

Developing a methodological matrix for evaluating the consequences of hazardous behavior requires integrating quantitative and qualitative indicators. In this regard, it is expedient to structure the Risk Behavior Impact Index (RBII) across four primary blocks:

1. **Economic-Fiscal Block:** The share of direct and indirect financial losses in GDP, alongside the dynamics of healthcare and law enforcement expenditures.
2. **Demographic and Public Health Block:** Premature mortality rates, DALY (Disability-Adjusted Life Years), and QALY (Quality-Adjusted Life Years) indices [10, pp. 312–320].
3. **Socio-Institutional Block:** Crime and deviance rates, levels of social capital and institutional trust, alongside divorce and orphanhood metrics.
4. **Moral-Axiological Block:** The level of adherence to ethical norms in society, the popularity of moral-destructive content, and the state of existential and value orientations among youth.

Implementing these evaluation criteria into practice serves as a fundamental methodological foundation not only for quantifying the real damage inflicted by hazardous behavior, but also for formulating preventive state policy. Relying solely on administrative and repressive methods to combat hazardous behavior is insufficient.

To mitigate economic and moral consequences, it is imperative to activate complex institutional mechanisms aimed at social subsidiarity, systemic psychological rehabilitation, strengthening the family institution, and cultivating a healthy moral-ethical atmosphere in society.

Conclusion. Evaluating the socio-economic and moral-ethical consequences of hazardous behavior consists of a unified, multi-tiered, and dynamic system. Systematic theoretical and practical monitoring of these consequences is a vital prerequisite for ensuring the sustainable development and ontological security of society.

References:

1. Дюркгейм Э. Социология. Ее предмет, метод, предназначение. – Москва: Канон, 1995. – С. 112–118.
2. Мертон Р. К. Социальная теория и социальная структура. – Москва: АСТ, 2006. – С. 210–215.
3. Becker G. S. Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach // Journal of Political Economy. – 1968. – Vol. 76. – No. 2. – P. 169–175.
4. OECD. Addressing Harmful Alcohol Use: Economics and Public Health Policies. – Paris: OECD Publishing, 2015. – P. 85–92.
5. Putnam R. D. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. – New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000. – P. 67–74.
6. Вебер М. Избранные произведения. – Москва: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 145–152.
7. Бандура А. Теория социального научения. – Санкт-Петербург: Евразия, 2000. – С. 180–186.
8. Франкл В. Человек в поисках смысла. – Москва: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 95–102.
9. Кастельс М. Информационная эпоха: экономика, общество и культура. – Москва: ГУ ВШЭ, 2000. – С. 210–218.
10. Murray C. J., Lopez A. D. The Global Burden of Disease: A Comprehensive Assessment of Mortality and Disability. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996. – P. 312–320.