

Axiological And Institutional Factors Of Youth Social Activism In Transformative Societies

Ochilova Marjona Botir qizi, Independent Researcher Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Annotatiion. This study explores the determinants of youth social activism during societal transformation from socio-philosophical and sociological perspectives. By examining the interplay between axiological (value-based) and institutional (structural-legal) factors, the paper analyzes the evolving role of youth as social agents in Uzbekistan and broader transforming societies. The research differentiates between traditional, civic, and emerging digital forms of youth engagement, evaluating how shift in values and institutional frameworks shape civic participation. The study concludes with conceptual and practical recommendations for optimizing institutional environments to align with the intrinsic value systems of contemporary youth.

Keywords: Societal transformation, youth social activism, axiology, value orientation, institutional environment, youth policy, digital activism, civil society, Uzbekistan, social capital.

Introduction. In the first quarter of the 21st century, global dynamics driven by rapid digitalization, economic restructuring, and socio-political transitions have fundamentally altered the social landscape. These shifts profoundly affect youth—the most demographically and socially dynamic segment of the population. Transformative societies are uniquely characterized by an imbalance: traditional social norms and established value systems weaken, while new institutional mechanisms and axiological orientations remain in the process of formation [1, p. 45]. Under these conditions, young people act not merely as passive recipients of social change, but as pivotal agents of economic, cultural, and political modernization.

In the Republic of Uzbekistan, systemic reforms implemented under the “Uzbekistan - 2030” Strategy and updated national youth policies provide a salient case of rapid societal transformation. In a nation where young people constitute over 60% of the population, mobilizing their intellectual, civic, and moral potential is a strategic imperative for national development and social stability [2, p. 12].

Youth social activism is a multifaceted phenomenon determined simultaneously by internal (value-motivational) and external (institutional-environmental) factors. While an axiological approach elucidates the intrinsic motives, moral orientations, and worldviews guiding youth initiatives, an institutional framework defines the structural opportunities, legal boundaries, and organizational platforms provided by the state and civil society. A comprehensive, integrated analysis of the dialectical relationship between axiological and institutional factors is therefore both theoretically essential and practically urgent.

Methods (theoretical and methodological framework)

Understanding youth social activism requires an interdisciplinary approach situated at the intersection of social philosophy, sociology, and political science. Philosophically, action is conceptualized as purposeful human agency aimed at transforming both self and society. According to Max Weber’s theory of social action, human agency is intrinsically linked to the subjective meanings and values attributed

to actions by social actors [3, p. 112]. During periods of social transformation, these meanings and values undergo significant flux.

This study incorporates the theory of anomie formulated by Émile Durkheim and further developed by Robert K. Merton, which posits that rapid social transitions can cause a breakdown of established norms without immediate replacement, potentially leading to social apathy, alienative behaviors, or destructive forms of activism [4, p. 88]. Furthermore, Anthony Giddens' Structuration Theory bridges the agency-structure dichotomy, demonstrating that youth (as agents) do not merely operate within institutional structures but actively reproduce and transform them through social practice [5, p. 204].

To systematically evaluate these dynamics, this research employs:

- **Systemic analysis** to conceptualize youth activism as a holistic, multi-level system;
- **Structural-functional analysis** to evaluate the efficiency of social and state institutions;
- **Axiological analysis** to investigate the hierarchy and evolution of youth values;
- **Comparative sociological interpretation** to examine traditional versus digital channels of participation.

Youth social activism is analyzed across three distinct levels of operation:

1. **Micro-level:** Individual value orientations, personal agency, intrinsic motivation, and self-identity.
2. **Meso-level:** The immediate social environment, including families, educational institutions, local communities (*Mahalla*), peer networks, and digital platforms.
3. **Macro-level:** National youth legislation, political and civic institutions, structural reforms, and macroeconomic conditions.

Results and discussion.

1) 3.1. Axiological Determinants of Youth Social Activism

Axiological factors constitute the internal engine of youth participation, defining its moral direction, intensity, and qualitative character. In a transforming society, youth value orientations represent a complex, dynamic synthesis of traditional cultural imperatives and modern pragmatic values.

Traditional vs. Modern Value Dynamics

In Uzbekistan, youth engagement is structured by the tension and synergy between traditional collective values (family solidarity, community responsibility, respect for elders, neighborhood/mahalla cohesion) and modern individualistic values (personal achievement, financial independence, career mobility, pragmatism) [6, p. 77].

Empirical and theoretical assessments indicate a growing prioritization of individualistic and pragmatic values among contemporary youth. Young people increasingly view social activism not as an abstract duty toward society, but as a instrument for building personal social capital, acquiring soft and hard skills, and achieving upward social mobility. This shift alters the motivational base of participation, making youth engagement more goal-oriented, project-based, and results-driven.

Moral-Ethical Orientations and Civic Responsibility

A critical dimension of the axiological matrix is civic self-awareness and moral responsibility. Youth engagement in volunteering, environmental conservation, and charitable initiatives directly reflects their sense of social solidarity, justice, and

empathy. The recent growth of voluntary civic engagement-such as the national “Yashil Makon” (Green Space) ecological campaign, peer-to-peer educational mentoring, and local humanitarian efforts-highlights a strong humanitarian component within contemporary youth values [7, p. 134].

Digital Axiology and Virtual Engagement

As “digital natives”, modern youth develop their value systems within global information networks and social media platforms (Telegram, Instagram, YouTube, TikTok). Within the digital sphere, values such as freedom of expression, immediacy, open access to information, and peer recognition become paramount.

However, digital axiology introduces specific risks to social cohesion:

- Exposure to misinformation and external cultural manipulation, leading to the erosion of traditional ethics;
- The emergence of “slacktivism”-superficial online engagement (likes, shares) disconnected from real-world civic actions;
- Value fragmentation and the rise of hyper-consumerist orientations.

Mitigating these vulnerabilities requires fostering critical thinking, digital literacy, and a balanced synthesis of national heritage and universal human values [8, p. 56].

2) 3.2. Institutional Determinants and Structural Efficiency

Institutional factors comprise the formal and informal structures, legal mechanisms, and social policies that regulate, facilitate, or constrain youth participation. The responsiveness and flexibility of the institutional environment directly govern whether youth energy is successfully integrated into constructive development.

Legal Framework and State Youth Policy

The legal poydevor (foundation) of youth policy in Uzbekistan is established by the Law “On State Youth Policy”, the creation of the Youth Affairs Agency, and related strategic decrees [9, p. 5]. Key institutional mechanisms include:

- The “Youth Notebook” (*Yoshlar Daftari*) targeted social support and empowerment system;
- Preferential financial and credit programs for youth entrepreneurship;
- Strategic leadership training and structural integration through the Youth Parliament;
- The “Five Initiatives” framework promoting culture, arts, sports, IT, and literature.

While these macro-level mechanisms expand avenues for socio-economic integration, residual bureaucratic procedures and top-down formalistic implementations occasionally reduce their real-world impact.

Civil Society Organizations and NGOs

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and public youth associations serve as critical channels for institutionalizing youth initiatives, operating as an essential bridge between young citizens and the state [10, p. 201]. A robust civil society allows for “bottom-up” civic initiatives. However, administrative practices in transitional contexts often favor top-down management. True institutionalization requires granting higher organizational autonomy to youth-led NGOs and expanding competitive grant funding.

Educational Institutions and the Mahalla System

At the meso-level, educational institutions and local community structures play the primary role in socialization:

- **Higher Education Institutions (HEIs):** Serve as central hubs for academic, scientific, and civic development. Empowering student self-governance bodies and research societies significantly elevates constructive activism.

- **The Mahalla (Local Community) System:** A unique socio-cultural institution in Uzbekistan that facilitates local socialization and community problem-solving. The introduction of the dedicated "Youth Leader" (*Yoshlar yetakchisi*) position in every neighborhood has significantly reduced the structural distance between youth and local governance [11, p. 92].

3) 3.3. Dialectical Synergy and Interplay of Factors

Optimal youth participation depends on alignment between axiological motivations and institutional opportunities. **Institutional Deficit (High Axiological Motivation / Limited Institutional Channels):** Young citizens possess strong intrinsic desires to participate, but lack formal channels, resources, or legal avenues. This disconnect generates frustration, alienation, alienation from public institutions, and can redirect activity into non-formal channels, protest actions, or outward migration ("brain drain") [12, p. 165].

1. **Axiological Deficit (High Institutional Provision / Low Intrinsic Motivation):** Extensive state infrastructure and funding exist, but young people lack genuine interest or personal identification with the initiatives. This results in **formalistic participation**, where events are conducted primarily for reporting metrics rather than sustainable outcomes.

The Optimal Model requires systemic congruence where institutional frameworks act as effective social elevators that directly support the self-actualization and value-driven aspirations of young people.

4) 3.4. Emerging Forms of Youth Engagement

Societal transformation has given rise to distinct new modalities of youth engagement:

- **Eco-Activism and Sustainability:** Driven by environmental challenges (e.g., the Aral Sea crisis, climate change, water scarcity), youth increasingly organize around practical, non-political environmental solutions [13, p. 89].

- **Digital Activism:** Leveraging social media networks, online petitions, and digital content creation to highlight civic issues, demand public accountability, and mobilize peer groups rapidly.

- **Social Entrepreneurship:** Merging market principles with social impact by founding ventures focused on inclusive employment, recycling, civic education, and healthcare accessibility.

- **Crowdfunding and Digital Volunteering:** Utilizing digital platforms to pool financial and human resources rapidly for local community needs or emergency responses.

Conclusion and recommendations. Promoting youth social activism in transformative societies requires an integrated approach that aligns internal value orientations with supportive, non-bureaucratic institutional frameworks. Sustainable civic engagement cannot be engineered through top-down administrative mandates alone; it must rest upon a solid axiological foundation and an enabling environment.

Based on the theoretical and empirical findings of this study, the following practical recommendations are proposed:

5) Axiological Sphere:

1. **Educational Modernization:** Enhance educational curricula to cultivate critical thinking, civic responsibility, and media literacy, reinforcing both national cultural heritage and universal human rights.

2. **Digital Resilience:** Implement structured digital literacy programs that strengthen ideological and psychological resilience against online disinformation and manipulation.

3. **Incentivizing Volunteering:** Develop formal social credit and recognition systems that link civic volunteering to academic credit, career opportunities, and professional advancement.

6) Institutional Sphere:

1. **Shifting to Bottom-Up Governance:** De-bureaucratize state youth programs by prioritizing grassroots, student-led, and community-initiated projects over top-down directives.

2. **Empowering Youth NGOs:** Expand competitive public grant funding and institutional support for independent youth non-profit organizations to foster a vibrant civil society.

3. **Enhancing Student Autonomy:** Transform student councils and academic societies within universities into truly autonomous self-governing bodies with genuine decision-making authority.

4. **Digital Civic Integration:** Formally integrate digital petition systems, open-data feedback loops, and online consultation platforms into municipal and national governance processes.

Achieving synergy between axiological motivations and institutional opportunities will effectively transform youth social energy into a primary driver for sustainable modernization, democratic governance, and social progress.

References

1. Abdullayev A.A. Transformatsiya jarayonida jamiyat va shaxs munosabatlari dialektikasi. - Toshkent: Fanga xizmat, 2021. -180 b.
2. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. Yangi O'zbekiston strategiyasi. - Toshkent: O'zbekiston, 2021. - 464 b.
3. Вебер М. Избранные произведения: Пер. с нем. / Сост., отв. ред. и авт. послесл. Ю.Н. Давыдов. - М.: Прогресс, 1990. — 808 с.
4. Мертон Р. Социальная теория и социальная структура. - М.: АСТ, Хранитель, 2006. — 873 с.
5. Гидденс Э. Устроение общества: Очерк теории структурирования. - 2-е изд. - М.: Академический Проект, 2005. — 528 с.
6. Jo'rayev N. Jamiyat ma'naviy-ruhiy transformatsiyasi va yoshlar aksiologiyasi // Falsafa va huquq. - Toshkent, 2022. - № 3. - B. 75–79.
7. Qahhorova Sh.M. Globallashuv sharoitida yoshlar ijtimoiy faolligini oshirishning ma'naviy-axloqiy omillari: Falsafa fan. dokt. ... dis. avtoref. — Toshkent, 2020. - 48 b.
8. Рахимов И.К. Цифровая культура и трансформации ценностных ориентаций молодежи в современном Узбекистане // Социологические исследования. - 2023. - № 5. - С. 54–61.

9. O'zbekiston Respublikasining "Yoshlarga oid davlat siyosati to'g'risida"gi Qonuni. - O'zbekiston Respublikasi qonun hujjatlari to'plami, 2016-y., 37-son, 425-modda.
10. Xalilov A.X. Fuqarolik jamiyati institutlari va yoshlar: o'zaro ta'sir va rivojlanish tendensiyalari. - Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2019. - 240 b.
11. Umarov B.M. Yoshlar sotsiologiyasi: darslik. — Toshkent: Sano-standart, 2021. - 312 b.
12. Inglehart R. Cultural Evolution: People's Motivations are Changing and Reshaping the World. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. - 280 p.
13. Smith J., Taylor L. Youth Civil Activism in Transforming Societies: Institutional and Value Dynamics // Journal of Youth Studies. - 2022. - Vol. 25, No. 2. — P. 85–102.