HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF USING SUBCULTURAL VALUES IN THE EDUCATION OF UNORGANIZED YOUTH BASED ON YUNOGOGY

Xoldorova Musharraf Latifjon qizi

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24083574

Abstract: This article examines yunogogical youth-centered education through the educational potential of youth subcultures. A comparative conceptual analysis integrates Uzbek educational thought with international theories of youth culture, participation and social learning. A five-component pedagogical model is proposed, including recognition, co-design, peer activity, institutional partnership and reflective evaluation. The findings are theoretical and do not claim experimental verification.

Keywords: youth, subculture, socialization, education, participation, responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

The socialization of young people outside stable educational, employment, or civic associations requires a differentiated analytical language. The expression “unorganized youth” should describe an institutional relationship rather than an alleged deficiency in the young person. In the context of yunogogical youth-centered education, informal cultural communities may provide belonging, recognition, and opportunities for self-expression that conventional institutions do not always supply. Such communities are heterogeneous: music, sport, gaming, urban art, and digital content creation each have distinct norms and different capacities to support prosocial development. An institutional approach alone may mistake weak participation in formal organizations for an absence of social competence. In practice, participation frequently occurs through flexible peer networks and project-based communities. The central pedagogical challenge is therefore to establish reciprocal channels between informal initiative and accessible public institutions without appropriating or stigmatizing youth culture. Youth agency, negotiated norms, and reflective dialogue can become educational resources only when young participants retain meaningful decision-making power.

The concept of subculture is not value-neutral. Some subcultural environments strengthen mutual assistance, creativity, and solidarity; others can reproduce exclusion, discrimination, or risky conduct. Educational policy should avoid both romanticization and moral panic. A defensible framework combines safeguarding, rights-based participation, critical media literacy, and contextual assessment of local needs. The intended outcome is not cultural conformity but greater capacity to cooperate across social boundaries. This study asks how yunogogical youth-centered education can be translated into a coherent pedagogical mechanism that is feasible for schools, youth centers, local communities, and civil organizations. It distinguishes the level of values, the level of interactions, and the level of institutional support. This distinction matters because a compelling cultural symbol does not automatically produce sustained behavioral change; opportunities, mentoring, and feedback are needed to turn interest into civic practice. Contemporary digital environments add a further dimension to this question. Young people encounter identity narratives and peer approval in online spaces that cross the boundaries of neighborhood and classroom. Their online activity can support offline

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

volunteering and creative collaboration, but it can also amplify misinformation or exclusionary pressure. The pedagogical task is to connect digital expression with verifiable contributions to the community and with the ability to evaluate consequences. Finally, a socially inclusive model must recognize differences in gender, disability, household resources, rural or urban location, and access to technology. A universal intervention can reproduce inequality if it assumes equal leisure time, transport, or internet connectivity. Consequently, the framework developed here treats access, trust, and institutional responsiveness as necessary conditions for yunogogical youth-centered education, not merely as background variables.

The socialization of young people outside stable educational, employment, or civic associations requires a differentiated analytical language. The expression “unorganized youth” should describe an institutional relationship rather than an alleged deficiency in the young person. In the context of yunogogical youth-centered education, informal cultural communities may provide belonging, recognition, and opportunities for self-expression that conventional institutions do not always supply. Such communities are heterogeneous: music, sport, gaming, urban art, and digital content creation each have distinct norms and different capacities to support prosocial development. An institutional approach alone may mistake weak participation in formal organizations for an absence of social competence. In practice, participation frequently occurs through flexible peer networks and project-based communities. The central pedagogical challenge is therefore to establish reciprocal channels between informal initiative and accessible public institutions without appropriating or stigmatizing youth culture. Youth agency, negotiated norms, and reflective dialogue can become educational resources only when young participants retain meaningful decision-making power. The concept of subculture is not value-neutral. Some subcultural environments strengthen mutual assistance, creativity, and solidarity; others can reproduce exclusion, discrimination, or risky conduct. Educational policy should avoid both romanticization and moral panic. A defensible framework combines safeguarding, rights-based participation, critical media literacy, and contextual assessment of local needs. The intended outcome is not cultural conformity but greater capacity to cooperate across social boundaries.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Abdulla Avloniy, in his work on moral education, interprets upbringing through the relationship between personal conduct and responsibility toward others. His normative framework can inform contemporary debates about civic duty, although it cannot be treated as an empirical study of present-day digital subcultures. Abdurauf Fitrat, writing about the family and education, emphasizes the formative influence of the social environment. Reading these Uzbek thinkers together highlights the need to understand young people within networks of social relations rather than as isolated recipients of instruction.

The international literature provides a useful counterpoint. Dick Hebdige treats subcultural style as symbolic meaning and social distinction, while Andy Bennett questions fixed subcultural boundaries and describes more fluid youth affiliations. This contrast warns against assuming that a single label represents a stable, homogeneous population. Wenger’s communities-of-practice perspective instead

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

directs attention to learning through participation, shared activity, and gradual acquisition of competence.

Freire's dialogic pedagogy is relevant because it challenges educational practices that impose predefined meanings without listening to participants. Bronfenbrenner's ecological approach complements this argument by locating youth development within overlapping family, community, educational, and wider institutional systems. Together these traditions suggest that pedagogical effects depend not only on content but also on the quality of relationships, the degree of agency, and the availability of supportive environments.

Abdulla Avloniy, in his work on moral education, interprets upbringing through the relationship between personal conduct and responsibility toward others. His normative framework can inform contemporary debates about civic duty, although it cannot be treated as an empirical study of present-day digital subcultures. Abdurauf Fitrat, writing about the family and education, emphasizes the formative influence of the social environment. Reading these Uzbek thinkers together highlights the need to understand young people within networks of social relations rather than as isolated recipients of instruction.

The international literature provides a useful counterpoint. Dick Hebdige treats subcultural style as symbolic meaning and social distinction, while Andy Bennett questions fixed subcultural boundaries and describes more fluid youth affiliations. This contrast warns against assuming that a single label represents a stable, homogeneous population. Wenger's communities-of-practice perspective instead directs attention to learning through participation, shared activity, and gradual acquisition of competence.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a conceptual and comparative analytical design rather than a field experiment. Its units of analysis were pedagogical principles, models of informal participation, and institutional conditions affecting yunogogical youth-centered education. Theoretical comparison was used to identify convergences and tensions between normative Uzbek educational thought, international youth-subculture research, and participatory learning theory. A systems approach then connected individual motivation, peer relations, community resources, and public-sector coordination.

Conceptual modeling was applied to formulate a sequence of diagnosis, co-design, implementation, reflection, and revision. At the diagnostic stage, practitioners would map youth interests, access barriers, and existing peer initiatives without assigning deficit-based labels. Co-design would involve young participants in selecting activities and safeguards. Implementation would combine youth agency, negotiated norms, and reflective dialogue with mentoring and local partnerships. Reflection would document participation quality, perceived belonging, and community contribution, while revision would adjust activities in response to feedback.

To avoid conflating theoretical propositions with measured findings, the analysis separates expected outcomes from demonstrated effects. Proposed indicators include voluntary retention, diversity of participants, completion of jointly designed projects, perceived self-efficacy, quality of intergroup

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

dialogue, and documented contributions to community needs. These indicators require baseline measurement, informed consent, transparent sampling, and follow-up observation before any causal claim can be made.

Ethical appraisal was integrated into the model through attention to privacy, non-discrimination, voluntary participation, and proportional safeguarding. Peer leaders were conceptualized as collaborators rather than informal surveillance agents. The analytical procedure therefore considers both the educational potential of informal cultural practices and the possibility that institutional interventions could undermine the trust on which those practices depend.

The study employed a conceptual and comparative analytical design rather than a field experiment. Its units of analysis were pedagogical principles, models of informal participation, and institutional conditions affecting yunogogical youth-centered education. Theoretical comparison was used to identify convergences and tensions between normative Uzbek educational thought, international youth-subculture research, and participatory learning theory. A systems approach then connected individual motivation, peer relations, community resources, and public-sector coordination.

RESULTS

The conceptual analysis yielded a five-component model for yunogogical youth-centered education: recognition of existing cultural resources, negotiated educational aims, peer-supported practical activity, institutional brokerage, and reflective evaluation. Recognition reduces the gap between formal educational language and young people's lived experience. Negotiation makes the goals transparent and contestable. Practical activity provides an observable context in which cooperation can develop. Institutional brokerage connects informal initiative with stable resources. Reflection helps participants interpret outcomes and adjust their conduct.

The model identifies youth agency, negotiated norms, and reflective dialogue as a possible bridge between expressive identity and collective responsibility. For example, a youth media group could document a neighborhood accessibility problem, consult residents, and prepare a public information campaign. The educational value would arise not from the medium itself but from research, ethical representation, shared decisions, and accountable follow-through. Similar logic can be applied to sport, music, design, and volunteering.

A second result is a distinction between participation volume and participation quality. High attendance alone does not demonstrate social inclusion or civic learning. More informative indicators assess whether young people can influence decisions, interact across social differences, resolve disagreement without coercion, and transfer acquired skills to other contexts. This distinction supports a move away from purely administrative reporting toward developmental evaluation.

A third result concerns risk management. Formal institutions should not assume that all subcultural practices are beneficial, yet blanket prohibition may intensify alienation. The proposed response is proportional: identify concrete harms, establish shared rules, provide safe alternatives, and preserve legitimate cultural expression. These conclusions are theoretical findings from synthesis of the cited literature; they are not reported as observed intervention effects.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

The conceptual analysis yielded a five-component model for yunogogical youth-centered education: recognition of existing cultural resources, negotiated educational aims, peer-supported practical activity, institutional brokerage, and reflective evaluation. Recognition reduces the gap between formal educational language and young people's lived experience. Negotiation makes the goals transparent and contestable. Practical activity provides an observable context in which cooperation can develop. Institutional brokerage connects informal initiative with stable resources. Reflection helps participants interpret outcomes and adjust their conduct.

DISCUSSION

Hebdige's interpretation of youth style as symbolic resistance invites a critical question: can formal educators use subcultural expression without neutralizing its meaning? Bennett's account of fluid, changing youth affiliations suggests that educators should avoid treating cultural membership as a fixed identity. The tension between these perspectives is productive for yunogogical youth-centered education. A rigid program risks converting living youth culture into an administrative category, whereas an entirely informal approach may fail to create continuity or equitable access.

Freire's emphasis on dialogue helps mediate this tension. A participatory educational process does not require institutions to abandon standards; it requires them to justify standards, listen to disagreement, and allow young people to shape legitimate goals. At the same time, Bourdieu's account of cultural distinction reminds us that some styles and competencies receive greater recognition than others. A program that rewards only polished digital performance may unintentionally privilege already advantaged participants.

The resulting policy implication is a negotiated partnership rather than either unrestricted celebration or disciplinary assimilation of subcultures. Practitioners need preparation in facilitation, conflict resolution, digital ethics, and culturally responsive assessment. Future research should test the proposed mechanism through longitudinal mixed-method designs, comparing participants with appropriately matched groups while accounting for selection effects and local differences.

Hebdige's interpretation of youth style as symbolic resistance invites a critical question: can formal educators use subcultural expression without neutralizing its meaning? Bennett's account of fluid, changing youth affiliations suggests that educators should avoid treating cultural membership as a fixed identity. The tension between these perspectives is productive for yunogogical youth-centered education. A rigid program risks converting living youth culture into an administrative category, whereas an entirely informal approach may fail to create continuity or equitable access.

Freire's emphasis on dialogue helps mediate this tension. A participatory educational process does not require institutions to abandon standards; it requires them to justify standards, listen to disagreement, and allow young people to shape legitimate goals. At the same time, Bourdieu's account of cultural distinction reminds us that some styles and competencies receive greater recognition than others. A program that rewards only polished digital performance may unintentionally privilege already advantaged participants.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

CONCLUSION

The analysis supports a rights-based, participatory understanding of yunogogical youth-centered education. Effective practice should integrate youth-defined cultural interests with mentoring, accessible infrastructure, safeguards, and transparent evaluation. The proposed model remains a theoretically grounded hypothesis until tested through field research with reliable baseline and follow-up evidence.

Further studies should examine differences across regions and youth communities, document unintended exclusion, and assess whether voluntary participation translates into durable civic skills. Policy should prioritize meaningful agency and social inclusion rather than attendance counts alone.

REFERENCES

1. Авлоний А. Туркий гулистон ёхуд ахлоқ. — Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992.
2. Фитрат А. Оила ёки оила бошқариш тартиблари. — Тошкент: Маънавият, 2000.
3. Hebdige D. Subculture: The Meaning of Style. — London: Methuen, 1979.
4. Bennett A. Subcultures or neo-tribes? Rethinking the relationship between youth, style and musical taste // Sociology. — 1999. — Vol. 33, No. 3. — P. 599–617.
5. Hall S., Jefferson T. (eds.). Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain. — London: Hutchinson, 1976.
6. Bourdieu P. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
7. Putnam R. D. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. — New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
8. Wenger E. Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
9. Freire P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. — New York: Continuum, 1970.
10. Bronfenbrenner U. The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.