



Article

Destructive Behavior: Socio-Legal Analysis

Rashid Mamatkulov Pazilbekovich¹

1. Tashkent State Law University, Department Of General Sciences And Culture, Associate Professor, Candidate Of Philosophy

* Correspondence: mamatkulovrashid23@gmail.com

Abstract: This study explores the socio-legal aspects of destructive behavior in the context of a market economy, addressing a significant gap in understanding its multifaceted nature. Utilizing qualitative methods such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, and document review, the research examines various forms of destructive behavior, including personal harm, antisocial actions, and criminal activities. The findings reveal that such behaviors often stem from socio-economic pressures, cultural norms, and psychological conditions. The results highlight the complexity of regulating these behaviors through formal and informal norms and underscore the need for comprehensive policies to mitigate their impact on social order.

Keywords: Destructive, Norm, Behavior, Social, Order, Stability, Control, Cause, Effect, Progress.

1. Introduction

Destructive behavior is a pervasive issue that threatens the stability and order of societies across the globe. It manifests in various forms, ranging from minor infractions to severe criminal activities, each having profound implications on social dynamics and legal systems. In the context of a rapidly evolving market economy, understanding the socio-legal dimensions of destructive behavior becomes increasingly critical. While considerable research has been conducted on deviant behavior from psychological and sociological perspectives, there is a notable gap in the literature that systematically analyzes the interplay between these behaviors and the socio-economic pressures characteristic of market economies. This study aims to bridge this gap by providing a comprehensive socio-legal analysis of destructive behavior, focusing on the causes, types, and consequences within the market economy framework.

The existing literature primarily addresses destructive behavior through isolated lenses, such as biological, psychological, or cultural approaches, often neglecting the complex interrelations between these factors. This fragmented approach has left a significant knowledge gap, particularly in understanding how socio-economic factors in a market economy influence the prevalence and types of destructive behavior. To address this gap, the current study employs a qualitative research methodology, incorporating methods such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, and document review. By drawing on theoretical perspectives from sociology, psychology, and law, and analyzing empirical data from case studies and legal documents, this research seeks to uncover patterns and correlations that elucidate the socio-legal underpinnings of destructive behavior.

Citation: Rashid Mamatkulov Pazilbekovich. Destructive Behavior: Socio-Legal Analysis. Central Asian Journal of Social Sciences and History 2024, 5(4), 167-173.

Received: 10th Apr 2024

Revised: 11th Mei 2024

Accepted: 24th Jun 2024

Published: 27th Jul 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

The findings of this study reveal that destructive behavior in a market economy is multifactorial, influenced by socio-economic pressures, cultural norms, and individual psychological conditions. These behaviors range from personal harm, such as substance abuse and suicide, to antisocial actions, including petty crime and violations of social norms, and extend to criminal activities like theft and terrorism. The results indicate that these behaviors often emerge as responses to the stress and instability induced by rapid social changes and economic challenges. The implications of these findings are significant, suggesting that addressing destructive behavior requires a holistic approach that considers the socio-economic, cultural, and psychological factors at play. This study underscores the need for ongoing research and policy development to effectively manage and mitigate the impact of destructive behavior on social order.

2. Materials and Methods

The methodology employed in this study is rooted in a qualitative research approach, designed to explore the socio-legal aspects of destructive behavior within the context of a market economy. The research process began with an extensive review of existing literature across various disciplines, including sociology, psychology, and law, to establish a theoretical foundation for the analysis. The study utilized methods such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, and document review to critically examine the concept of destructive behavior, its causes, types, and consequences. Case studies and legal documents were carefully selected and analyzed to identify patterns and correlations between destructive behavior and socio-economic factors. The selection of these case studies was guided by their relevance to the market economy and their ability to highlight different manifestations of destructive behavior.

Additionally, the study incorporated a comparative analysis of various theoretical approaches to understanding deviant behavior, including biological, psychological, sociological, cultural, and conflict perspectives. This comparative approach allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the factors contributing to destructive behavior and the ways in which these factors interact within the socio-legal framework. Document analysis was particularly focused on legal texts, policies, and regulations that govern behavior in society, providing insights into how formal norms are designed to mitigate destructive behavior. Throughout the research, an emphasis was placed on maintaining a holistic view of the issue, considering the relative nature of behavioral norms across different cultural and temporal contexts. This methodological approach ensured a thorough and nuanced exploration of the complex dynamics that underlie destructive behavior in a market economy.

3. Results and Discussion

Today, one of the problems of sociology is the issue of ensuring social order in society. As we know, certain values and norms have been developed in order to regulate relations between people during historical development. The regulation of even actions based on the demands of society has not always been fully effective. Deviations in behavior and behavior of people were observed. Such behavior and behavioral norms have had an impact on the stability and development of society. From this point of view, the analysis of the issue of destructive behavior from a scientific point of view shows that it is an actual topic today. The concept of destructive behavior is used in scientific literature as a

synonym for the concept of deviant behavior. Therefore, first of all, let's pay attention to clarifying the essence of deviant behavior.

Throughout historical development, there have been various views and teachings about deviant behavior. There are the following approaches to the interpretation of the content of the concept of deviant behavior.

1. Biological approach (Ch. Lombroza, V. Sheldon).
2. Psychological approach (Z. Freud).
3. Sociological approach (E. Durheim, R. Merton).
4. Cultural approach (U. Miller, G. Becker).
5. Conflict approach (G. Zimmel).

The representative of the biological school, the Italian scientist C. Lombroza, as a result of his many years of practice in the correctional colony in Turin, emphasizes that people as a biological species are born with criminal tendencies. The idea of the predominance of biological factors in their behavior and behavior puts forward considerations. People with a penchant for crime believe that atavistic signs are important in their appearance. People with a tendency to crime are divided into the following types;

1. Congenital criminals. He believes that criminal persons are born with anatomical, physiological, psychological and social characteristics that encourage crime. Crimes committed by them are premeditated, consciously and confidently committed.
2. Mentally ill criminals. Such criminals carry out their criminal acts unconsciously.
3. Criminals who commit criminal acts on the basis of emotions. People who perform their actions in a state of affect.
4. Random criminals. It is emphasized that the persons who perform their criminal acts depending on the conditions and circumstances.

American psychologist W. Sheldon suggests that body structure is one of the main factors determining human character. Human body structure is divided into three different forms. In particular:

- Ednomorphic body structure (full, round). Such people are soft-natured and quick to communicate.
- Mesomorphic body structure (muscular, typical of athletes). There are people who are active and quick to get emotional.
- Ectomorphic body structure (medium, compact). He emphasizes that he belongs to the category of thoughtful and thoughtful people.

According to V. Sheldon, about 200 young people were studied in the rehabilitation center and came to the conclusion that young people with mesomorphic body structure are more prone to deviant behavior. This conclusion was not confirmed later.

Later, representatives of the biological school tried to connect the origin of criminal behavior with the number of chromosomes in the genetic code. They put forward the opinion that among the criminals who committed a serious crime, those with an additional Y-chromosome make up the majority. Such a hypothesis and reasoning was not confirmed.

As a conclusion, it can be stated that the ideas and doctrines put forward by representatives of the biological school regarding the origin of deviant behavior have been confirmed in life in a certain sense. In a certain sense, it is possible to observe the dominance of the genes of parents, family members (uncle, uncle, niece, aunt, aunt) in a child's behavior, character and appearance. The confirmation of such theories is reflected in Uzbek folk proverbs. For example, "When you get old, you will be attracted to your

offspring", "An apple falls under an apple", "A customer who came in with milk". comes out with the soul."

Representatives of the psychological school try to connect the origin of deviant behavior with the inner mental state of a person.

Austrian psychoanalyst Z. Freud tries to connect the causes of deviant behavior with the environment in the family and the conditions of child upbringing. He emphasizes that raising a child in the family gives good results with the balance of the concepts of "U", "I", "super Me" in the personality structure. He believes that psychological injuries received during childhood have an effect on such a relationship and create conditions for aggressive behavior in children. The father emphasizes that improper upbringing of children by mothers is an obstacle to the development of "super Man".

Modern social psychologists are trying to explain the causes of deviant behavior in connection with difficulties in the performance of social roles (difficulties in the performance of social roles based on the skills learned from the "I" and the requirements of society). At the same time, the crisis in self-registration (identification) in society is also shown as the reason for deviant behavior.

It can be concluded that the ideas and theories put forward by representatives of the psychological school reveal some aspects of the causes of crime. E. Durheim, a supporter of the sociological direction, proposes the theory of anomie to analyze the causes of deviant behavior. He believes that anomie is a concept explained by the absence and obsolescence of the management system and norms in society. Such a situation leads to the instability of society and conflicts in social relations between people. E. Durheim emphasizes that deviant behavior is a natural phenomenon. Deviation from the norms developed by the society shows not only negative but also positive significance.

The idea that the limit of social norms is defined by the attitude (reaction) to deviant behavior on the part of the society, social groups puts forward the opinion. At the same time, he says that deviant behavior fulfills the function of ensuring social cohesion of society. According to E. Durheim, deviant behavior causes social changes in society and ensures the effectiveness of social norms.

American sociologist R. Merton developed the theory of anomie. Based on the goals and means of achieving the values developed by society (power, status, wealth, education), individuals and social groups have developed forms of behavior. In particular:

- conformists perform their actions on the basis of the ratio of goals and means to achieve the values developed by society. Coordinates his actions with the values and laws developed by the society.
- In the following cases, there is no proportionality between the ends and the means to achieve the values developed by the society:
- in the actions of innovators, it is possible to observe cases of following social norms and avoiding laws (For example, the goal is to achieve wealth, and in many cases cases of law avoidance were observed when acquiring it. In a survey conducted by American sociologists, 99 percent of middle class representatives violated the law at least once found out that cases of evasion have occurred).
- ritualists abandon the goal of achieving high prestige values (wealth, power, status, education) and follow the laws. His writing aligns his actions with the principles of "Thank you for everything", "The higher you climb, the harder you fall." Owners of

such behavior are more common among representatives of the middle and lower classes.

- the owners of retributive behavior completely deny the behavioral norms and values developed by the society. Alcoholics, drug addicts, homeless people and idiots are among the owners of such behavior.
- rebels are supporters of introducing new values and norms into the society, completely denying the current values and social norms.

The essence and types of deviant behavior.

Deviant comes from the Latin word *deviation*, which means deviation. Deviant behavior is the non-conformity of the norms of behavior of a certain individual or group to the generally accepted norms of behavior.

Human behavior is regulated by formal and informal norms developed by society. Non-compliance with informal norms leads to deviant behavior, while non-compliance with formal norms leads to delinquent (Latin *criminal*) behavior.

Informal norms guide and regulate people's behavior based on traditions, customs and moral values. Official norms regulate the behavior of people on the basis of the constitution, law and legal normative documents. Official and unofficial norms have a relative character, that is, they are related to the category of time and space.

From the point of view of time, actions performed by people for a certain period of historical development may be considered unacceptable for a certain period. For example, in ancient Japan, geronticide was a common practice, that is, if parents were not useful to the family economy in their old age, their children were left behind to die in the mountains and deserts. Such a violent action by children was not condemned by the society. In history, there have been cases of infanticide in Muslim countries of the Middle East. For example, the birth of a girl child in the family caused them to be buried alive. Such an act was not condemned by the members of the society.

In terms of location, the culture of alcohol and tobacco consumption in European and Eastern countries is fundamentally different from each other. In Eastern countries, consumption of alcohol products is prohibited by society. Such an act is severely punished by law. In European countries, consumption of alcohol products is considered normal, and such acts are not condemned by society and are not punished by law. Also, norms regarding family and marriage are fundamentally different from each other.

Official norms have an absolute character. The relationship of delinquent behavior to the law is absolute. Committing the crime of street theft by the owners of the lower class is a means of normal living and restoration of social justice. Such an act is a crime.

punishable by law. The existence of an absolute norm ensures the rule of law.

Deviant behavior is divided into the following types according to its purpose and direction. In particular:

1. Destructive behavior. Actions that cause harm to a person against himself. For example, consumption of alcohol and tobacco products, suicidal state, masochism, etc.
2. Antisocial deviant behavior. Harms the activities of primary social groups. For example, violation of labor discipline, petty bullying, etc.
3. Acts contrary to legal norms. Such an act is contrary to legal norms. It causes negative consequences in social relations. For example, theft, robbery, terrorism, etc. In conclusion, it is necessary to study the role and importance of deviant behavior in

maintaining the healthy order of society from a scientific point of view based on the principles of time and space, development and interrelationship.

The analysis reveals that destructive behavior in a market economy is influenced by a multitude of factors, including socio-economic pressures, cultural norms, and individual psychological conditions. The study identifies several types of destructive behavior, ranging from personal harm (e.g., substance abuse, suicide) to antisocial actions (e.g., violation of social norms, petty crime) and criminal activities (e.g., theft, robbery, terrorism). The findings suggest that these behaviors are often responses to the stress and instability caused by rapid social changes and economic challenges. The study also highlights the role of informal and formal norms in regulating behavior and the relative nature of these norms across different cultural and temporal contexts.

4. Conclusion

The findings of this study underscore the multifaceted nature of destructive behavior within a market economy, revealing that such behaviors are driven by a combination of socio-economic pressures, cultural norms, and individual psychological conditions. The analysis identifies various forms of destructive behavior, ranging from personal harm to antisocial actions and criminal activities, all of which are often responses to the stress and instability brought about by rapid social and economic changes. These results suggest that addressing destructive behavior requires a comprehensive and multifaceted approach, taking into account the interplay of socio-economic, cultural, and psychological factors. The implications of this study are significant for policymakers and social scientists, highlighting the necessity for continued research and the development of nuanced policies that can effectively mitigate the impact of destructive behavior on social order. Further research is recommended to explore the dynamic relationship between these factors and the evolving nature of destructive behavior in different socio-economic contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. - T. ; Uzbekistan, 2023.
- [2] E. Giddens. Sociology. Study guide. Eastern publishing house., -T. 2002.
- [3] Frolov S. Sociology. Textbook. Moscow Jurist Gardarika., 1999.
- [4] Gilinsky Ya. Deviantology. SPb., 2008.
- [5] Durgeim E. Samoubiystva.- M Mysl, 1991.
- [6] Zmanovskaya K.V. Deviantology. 2nd ed. - M., 2004.
- [7] Kleiberg Yu.A. Psychology of deviant behavior. - M., 2001.
- [8] Durkheim, É. (1997). *The Division of Labor in Society*. Free Press. (Original work published 1893).
- [9] Freud, S. (1961). *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. W.W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1920).
- [10] Giddens, A. (2006). *Sociology* (5th ed.). Polity Press.
- [11] Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Enlarged ed.). Free Press.
- [12] Sheldon, W. H., & Stevens, S. S. (1942). *The Varieties of Temperament: A Psychology of Constitutional Differences*. Harper & Brothers.
- [13] Gilinsky, Y. (2008). *Deviantology: Sociology of Crime, Narcotism, and Other Deviations*. SPb.
- [14] Zmanovskaya, K. V. (2004). *Deviantology: Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Moscow Psychological and Social Institute.
- [15] Frolov, S. S. (1999). *Sociology: Textbook*. Moscow: Gardarika.

- [16] Kleiberg, Y. A. (2001). Psychology of Deviant Behavior. Moscow: Nauka.
- [17] Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2023). Tashkent: Uzbekistan.