

The Essence, Formation Regularities And Manifestation Features Of The Concepts Of Idea And Ideology In Society

Khodjayev Olimkhon Shavkatovich

Senior Lecturer, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Kokand State University; Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophical Sciences

Abstract: This article examines the essence, formation regularities and manifestation features of the concepts of idea and ideology in society from a philosophical and socio-theoretical perspective. The purpose of the research is to substantiate the idea as a meaning-producing element of social consciousness and ideology as a complex communicative, cultural and institutional mechanism that systematizes ideas, legitimizes collective orientations and directs them toward social practice. The article synthesizes classical and contemporary theories of ideology, social constructivism, discourse analysis, legitimacy theory and approaches related to national idea, civil society, spiritual stability and the digital information environment. The findings show that ideas and ideologies do not emerge randomly; they are formed under the influence of historical needs, social interests, communicative conditions, institutional continuity, value systems and cultural memory. The manifestation of ideological processes can be observed through political institutions, education, mass media, religious and spiritual life, digital networks and everyday social practices. The research argues that in a democratic society ideology should not be reduced to a closed dogma; it must function as an open normative and communicative system that balances national interests, human dignity, rule of law, freedom of conscience and constructive pluralism of thought.

Keywords: Idea, ideology, social consciousness, national idea, values, legitimacy, civil society, spiritual stability, discourse, digital society.

Introduction

Introduction. The problem of idea and ideology belongs to the central field of social philosophy because every society preserves itself not only through material production, legal institutions and administrative mechanisms, but also through meanings, goals, symbols, collective memories and expectations about the future. A society without ideas becomes a mechanical aggregation of individuals, whereas a society without a reflective ideological culture risks losing the ability to coordinate its historical movement, defend its identity and transform conflicts into rational public dialogue. In the philosophical tradition, an idea may be understood as a meaningful intellectual image that expresses a problem, value, goal or possible model of action; ideology, in turn, is a structured system of ideas, values, norms and representations through which social groups interpret reality, justify interests, mobilize behavior and evaluate the legitimacy of institutions. This distinction is important because not every idea becomes ideology, and not every ideology remains alive if it loses contact with social experience, moral credibility and practical necessity. The classical genealogy of the term ideology is usually linked with Destutt de Tracy, who regarded it as a science of ideas, but the modern discussion became more complex after Marx and Engels interpreted ideology as a form of social consciousness related to material relations, class interests and the inversion of reality in thought. Later, Mannheim showed that ideology should not be examined only as false consciousness; it must be studied as a historically situated way in which groups perceive the social world, protect their positions and imagine change. In the twentieth century, Gramsci connected ideology with hegemony and civil society, Althusser with ideological state apparatuses, Geertz with cultural systems, Habermas with communicative rationality, Foucault with regimes of truth, and Bourdieu with symbolic power. These approaches demonstrate that ideology is neither a simple set of slogans nor a purely political technology; it is an organized field where knowledge, belief, interest, language, identity and power intersect. For Uzbekistan and other societies undergoing modernization, the analysis of idea and ideology has special relevance because social renewal requires not only economic indicators and administrative reforms, but also a coherent moral-intellectual basis capable of harmonizing national traditions, constitutional values, scientific thinking, interreligious tolerance, civic responsibility and openness to global development. The Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan guarantees freedom of

thought, speech and convictions, the right to seek, obtain and disseminate information, and freedom of conscience, thereby establishing a legal framework in which ideological life must be connected with human dignity, pluralism and responsibility. The national development strategies of recent years also emphasize the creation of conditions for human potential, spiritual maturity, fair public administration, rule of law and social stability. These priorities make the scientific study of ideological processes not an abstract exercise, but a practical necessity: if the meaning of ideas, the laws of their formation and the modes of their manifestation are not understood deeply, public consciousness may become vulnerable to dogmatism, manipulation, radicalization, consumerist emptiness or fragmented digital influence. The present article therefore aims to analyze the concepts of idea and ideology as two interrelated but not identical phenomena, to reveal the regularities through which they are formed in society, and to classify the major ways in which they manifest themselves in political, cultural, educational, religious, informational and everyday life. The research proceeds from the assumption that a mature ideological system is not measured by the loudness of its declarations, but by its capacity to connect truth with value, freedom with responsibility, national interest with universal human principles, and social stability with creative renewal.

Materials And Methods

Materials and Methods. The methodological basis of the article is an interdisciplinary theoretical synthesis that combines philosophical conceptual analysis, socio-historical interpretation, comparative hermeneutics and elements of discourse analysis. Since the object of study is not a measurable object in the narrow empirical sense but a complex socio-spiritual phenomenon, the research does not rely on statistical sampling; instead, it reconstructs the conceptual logic of idea and ideology through classical philosophical texts, modern social theory, constitutional-normative sources and contemporary discussions about information society. Conceptual analysis is used to differentiate the semantic fields of idea, belief, value, doctrine, worldview, ideology and discourse; without this differentiation the topic becomes blurred, and ideology is either reduced to propaganda or idealized as pure moral education. The socio-historical method makes it possible to observe how ideas arise from concrete needs of society, such as the need for unity, justice, modernization, national identity, intergenerational continuity or defense against destructive extremism, and how these ideas acquire ideological form when they become institutionalized in education, law, political communication, cultural memory and public rituals. The hermeneutic approach is important because ideological texts and symbols never function as neutral data; they are interpreted differently by social groups depending on experience, interest, language, memory and communicative context. Therefore, the same idea, for example freedom, justice, patriotism or modernization, may be manifested as a philosophical principle, a legal norm, an educational aim, a political slogan, a media frame or a personal moral conviction. Discourse analysis is used to examine ideology as a system of socially distributed meanings expressed through language, narratives and symbolic codes. This method follows the view that social reality is not merely reflected in language but also constructed and stabilized through repeated patterns of naming, evaluation, opposition and legitimization. In addition, the article uses the structural-functional method to clarify what functions ideas and ideologies perform in society: orientation, integration, mobilization, legitimization, criticism, socialization, identity construction and conflict mediation. The normative-axiological method is also applied because ideological processes cannot be studied only descriptively; they must be evaluated in relation to human dignity, freedom of conscience, constitutional order, public security, tolerance and the development of civil society. This is especially relevant in contexts where ideological influence may appear in constructive forms, such as national self-awareness, civic solidarity and educational responsibility, or in destructive forms, such as fanaticism, misinformation, xenophobia and manipulative populism. The article treats the Constitution of Uzbekistan, the Strategy “Uzbekistan-2030,” the Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022-2026, and the law on freedom of conscience and religious organizations as normative materials that illuminate the contemporary institutional boundaries of ideological development. At the same time, these documents are not used as a substitute for philosophical theory; rather, they provide the socio-legal horizon within which the theoretical concepts acquire practical significance. The analytical procedure consists of four stages: first, the semantic essence of idea and ideology is clarified; second, the formation regularities of ideological processes are derived from social theory and historical logic; third, the main manifestation features of ideology are classified; fourth, the implications of these findings for democratic renewal, national development and spiritual stability are discussed. Such a design allows the article to avoid both excessive abstraction and narrow

political descriptivism. It also corresponds to the IMRAD model because the introduction formulates the problem, the methods justify the research logic, the results present conceptual findings, and the discussion interprets these findings in the broader context of social development.

Results

Results. The first result of the study is the clarification that the concept of idea has a broader and more primary meaning than the concept of ideology. An idea is an intellectual-semantic formation that expresses a perceived truth, a desired value, a solution to a problem or an image of possible social order; it may exist at the level of individual consciousness, scientific thinking, moral reflection or collective aspiration. Ideology emerges when ideas are organized into a relatively stable system, connected with social interests, transmitted through institutions, and used to interpret, legitimize or transform social reality. Thus, idea is the nucleus of meaning, while ideology is the organized field of meaning. This distinction makes it possible to avoid two methodological errors: the first error is to call every thought ideology, which destroys analytical precision; the second error is to treat ideology only negatively, as deception, while in fact ideology can also perform integrative, educational and emancipatory functions if it remains open to reason, dialogue and ethical responsibility. The second result is the identification of basic formation regularities. The formation of ideas and ideologies is conditioned by historical necessity: societies produce ideas when existing meanings no longer explain new circumstances or when a new goal must be articulated. For example, modernization, national independence, cultural renewal, technological transformation or social crisis intensify the demand for new ideological interpretations. Another regularity is social interest: every ideology expresses, consciously or indirectly, the interests and expectations of certain communities, classes, institutions, generations or national collectives. This does not mean that ideology is always selfish; rather, it means that ideas become socially powerful when they are connected with needs recognized as significant by people. A third regularity is value selection. Ideology cannot include all possible values equally; it selects, ranks and connects them into a hierarchy, such as freedom with responsibility, tradition with innovation, national identity with universal humanism, or stability with reform. A fourth regularity is institutional mediation. Ideas become ideology only when they enter schools, universities, family education, media systems, political organizations, religious communities, cultural institutions and digital platforms. Without institutional mediation, even a strong idea remains a personal insight or intellectual fragment. A fifth regularity is communicative reproduction. Ideology survives through narratives, symbols, concepts, examples, rituals, public debates and repeated interpretation; it is reproduced not simply by command but by the continuous circulation of meanings in society. A sixth regularity is adaptation. If ideology cannot adapt to new knowledge, social changes and moral challenges, it loses credibility and becomes a ceremonial shell. A seventh regularity is conflict and competition. Ideological space is never empty and never completely homogeneous; different ideas compete for legitimacy, and this competition may be productive when it is governed by law, dialogue and intellectual culture, but destructive when it becomes hatred, coercion or information warfare. The third result concerns the manifestation features of ideology. Ideology manifests itself cognitively, by offering explanations of social reality; axiologically, by defining what is valuable and desirable; normatively, by proposing rules of proper behavior; emotionally, by mobilizing feelings of belonging, hope, pride or indignation; symbolically, by using signs, images, heroes, events and narratives; institutionally, by being embedded in education, law, media and organizations; and practically, by influencing everyday decisions, civic participation and social behavior. These dimensions show that ideology is not limited to official doctrine: it appears in textbooks, speeches, online discussions, religious interpretation, cultural festivals, family upbringing, advertising, memorial practices and even urban symbols. The fourth result is the classification of constructive and destructive ideological development. Constructive ideology strengthens social solidarity without suppressing freedom, protects national identity without hostility to other peoples, supports spiritual education without fanaticism, promotes modernization without cultural nihilism, and encourages critical thinking without moral relativism. Destructive ideology, by contrast, absolutizes one partial interest, divides society into enemies and pure believers, manipulates fear, rejects rational criticism, and replaces moral responsibility with blind obedience. The fifth result is the argument that the digital era has changed the speed, scale and form of ideological processes. Previously, ideology was largely mediated by formal institutions, printed texts and centralized communication; today it is also shaped by algorithms, social networks, short videos, memes, influencers, anonymous communities and transnational information flows. This does not eliminate classical ideological mechanisms, but it multiplies their forms. In

digital space, a weak idea may become viral, a false narrative may look persuasive, and emotional mobilization may outrun rational verification. Therefore, the formation of ideological immunity in society requires not censorship as the first reflex, but media literacy, critical thinking, ethical communication, scientific worldview, respect for law and the ability to distinguish between belief, evidence, manipulation and responsible conviction. The sixth result is that the national idea in a modern democratic state should be understood not as a closed formula but as a living framework of shared meanings. It must provide citizens with a sense of belonging and purpose, but it must also leave space for pluralism, creativity and philosophical reflection. In this sense, ideology becomes mature when it is capable of self-correction. A society that cannot revise its ideological language becomes rigid; a society that has no common ideological horizon becomes fragmented. The optimal model is therefore dialogical ideology: a system of guiding values that is stable in its constitutional and moral foundations but open in its methods, interpretations and public discussion.

Conceptual model of idea and ideology in social development

Analytical layer	Idea	Ideology	Main social function
Semantic level	Meaning, image, goal or value expressed in thought	System of organized meanings and values	Orientation and interpretation
Social level	Individual or collective aspiration	Institutionalized representation of interests and norms	Integration and mobilization
Normative level	Moral or rational proposition	Hierarchy of values and rules of legitimacy	Regulation and justification
Communicative level	Concept, symbol or argument	Narrative, discourse and symbolic code	Transmission and reproduction
Practical level	Potential model of action	Mechanism directing behavior and policy choices	Socialization and transformation

Discussion

Discussion. The obtained results demonstrate that the essence of idea and ideology should be analyzed through a balanced approach that avoids both ideological nihilism and ideological absolutism. Ideological nihilism assumes that modern society can live without shared ideas, as if economic exchange, technology and individual choice alone were sufficient for public cohesion. This view is theoretically weak because any form of collective life requires common meanings, even when those meanings are expressed in liberal, secular, religious, national, scientific or civic language. Ideological absolutism, on the other hand, assumes that one fixed doctrine can solve all social contradictions and that criticism is a threat rather than a source of renewal. This view is dangerous because it transforms ideology from a system of orientation into an instrument of closure. The philosophical task is to build a third position: ideology as a reflective, value-based and communicatively open system. Such a position corresponds to the requirements of contemporary civil society, where citizens must be united by basic constitutional principles but also free to discuss, interpret and develop them. The relationship between idea and ideology can be compared to the relationship between seed and cultivated field: the idea contains potential meaning, but ideology provides the cultural soil, institutional order and communicative channels through which that potential can either grow into a socially useful value or become distorted by dogmatism and manipulation. This metaphor also shows why the quality of ideological development depends on education. An idea that enters an uncritical consciousness may easily be simplified into prejudice; an idea that enters an educated and morally responsible consciousness becomes a source of constructive action. Therefore, universities, especially departments of philosophy, social sciences and religious studies, have a strategic role in forming a culture of conceptual precision, tolerance and critical patriotism. In the context of Uzbekistan, this is particularly significant because the country's modernization agenda includes both institutional reform and spiritual renewal. The Strategy "Uzbekistan-2030" identifies conditions for human potential, education, social welfare, rule of law and security as priority areas, while the Development Strategy for 2022-2026 highlights human dignity, civil society, justice, human capital, spiritual development and national interests. These orientations cannot be realized only through administrative orders; they require meaningful internalization by citizens. Ideological work in this constructive sense means

explaining reforms, connecting them with values, encouraging participation, preventing indifference and strengthening the moral basis of social trust. However, ideological work must not be confused with mechanical repetition of slogans. The most effective ideology is not the one that speaks the loudest, but the one that citizens recognize as truthful, just and connected with their lived experience. Habermas's idea of communicative rationality helps here: legitimacy grows when norms are not merely imposed, but can be publicly justified through reasoned communication. Similarly, Gramsci's concept of hegemony reminds us that stable social leadership depends on consent, education and cultural persuasion, not only on coercive power. Bourdieu's theory of symbolic power adds that ideological influence often works invisibly, through language, taste, prestige and everyday classifications. These theoretical insights indicate that the modern development of ideas and ideologies requires transparent communication, ethical authority and institutional trust. Another important issue is the relation between national ideology and universal values. A superficial approach may place them in opposition, as if national identity necessarily contradicts human rights or as if universal norms require the erasure of local traditions. A deeper philosophical view shows that national ideology becomes morally strong when it translates universal values into the living language of a particular culture, and universal values become socially effective when they are embodied in concrete institutions, customs and educational practices. The Constitution's guarantees of thought, speech, access to information and freedom of conscience create exactly this framework: citizens may hold different convictions, but those convictions must be exercised within the boundaries of constitutional order, public morality, the rights of others and peaceful coexistence. This is especially important for the field of religion and spirituality. Religious values can contribute to moral education, compassion and social solidarity, yet religious discourse becomes constructive only when it respects freedom of conscience, the secular legal order and the equality of citizens. The law on freedom of conscience and religious organizations, by defining legal guarantees and organizational rules, reflects the necessity of balancing individual belief, public order and institutional transparency. In a wider sense, this balance is the philosophical heart of ideological maturity: a society must protect belief without allowing coercion, protect criticism without allowing humiliation, and protect unity without suppressing diversity. Digital transformation further complicates this balance. Contemporary ideological processes operate through fragmented attention, emotional acceleration and algorithmic personalization. People often encounter ideas not as systematic arguments but as short signals, images and viral narratives. This produces a paradox: society has more information than ever, but not necessarily more understanding. The answer cannot be purely technical. It must include philosophical education, media ethics, civic responsibility and the formation of what may be called ideological immunity. Ideological immunity is not hostility to foreign ideas; it is the ability to evaluate any idea according to truthfulness, moral consequence, legal compatibility and social usefulness. In this regard, the formation of a mature ideological culture requires a new synthesis: national memory must be connected with scientific rationality, patriotism with openness, religious tolerance with secular legality, and digital literacy with ethical self-control. The article's findings also have implications for the terminology used in academic and public discourse. When "idea" is used vaguely, it loses analytical power; when "ideology" is used only as a negative label, society loses the opportunity to discuss its own value architecture honestly. Therefore, scholars should rehabilitate ideology as an object of critical science, not as propaganda. To study ideology scientifically means to ask: What values does it select? Whose interests does it express? Through which institutions is it reproduced? How does it treat dissent? Does it increase human dignity or reduce persons to instruments? Does it open the future or imprison society in myth? These questions transform ideological analysis into a discipline of civic responsibility. They also show that the development of ideas and ideologies cannot be separated from the moral quality of leadership, the credibility of institutions and the educational level of the population. Where institutions are trusted, ideology becomes a bridge between policy and consciousness; where trust is weak, even correct ideas may be perceived as empty rhetoric. Consequently, the theoretical basis of ideological development includes not only philosophy of ideas but also sociology of trust, political legitimacy, pedagogy, communication theory and ethics.

Conclusion

Conclusion. The research allows several general conclusions to be formulated. First, the concepts of idea and ideology are closely connected but not identical: an idea is a semantic-intellectual formation that expresses a value, goal or model of action, while ideology is a structured system of ideas that interprets reality, legitimizes collective orientations and directs social practice. Second, the formation of ideas and ideologies

obeys identifiable regularities, including historical necessity, social interest, value selection, institutional mediation, communicative reproduction, adaptation and competition. These regularities show that ideology is not an accidental product of rhetoric but a complex social phenomenon rooted in material life, cultural memory, moral expectations and institutional practice. Third, ideology manifests itself through cognitive, axiological, normative, emotional, symbolic, institutional and practical dimensions; therefore, its presence must be studied not only in political programs but also in education, media, religion, culture, digital communication and everyday behavior. Fourth, constructive ideology differs from destructive ideology by its relation to human dignity, truth, freedom, pluralism and responsibility. Constructive ideology strengthens social unity while preserving the space for thought, conscience and dialogue; destructive ideology manipulates identity, absolutizes partial interests and turns difference into hostility. Fifth, the digital information environment has made ideological processes faster and more unstable, which increases the need for media literacy, philosophical thinking and ideological immunity. Sixth, for contemporary Uzbekistan the theoretical study of ideas and ideology has direct practical importance because modernization, national development, spiritual renewal, interreligious tolerance, rule of law and civil society require not only institutional reform but also a mature culture of meaning. The national idea should be understood as a living, dialogical and constitutionally grounded system of shared values rather than as a closed dogma. It must integrate national identity with universal human principles, tradition with innovation, freedom with responsibility and stability with reform. The general scientific contribution of the article is that it proposes a layered understanding of ideology as a meaning-producing, value-selecting, institutionally mediated and communicatively reproduced system. Such an approach enables scholars and practitioners to evaluate ideological processes not by external slogans, but by their capacity to increase social trust, moral responsibility, civic participation and intellectual openness. Future research should develop empirical indicators for measuring ideological maturity, analyze digital ideological influence among youth, and compare national models of ideological education in societies that combine rapid modernization with preservation of cultural identity.

References

1. Plato. *The Republic*. Translated by B. Jowett. New York: Modern Library, 1991.
2. Marx, K., Engels, F. *The German Ideology*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976.
3. Mannheim, K. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 1936.
4. Ходжаев, Олимхон Шавкатович. "Индивидуальный подход в педагогическом процессе: основные положения и понятия." *СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ КОНЦЕПЦИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ И УПРАВЛЕНИЯ В СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИХ СИСТЕМАХ*. 2016.
5. Ходжыев О. S. ИТМОЙ ОНГ СТРУКТУРАСИДА Г 'ОYA VA МАFKУRАNING TUTGAN O 'RNI // *Oriental Art and Culture*. – 2025. – Т. 6. – №. 4. – С. 201-207.
6. Shavkatovich, Hodjajev Olimkhon. "THE NEED FOR INTENSIFICATION OF IDEOLOGICAL PROCESSES." *Евразийский Союз Ученых* 4-9 (73) (2020): 63-64.
7. Ходжаев, Олимхон Шавкатович. "К ВОПРОСУ О ПОНИМАНИИ СООТНОШЕНИЯ, СОДЕРЖАНИЯ И НАПРАВЛЕННОСТИ СОЦИАЛЬНОГО РАЗВИТИЯ СОЦИОЛОГИИ." *СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ КОНЦЕПЦИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ И УПРАВЛЕНИЯ В СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИХ СИСТЕМАХ*. 2016.
8. Ходжаев, О. Ш. "Социально-психологические аспекты специфики общения в Интернете." *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее*. 2016.
9. Ходжаев, О. Ш. "Организация самостоятельной работы по социологии." *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее*. 2016.
10. Gramsci, A. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
11. Althusser, L. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
12. Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
13. Habermas, J. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. 1. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
14. Bourdieu, P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

-
15. Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Official text, 2023 edition. Available through the constitutional portal of the Republic of Uzbekistan.
 16. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-158, September 11, 2023, On the Strategy 'Uzbekistan-2030'.
 17. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-60, January