



INSTITUTIONAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MANAGING SPIRITUAL PROCESSES

Oripov Shuxratjon Orip

Independent Researcher at the Institute for Socio-Spiritual Research

Under the Republican Center for Spirituality and Enlightenment

+99895 1176006,

shuxrat.orif@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes in society. Spiritual processes are interpreted as a complex social phenomenon associated with the formation of social consciousness, value systems, and moral norms. The study highlights the role of state and public institutions as well as the impact of modern technologies in the context of informatization and digital transformation. It argues that effective management of spiritual processes requires harmonizing technological efficiency with humanistic values and moral responsibility. The article concludes that institutional stability and technological coherence are essential conditions for creating a healthy spiritual environment in society.

Keywords: Spiritual processes, management, institutional foundations, technological foundations, social consciousness, digital transformation, spiritual environment.

Introduction

In the context of the development of modern society, spiritual processes are increasingly emerging as one of the important factors of social stability, national progress, and the development of human capital. The acceleration of globalization, informatization, and digital transformation processes directly affects the spiritual environment of society, fundamentally transforming the mechanisms of formation of the system of values, social consciousness, and moral norms. Under such conditions, spiritual processes are no longer regarded as



phenomena that occur spontaneously, but rather as complex social systems that require conscious management, coordination, and strategic direction.

The issue of managing spiritual processes in society is primarily related to identifying the institutional foundations of these processes and providing them with mechanisms that ensure their effective functioning. State and public institutions, the system of education and upbringing, the sphere of mass communication, as well as mechanisms of social cooperation play a significant role in the formation and development of spiritual processes. At the same time, modern technologies expand the scope of activity of these institutions and significantly transform the forms and methods of spiritual influence. Information technologies, digital platforms, and network communications not only facilitate the rapid dissemination of spiritual ideas and values, but also make the issue of managing their content and direction an increasingly relevant challenge.

From this perspective, the scientific analysis of the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes represents one of the important theoretical and practical tasks of the present day. In this process, it is essential to harmonize technological efficiency with humanism, moral responsibility, and social interests. Otherwise, technological tools may not contribute to the improvement of spiritual processes; instead, they may increase the risk of simplifying them, making them superficial, or turning them into instruments of manipulation. This article examines the management of spiritual processes in the context of the interaction between the institutional structures of social development and modern technological opportunities. The study aims to interpret the management of spiritual processes not merely as an organizational and practical activity, but as a complex social phenomenon formed through the interaction of social consciousness, value systems, and the technological environment.

Literature Review

In the context of modern societal development, spiritual processes should not be regarded as a collection of random phenomena, but rather as a complex, multilayered, and increasingly technologized system that emerges as an important object of social governance. The management of these processes primarily requires a scientifically grounded understanding of the interconnection between



institutions (the state, education, culture, the mahalla, and mass media) and technologies (mechanisms of moral regulation, communication, education, and information-ideological influence). From this perspective, M. Mamatov interprets spiritual development at a strategic level and directly associates it with the education of a harmoniously developed generation, emphasizing that “the principles of spiritual development represent a priority social mechanism that encompasses all spheres of social life and ensures the comprehensive development of the individual.” The strength of this approach lies in the fact that the author considers spiritual processes not as a passive cultural state, but as an actively managed social process. However, from a critical standpoint, the technological components within Mamatov’s concept (specific instruments and algorithms) remain at a general level and their practical modeling is not sufficiently elaborated.

The issue of a technological approach to stabilizing the spiritual environment is examined more specifically by I. A. Nurmatova. She writes: “Stabilizing the spiritual environment of society is impossible without technologies of moral regulation, since norms themselves serve as the main mechanism regulating interpersonal relations.” This idea substantiates the priority of a normative-technological approach in the management of spiritual processes. At the same time, from a critical perspective, the author does not sufficiently discuss the potential risk that excessive normative regulation may limit creative freedom and spiritual diversity.

B. A. Muqimov emphasizes that the institutional foundations of spiritual processes are closely connected with the personality of the leader and the culture of governance. According to him, “the moral character of a leader is the main factor shaping the ethical environment in the process of governance.” This view prioritizes the personal spiritual potential of the management subject over technological mechanisms. However, from a scholarly critical standpoint, such a position risks elevating the individual factor to an absolute level while relegating the role of systemic institutions and digital technologies to a secondary position.

J. S. Iymanov’s approach is significant in addressing the issue of regional and territorial stability of spiritual processes. He states that “a spiritually stable environment is formed through the harmony of institutional cooperation and socio-cultural technologies.” The advantage of this approach lies in interpreting



technologies not merely as tools, but as factors strengthening regional identity and social solidarity. Nevertheless, from a critical perspective, the author addresses the negative transformational effects of technologies (such as information manipulation and virtual moral degradation) only within a limited framework.

J. A. Jabborov provides a profound analysis of needs as the internal driving force of spiritual processes. He argues that “the growth of spiritual needs is an internal source of societal development and is dialectically interconnected with technological progress.” The strength of this view lies in substantiating spirituality not only as a result of external governance but also as an internal motivational process. However, from a scientific critical perspective, the contradictions between needs and technologies (such as consumerism and virtual dependency) are not sufficiently conceptualized.

Overall, the analysis demonstrates that the management of spiritual processes cannot be effective without the harmony of institutional and technological foundations. Institutions provide stability and legitimacy to spiritual processes, while technologies impart dynamism and effectiveness. However, the dominance of technologies may lead to the simplification of spiritual content, while the absolute dominance of institutions may strengthen formalism. Therefore, under contemporary conditions, managing spiritual processes requires a dialectical, flexible, and scientifically grounded techno-institutional model.

The issue of the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes emerges as a profound socio-philosophical problem in modern society, requiring an understanding of the complex interaction between social consciousness, moral norms, and digital tools. Spiritual processes are no longer shaped solely through traditional institutions of education, culture, and ideology, but also through algorithmic governance, platform-based communication, and digital infrastructures. Consequently, their management should be analyzed as a multilayered process closely connected not only with normative-institutional mechanisms but also with technological design and information architecture.

From an institutional perspective, D. North interprets mechanisms regulating spiritual processes as “rules of the game,” emphasizing that institutions are “a set of formal and informal constraints that structure human interaction.” This approach demonstrates that in managing spiritual processes, the role of institutions extends beyond laws and organizations to include moral habits, social



expectations, and cultural norms as essential governance resources. However, in the digital environment these “rules” are increasingly defined by technological protocols and platform policies, pushing traditional institutional sources of moral norms into the background.

Within the framework of new institutionalism, J. March and J. Olsen argue that “institutions are not only structures that constrain interests but also systems that produce meaning.” This idea reveals the symbolic and cognitive dimensions of managing spiritual processes: institutions provide individuals with ready-made answers to the question of how one should live. In conditions of technological governance, such meanings are increasingly transmitted through digital interfaces, ratings, and visual indicators. As a result, the governance of spiritual processes faces a form of hidden normativity implemented not through institutions but through design and technical standards.

In analyzing technological foundations, L. Lessig’s well-known thesis that “code regulates in a way similar to law” is of particular importance. He argues that “in the digital environment behavior is regulated not only by legal norms but also by technological architecture.” This approach fundamentally transforms the issue of managing spiritual processes: moral choices are now formed not only through conscious decision-making but also within the scope of actions permitted or restricted by platforms. From this perspective, technological design becomes a hidden regulator of spiritual processes, partially assuming the traditional educational functions of institutions.

In the critique of algorithmic governance, A. Rouvroy and T. Berns describe algorithmic domination as “the practice of governing subjects based on pre-calculated behavioral models,” emphasizing that “algorithmic rationality bypasses moral deliberation.” This idea reveals the primary risk in managing spiritual processes through technology: decisions and values are shaped not through open discussion and reflection but through statistical probabilities and automated recommendations. As a result, spiritual processes may become subordinated to technological efficiency rather than institutional legitimacy.

L. Winner also critically examines the normative nature of technology, arguing that “artifacts themselves can possess political and moral content.” This perspective demonstrates that the technological foundations of managing spiritual processes are not neutral: the chosen technology indirectly determines which



values become dominant in society. Therefore, technological choice itself should be evaluated as an ethical decision.

In the conditions of the information society, Y. Benkler analyzes the communicative environment and writes that “digital networks create decentralized yet powerful mechanisms for shaping social norms.” This approach highlights the role of platforms, communities, and algorithmic filters alongside state and formal institutions in managing spiritual processes. Consequently, governance becomes decentralized, yet a new spiritual environment emerges in which responsibility remains ambiguous.

The issue of the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes demonstrates that spirituality in modern society is not a spontaneous phenomenon but a complex process directed through social structures, information flows, and technological tools. Today, spiritual values, moral norms, and social ideals are shaped not only through education, culture, or traditional ideological institutions, but also through digital platforms, artificial intelligence-based recommendation systems, media algorithms, and communicative technologies. Therefore, the management of spiritual processes must be analyzed not only through normative-legal or organizational approaches but also by taking into account the internal logic and ethical consequences of the technological environment.

From a socio-philosophical perspective, P. Berger and T. Luckmann explain the mechanism of institutionalization of spiritual processes, arguing that “social reality stabilizes through institutions that possess external coercive power.” This idea highlights the central role of institutions in managing spiritual processes: moral values do not remain at the level of personal belief but become consolidated in the form of social norms and expectations. However, within the digital environment this process of institutionalization increasingly acquires an accelerated and simplified form, where visual images and short fragments of information gradually replace deep spiritual reflection.

In cultural governance theory, A. Giddens emphasizes the reflexive character of institutional systems, writing that “in modern society social practices are constantly reconsidered on the basis of information.” This approach reveals the dynamic nature of managing spiritual processes: institutions are no longer rigid and unchanging norms but systems that evolve under the influence of



technological information flows. From this perspective, managing spiritual processes requires not only stability but also adaptability; however, such adaptability should not lead to the erosion of moral principles.

In analyzing technological foundations, M. Castells examines the structural characteristics of the information society and argues that “information flows are becoming the main source of power and meaning production in modern society.” This idea demonstrates the direct impact of technologies on the governance of spiritual processes: those who control information also gain the ability to shape values and spiritual orientations. However, if this process becomes detached from democratic oversight and ethical responsibility, spiritual governance may acquire a manipulative character.

M. McLuhan addresses the issue of media and technological governance through his famous thesis that “the medium is the message,” emphasizing that “the form of communication transforms social consciousness no less than the content itself.” This view demonstrates that technological tools in managing spiritual processes are not neutral. In a rapid and fragmented digital communication environment, deep ethical reflection and contemplation gradually give way to emotional reactions and simplified evaluations.

In his critique of technological rationality, J. Habermas warns that “when instrumental reason colonizes the lifeworld, the possibilities of moral communication are narrowed.” This position highlights the risk of accepting technological efficiency as the absolute criterion in managing spiritual processes. If governance is oriented solely toward technical outcomes, spiritual processes may lose their humanistic and dialogical essence.

In contemporary research on digital ethics, V. Mayer-Schönberger criticizes data-driven governance, arguing that “big data may limit moral choice by predicting behavior.” This approach underscores the relevance of human freedom and moral choice in managing spiritual processes through technologies. Algorithmic recommendations may not necessarily strengthen an individual’s moral reflection but may instead subordinate it to automated decision-making.

Research Methodology

This study aims to analyze the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes from a socio-philosophical perspective, interpreting



spiritual processes as an integral and dynamic component of societal development. The research methodology is based on a comprehensive and integrative approach and seeks to reveal the interrelations between spiritual processes, governance institutions, and modern technologies as a unified scientific system. In this context, spiritual processes are examined not as static phenomena, but as social processes that continuously evolve under the influence of social needs, historical conditions, and the technological environment.

Within the study, the systems approach serves as the primary methodological foundation, enabling the analysis of the management of spiritual processes as a complex set of relationships among institutions, normative mechanisms, technological tools, and social consciousness. This approach helps to identify the role of state and public institutions in the formation and governance of spiritual processes, their functional responsibilities, and their interaction with technological infrastructure. Functional analysis, in turn, is directed at revealing the role of managing spiritual processes in strengthening social stability, social trust, and moral norms.

In addition, the research employs socio-philosophical analysis and theoretical generalization methods to substantiate the conceptual foundations of managing spiritual processes, as well as their normative-ethical and institutional dimensions. Through a comparative approach, the characteristics of managing spiritual processes in different governance models and technological practices are comparatively analyzed, allowing the identification of their effectiveness and limitations. This method makes it possible to distinguish both universal and specific features in the management of spiritual processes.

A reflexive approach also occupies an important place in the research methodology, as it enables the analysis of the moral responsibility of governance actors, the understanding of the social and ethical consequences of their decisions, and the formation of a conscious and responsible stance in the use of technological tools. Furthermore, the normative-analytical method is applied to scientifically examine the balance between ethical norms, social interests, and technological opportunities that should guide the management of spiritual processes.

Overall, this methodological framework makes it possible to analyze the management of spiritual processes not merely as a separate organizational activity, but as a complex social phenomenon formed through the interaction of



social consciousness, institutional systems, and the technological environment. This provides a solid theoretical and methodological foundation for a deeper understanding of the institutional and technological bases of managing spiritual processes and for scientifically substantiating their role in ensuring the sustainable development of society.

Analysis and Results

The conducted theoretical and methodological analysis demonstrates that spiritual processes in the development of modern society should not be considered a collection of spontaneous or random phenomena. Rather, they appear as a complex social system that is managed, directed, and evaluated through specific institutional structures and technological mechanisms. The formation of spiritual processes as an object of governance emerges through the dialectical relationship between their internal essence—values, beliefs, moral norms, and social consciousness—and external factors such as political institutions, the education system, the information environment, and communication technologies. As a result, spirituality is interpreted not merely as a cultural or moral condition but as a strategic resource that ensures social stability.

The analysis reveals that institutional factors ensure normativity, legitimacy, and continuity in the governance of spiritual processes. The state, education, culture, the mahalla, the family, and mass media serve as the social space and organizational foundation for spiritual processes. However, these institutions alone do not possess sufficient influence. Their effectiveness becomes evident only when they are integrated with technologies of spiritual governance. In this regard, the results of the analysis indicate that technological support for institutional governance plays a decisive role in ensuring the continuity and stability of spiritual processes.

From the perspective of a technological approach, the analysis shows that ethical regulation, educational modeling, communicative influence, information-ideological management, and digital tools are emerging as important instruments in working with spiritual processes. These technologies make it possible to integrate spiritual values into public consciousness, renew them, and adapt them to changing conditions. Consequently, spiritual processes transform from a static condition into a dynamic system capable of rapidly adapting to social changes. At



the same time, the analysis also reveals the ambivalent nature of technologies: while they can enhance the spiritual environment, when applied incorrectly or without proper control they may lead to simplification, standardization, and the strengthening of manipulative influence.

The research findings indicate that the most effective model for managing spiritual processes is based on the dialectical unity of institutional stability and technological adaptability. Institutions provide spiritual processes with historical continuity and social trust, while technologies adapt them to contemporary conditions and increase their effectiveness. As a result of this interaction, spiritual needs, social behavior, and value systems become processes that can be managed and predicted. Thus, spiritual processes are not a passive product of social development but rather a social phenomenon that is consciously shaped and strategically directed.

The analysis also demonstrates that the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes cannot achieve full effectiveness without the human factor. Any technology or institutional mechanism yields real results only when it is harmonized with the individual's internal spiritual needs, motivations, and conscious activity. Therefore, the system of managing spiritual processes should be oriented toward forming the individual not as a passive object but as an active subject. Through this approach, spiritual processes become an important mechanism ensuring social stability, moral balance, and the long-term development of society.

In general, the analysis and the results obtained confirm that the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes constitute an integral component of social development in modern society. Through the scientific organization and technologization of these processes, spirituality becomes a manageable, stable, and strategically oriented resource within social life.

The issue of the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes in modern society demonstrates that the formation of social consciousness, value systems, and moral norms is now carried out not only through traditional cultural and educational institutions but also through complex organizational mechanisms and digital information technologies. Therefore, the governance of spiritual processes should be understood not as a natural or spontaneous phenomenon, but as a socially organized process guided by



normative foundations and technological tools. Particularly under conditions of globalization and digital civilization, the production, dissemination, and consolidation of spiritual values have become the result of complex interactions between institutions and technologies.

Within the framework of the institutional approach, T. Parsons emphasizes the continuous reproduction of values and norms through institutions as a key factor ensuring social stability, arguing that “social systems can function stably only when they are based on normative consensus.” This idea reveals the legitimizing role of institutions in managing spiritual processes: education, religion, law, culture, and mass communication systems transmit normative models of “how one should live” to members of society. However, under contemporary conditions the influence of these institutions is increasingly intertwined with technological tools, and traditional institutional mechanisms are entering into competition with the digital environment.

The institutional governance of spiritual processes is also reflected in M. Weber’s concept of rationalization. Weber notes that in modern society institutions increasingly operate through formal rules and bureaucratic mechanisms, warning that “rational governance strengthens purposiveness but may lead to the weakening of spiritual meaning.” This perspective highlights the risk of relying solely on organizational efficiency in managing spiritual processes. If institutions become limited to technical rationality, spiritual values may transform into formal norms that are not internalized as genuine moral beliefs.

In analyzing technological foundations, M. Castells emphasizes that in the information society “processes of power and meaning production are carried out through information networks.” This view demonstrates how strongly the governance of spiritual processes has become connected to information flows and digital platforms. Social networks, media algorithms, and digital content have the capacity to shape moral evaluations, social ideals, and value systems rapidly and on a large scale, often surpassing the slower and gradual mechanisms of traditional institutional influence.

The normative nature of technology is further explained by M. Foucault through the relationship between knowledge and power, arguing that “every system of knowledge produces and reinforces a particular social order.” This perspective reveals the direct influence of technological governance on spiritual processes:



digital surveillance, rating systems, and monitoring mechanisms not only control human behavior but also indirectly define moral norms. As a result, the governance of spiritual processes increasingly takes the form of hidden technological discipline rather than open education and ideological persuasion. S. Zuboff critically analyzes the ethical consequences of the digital environment, arguing that “systems of digital surveillance create the risk of limiting moral freedom by predicting and directing human behavior.” This approach highlights the primary danger in governing spiritual processes through technology: if technological tools operate beyond institutional and public control, spiritual values may become the product of algorithmic guidance rather than conscious moral choice.

At the same time, Y. Benkler emphasizes the positive possibilities of the digital environment, stating that “networked communication enables citizens to actively participate in moral and ethical discussions.” This view suggests that technologies in managing spiritual processes can function not only as instruments of control but also as mechanisms that strengthen open dialogue and social reflection. Thus, the moral implications of technological foundations depend directly on the institutional and normative context in which they are applied.

Conclusion/Recommendations

The institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes in modern society appear as a complex mechanism that is increasingly implemented not through open normative control, but through hidden, reflexive, and technological means. While institutions provide spiritual norms with historical legitimacy and social stability, technologies create new and rapid ways of integrating these norms into everyday behavior. However, if this process is not harmonized with ethical reflection, social dialogue, and institutional responsibility, spiritual processes may acquire an automated and manipulative character. Therefore, the governance of spiritual processes requires both technological design and institutional policy to be carried out under philosophical and ethical oversight.

The conducted scientific analysis demonstrates that in the conditions of modern society, the governance of spiritual processes is not an independent or secondary sphere. Rather, it emerges as an important institutional-technological system that



determines strategic directions of social development and ensures social stability and cohesion. Spiritual processes are not phenomena that occur spontaneously in social life; they represent complex social processes that require purposeful, scientifically grounded, and technologically supported governance. In this sense, the effective management of spiritual processes is achieved through the dialectical interaction of institutions, technologies, and the human factor.

Institutional foundations provide spiritual processes with stability, continuity, and social legitimacy, while technological foundations enable their renewal, adaptation to contemporary conditions, and increased effectiveness. However, the predominance of one of these factors should not negate the role of the other. Excessive formalization of institutions may lead to the bureaucratization of spiritual processes, while the absolutization of technologies may result in the simplification and standardization of spiritual content. Therefore, an effective governance model should be based on maintaining a balance between institutional stability and technological adaptability.

Based on the research findings, it is appropriate to propose the following scientific and practical recommendations. First, the activities of state, educational, cultural, and public institutions in managing spiritual processes should be coordinated on the basis of a unified conceptual platform. Such a platform would ensure that spiritual policy becomes systematic and long-term rather than fragmented. Second, in working with spiritual processes, technologies of ethical regulation, communication, and education should be developed on a scientific basis and adapted to regional and social characteristics. Third, in the use of digital and information technologies, spiritual security, social responsibility, and ethical standards should be established as fundamental principles.

In addition, special attention should be given to the central role of the human factor in managing spiritual processes. Any institutional or technological mechanism can produce effective results only when it is harmonized with the individual's internal spiritual needs, conscious activity, and moral responsibility. Therefore, technologies of spiritual governance should be oriented toward shaping individuals not as passive recipients but as active participants.

In general, improving the institutional and technological foundations of managing spiritual processes represents an important factor in strengthening spiritual stability in society, increasing social trust, and contributing to strategic



development. On the basis of this approach, spirituality can become not merely an additional element of social development but a leading, manageable, and strategically oriented resource of societal progress.

References:

1. Mamatov M. Yangilanayotgan O‘zbekistonning ma’naviy taraqqiyot tamoyillari – barkamol avlodni tarbiyalash omili. – Toshkent, 2023. – 16-18-betlar.
2. Nurmatova I.A. Jamiyat ma’naviy muhitini barqarorlashtirishda axloqiy me’yorlashtirish texnologiyalari. – Andijon, 2023. – 5-7-betlar.
3. Muqimov B.A. Boshqaruvda rahbar ma’naviy qiyofasining axloqiy asoslari. – Toshkent, 2014. – 14-16-betlar.
4. Iymanov J.S. Markaziy Osiyoda ma’naviy barqaror muhit istiqbollari: muammo va yechimlar. – Andijon, 2023. – 9-11-betlar.
5. Jabborov J.A. Ma’naviy ehtiyojlar yuksalishi jamiyat rivojlanishining muhim omili sifatida. – Samarqand, 2023. – 7-9-betlar.
6. North D. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. — 1–20-betlar.
7. March J., Olsen J. Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics. — New York: Free Press, 1989. — 25–45-betlar.
8. Lessig L. Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace. — New York: Basic Books, 1999. — 1–30-betlar.
9. Rouvroy A., Berns T. Algorithmic Governmentality and Prospects of Emancipation. — Réseaux, 2013. — 1–20-betlar.
10. Winner L. The Whale and the Reactor: A Search for Limits in an Age of High Technology. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. — 19–39-betlar.
11. Benkler Y. The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom. — New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. — 200–230-betlar.
12. Berger P., Luckmann T. The Social Construction of Reality. — New York: Anchor Books, 1966. — 65–90-betlar.
13. Giddens A. The Consequences of Modernity. — Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990. — 30–60-betlar.



14. Castells M. *The Power of Identity*. — Oxford: Blackwell, 1997. — 1–30-betlar.
15. McLuhan M. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. — New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964. — 1–25-betlar.
16. Habermas J. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. 2. — Boston: Beacon Press, 1987. — 180–210-betlar.
17. Mayer-Schönberger V. *Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in the Digital Age*. — Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009. — 140–180-betlar.
18. Parsons T. *The Social System*. — London: Routledge, 1951. — 30–60-betlar.
19. Weber M. *Economy and Society*. — Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978. — 950–1020-betlar.
20. Castells M. *The Rise of the Network Society*. — Oxford: Blackwell, 2010. — 450–500-betlar.
21. Foucault M. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. — New York: Pantheon Books, 1977. — 1–40-betlar.
22. Zuboff S. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. — New York: PublicAffairs, 2019. — 350–400-betlar.
23. Benkler Y. *The Wealth of Networks*. — New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. — 250–300-betlar.
24. Searle J. *The Construction of Social Reality*. — New York: Free Press, 1995. — 30–55-betlar.
25. Scott J. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. — New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998. — 1–35-betlar.
26. Feenberg A. *Critical Theory of Technology*. — New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. — 70–100-betlar.
27. van Dijck J., Poell T., de Waal M. *The Platform Society*. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. — 35–60-betlar.
28. Deleuze G. “Postscript on the Societies of Control.” — October, 1992. — 1–7-betlar.
29. Nissenbaum H. *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life*. — Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010. — 120–150-betlar.
30. Pettit P. *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. — 15–40-betlar.



31. Durkheim É. Moral Education. — New York: Free Press, 1961. — 30–60-betlar.
32. Foucault M. Security, Territory, Population. — New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. — 90–120-betlar.
33. Stiegler B. Technics and Time. Vol. 1. — Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. — 80–120-betlar.
34. Ellul J. The Technological Society. — New York: Vintage Books, 1964. — 120–160-betlar.
35. Floridi L. The Ethics of Information. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. — 30–70-betlar.
36. Luhmann N. Social Systems. — Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. — 230–270-betlar.
37. Morozov E. To Save Everything, Click Here. — New York: PublicAffairs, 2013. — 40–80-betlar.
38. Bourdieu P. Outline of a Theory of Practice. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. — 65–90-betlar.
39. Greenfield A. Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life. — London: Verso, 2017. — 45–75-betlar.
40. Capurro R. Information Ethics: Its Place in the History of Ethics. — Karlsruhe: Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie, 2010. — 25–50-betlar.
41. Crouch C. Post-Democracy. — Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004. — 1–30-betlar.
42. Alexander J. The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. — 35–60-betlar.