

CLASSIFICATION OF BEHAVIOR MODELS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DESTRUCTIVE, ASOCIAL, AND ANTISOCIAL DIRECTIONS

Mamatnazarov Lazizbek Turakuliyevich

Independent Researcher at the Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract:	Keywords:
This article provides a rigorous theoretical and methodological analysis of deviant behavior models, focusing on the comparative differentiation of destructive, asocial, and antisocial trajectories within contemporary deviancology, sociology, criminology, and social psychology. Drawing upon classical and modern paradigms—including Durkheim and Merton’s anomie theories, Agnew’s General Strain Theory, Bandura’s Social Learning Theory, Lemert’s Labeling Theory, and Fromm’s psychological insights on destructiveness—the study synthesizes the genesis, motivational structures, directional vectors, and degrees of social danger associated with each behavioral model. The analysis establishes clear conceptual boundaries: destructive behavior centers on internal (auto) or external (hetero) harm; asocial behavior represents a passive rejection of societal norms through withdrawal and apathy; and antisocial behavior involves active, aggressive violations of legal and constitutional frameworks. Furthermore, the paper examines the dynamic interconnections and synergistic degeneration between these models, alongside their modern manifestations in the digital environment (e.g., cyberbullying, digital autism, darknet fraud). Ultimately, the study advocates for a transition from punitive-repressive models to targeted, institutional, and human-centric preventive strategies, emphasizing early detection, social integration, and multidimensional resocialization.	Deviant behavior, destructive behavior, asocial behavior, antisocial behavior, autodestructiveness, heterodestructiveness, General Strain Theory, labeling theory, retreatism, delinquency, resocialization, situational prevention.

Introduction

In modern deviancology, sociology, criminology, and social psychology, the deviation of individual behavior from societal norms and values (deviancy) stands as one of the most complex and multifaceted subjects of research. The extent to which human actions diverge from socio-legal and moral standards is not uniform; it encompasses a broad spectrum ranging from passive indifference to active destructiveness and criminal assault.

In this field, scientifically differentiating the three primary directions of deviant behavior—destructive, asocial, and antisocial models—and establishing the conceptual boundaries between them holds profound academic and practical significance.

Classification of behavior models and the comparative analysis of their destructive, asocial, and antisocial trajectories constitute one of the most fundamental theoretical and practical problems in contemporary deviancology, sociology, criminology, and social psychology. The deviation of human behavior from legal, moral, cultural, and institutional norms established in society manifests as a complex, multi-stage phenomenon characterized by varying degrees of destructiveness. The scientific differentiation of these deviant behavior models and the establishment of nuanced theoretical-conceptual boundaries between them serve as a foundational imperative not only for academic research, but also for developing institutional mechanisms for early detection, prevention, and resocialization of destructive actions.

Research Methodology and Approaches (Methods)

From a source-based and methodological standpoint, the classification of behavior models relies on the anomie theories of Émile Durkheim and Robert Merton, Robert Agnew's General Strain Theory, Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory, Edwin Lemert and Howard Becker's Labeling Theory, as well as the psychoanalytic teachings on destructiveness and aggression formulated by Erich Fromm and Sigmund Freud. This rigorous academic foundation systematically elucidates the genesis, motivational structure, degree of social danger, and directional vectors of destructive, asocial, and antisocial behavioral domains from a comparative-methodological perspective.

Results and Analysis (Results)

In deviancology, destructive behavior is interpreted as a set of singular or systematic actions of an individual aimed at inflicting damage upon themselves, their immediate material and spiritual environment, or the integrity of the social system as a whole. The primary differential characteristic of destructiveness lies in its division into internal (autodestructiveness) and external (heterodestructiveness) vectors. As Erich Fromm emphasized in his fundamental work *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, destructiveness is not merely a biological instinct or reaction, but rather a "responsive reaction" and the product of a neurotic social deformation that arises when an individual's existential needs (freedom, self-expression, influencing one's environment) are blocked [1, p. 214].

Within the taxonomy of behavioral models, autodestructive behavior directs the vector of harm directly toward the individual's own physical, psychological, and social subjectivity. This category encompasses suicidal behavior, parasuicide, automutilation (self-harm), chronic addictions (substance abuse, substance dependence, alcoholism), as well as extreme and life-threatening behavioral patterns (pathological engagement in extreme sports, autoaggression). As Émile Durkheim demonstrated in his classic sociological study *Suicide*, self-harming acts are not isolated psychological phenomena, but rather the result of a breakdown in social integration and moral regulation between society and the individual (egoistic, anomic, and altruistic suicide) [2, p. 158].

In the heterodestructive behavioral form, the destructive vector is directed outward toward the external world-surrounding individuals, the natural environment, material objects, and cultural

values. Prominent manifestations of this vector include vandalism, environmental crimes, destruction of property, sadistic relationships, as well as destructive aggression within the digital domain (cyberbullying, hating, trolling). According to Robert Agnew's General Strain Theory, when an individual experiences three primary types of strain in life-the loss of positive stimuli, exposure to negative or threatening factors, and a perceived gap between aspirations and actual opportunities-they enter a state of severe negative emotion (anger, frustration), which subsequently manifests through a destructive outbreak [3, p. 320].

Asocial behavior fundamentally diverges from destructive behavior in both its directional orientation and the nature of its social danger. Asociality represents a passive rejection of established moral, aesthetic, cultural, and temporal norms in society, an intentional or involuntary withdrawal from social relations, and the adoption of a passive, apathetic lifestyle. The defining feature of the asocial behavior model is that it does not exert direct, aggressive physical violence against other individuals or the legal infrastructure of society; rather, it manifests as a refusal to fulfill one's social obligations and normative expectations as a member of society.

The classification of asocial behavior includes vagrancy, pauperism, social apathy and isolationism, marginal and parasitic lifestyles, as well as persistent avoidance of employment and education (the hikikomori phenomenon, NEET youth). In his theory of structural anomie, Robert Merton categorizes asocial behavior as a retreatist mode of adaptation. According to Merton, retreatists simultaneously reject both the culturally prescribed goals of society (wealth, career, social status) and the legitimate institutional means of achieving them (labor, education) [4, p. 245]. They reside "within" society, yet spiritually and functionally disengage from being active participants in it.

The phenomenological sociology of Alfred Schütz carries significant methodological relevance in understanding the formation of asocial models. As Schütz noted, when the "intersubjective meanings" and routine stocks of knowledge within an individual's lifeworld erode, the person loses their social role and adopts an anonymous behavioral strategy [5, p. 128]. An asocial individual does not engage in active conflict with society; rather, they engage in escapism from its moral and social demands. This withdrawal may be spatial (moving to urban peripheries or marginal communities) or mental (retreating into virtual worlds or closed subcultures).

Antisocial (delinquent and criminal) behavior constitutes the most severe, socially dangerous, and legally punishable tier of the classification matrix. Antisociality involves an overt, aggressive, and deliberate challenge to legal norms, the legislative system, and the honor, dignity, property, and lives of citizens. While asociality is a passive rejection of societal norms, antisociality actively violates those norms through force, fraud, or coercion.

The taxonomy of antisocial behavior spans delinquency (minor infractions, disorderly conduct, public disturbance) and criminality (serious crimes: theft, robbery, homicide, fraud, cybercrime, mass riots). It should be noted that antisocial behavior invariably incurs the application of constitutional, administrative, and penal sanctions by the state. According to Edwin Sutherland's Differential Association Theory, antisocial and criminal behaviors are not biologically or genetically inherited; rather, they are learned within micro-social environments

through intensive interaction with criminal or deviant groups, where individuals acquire destructive values, criminal techniques, and rationalizations for their actions [6, p. 142].

Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory and cognitive modeling concept also occupy a central position in explaining the development of antisocial behavior. As Bandura demonstrated through his Bobo Doll experiments, when individuals (particularly youth and children) observe aggression and antisocial conduct being rewarded or leading to success in their external environment, media, or adult behavior, these antisocial models become imprinted onto their cognitive schemes and subsequently enacted [7, p. 185].

A comparative-methodological analysis of these three behavioral models enables the identification of their similarities, fundamental distinctions, and mechanisms of destructive convergence (inter-model transition).

Discussion

For a comprehensive comparative analysis, it is necessary to evaluate these models across several core analytical parameters:

First, the directional vector and object. In destructive behavior, the object is either the self (auto) or the surrounding material/spiritual environment (hetero). In asocial behavior, there is no explicitly targeted aggressive object; instead, the object becomes the individual's internal environment through the severance of social ties and withdrawal from social roles. In antisocial behavior, the object is always defined, external, and social in nature: the rights of citizens, state laws, public order, and societal security.

Second, attitude toward norms and motivation. A destructive individual shatters norms while in a state of emotional frustration or psychopathological agitation. An asocial individual disregards norms through indifference and apathy; they do not actively combat norms, but escape from them. Conversely, an antisocial individual consciously and actively violates or ignores norms to satisfy personal material, physical, primary, or transient interests.

Third, the degree of social danger and form of institutional response. The social danger of asocial behavior is indirect, primarily manifesting as the depletion of social capital and human resources, which is met with moral-communal disapproval (public opinion, neighborhood oversight). Destructive behavior carries a moderate to severe level of danger, requiring medical, psychological, and social rehabilitation. Antisocial behavior poses the highest level of social danger, triggering rigorous administrative and criminal sanctions, legal coercion, and penal isolation enforced by the state.

Fourth, genetic degeneration and transformation (synergy) of the models. It is critical to emphasize that these three models do not exist as isolated, static states. Rather, a dynamic genetic interplay exists among them. Prolonged asocial behavior (e.g., long-term social isolation and unemployment) induces deep psychological frustration and anomie within an individual. Over time, this frustration degenerates into autodestructiveness (substance abuse, addiction) or heterodestructiveness. To satisfy their addictions or basic needs, a person in a destructive state ultimately transitions into the antisocial tier-engaging in theft, fraud, and criminal acts. Edwin Lemert explains this trajectory through the concepts of primary and

secondary deviance within his labeling framework [8, p. 112]. Once labeled as a "deviant" by society for an initial asocial or destructive act, the individual faces social exclusion and is compelled to join criminal and antisocial subcultures as a self-defense mechanism.

Under contemporary conditions of digital transformation and globalization, a virtual realization of these three behavioral models is taking place. In the information space, asociality manifests as "digital autism" and virtual escapism; destructiveness re-emerges as cyberdestructiveness, cyberbullying, and hidoka-destruction; while antisociality transmutes into cybercrime, darknet fraud, and online recruitment. As Manuel Castells noted, digital networks accelerate the transformation of behavioral models, imparting a systemic, anonymous, and mass character to destructive trajectories [9, p. 205].

Regarding asocial behavioral models, the primary strategic priority lies in social subsidiarity, integration, and the creation of legitimate mobility channels. For destructive behavioral models (auto- and heterodestructiveness), social-psychological diagnostics, mediation, and psycho-emotional rehabilitation mechanisms must be deployed. Early detection of suicidal risks, domestic disputes, and emotional deprivation by social workers and community specialists prevents destructive outbursts. For antisocial behavioral models, digitizing situational prevention, proactive oversight, and resocialization measures are applied. Specialized prevention officers and digital infrastructure (video analytics, intelligent monitoring) eliminate the anonymity and opportunity structure for delinquent acts, while enrolling offenders into targeted moral and social rehabilitation programs.

Conclusion

The taxonomy of behavior models across destructive, asocial, and antisocial trajectories, alongside their comparative analysis, serves as a methodological foundation for maintaining social order and ontological security in society. Understanding the dynamic transition from passive, isolated forms of deviance (asociality) to active, socially dangerous criminal acts (antisociality) requires shifting away from purely punitive-repressive measures toward implementing targeted social-psychological, economic, and institutional prevention mechanisms.

References:

1. Фромм Э. Анатомия человеческой деструктивности. – Москва: АСТ, 2017. – 624 с.
2. Дюркгейм Э. Самоубийство: Социологический этюд. – Москва: Мысль, 1994. – 399 с.
3. Agnew R. Pressured into Crime: An Overview of General Strain Theory. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. – 256 p.
4. Мертон Р. К. Социальная теория и социальная структура. – Москва: АСТ, 2006. – 880 с.
5. Шутц А. Смысловая структура повседневного мира: очерки по феноменологической социологии. – Москва: Институт Фонда «Общественное мнение», 2003. – 336 с.
6. Сатерленд Э. Х. Практическое значение теории дифференциальной ассоциации // Социология преступности. – Москва: Прогресс, 1966. – С. 138–149.

-
7. Бандура А. Теория социального научения. – Санкт-Петербург: Евразия, 2000. – 320 с.
 8. Лемерт Э. Социальная патология: концепция первичной и вторичной девиации. – Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 2016. – 256 с.
 9. Кастельс М. Информационная эпоха: экономика, общество и культура. – Москва: ГУ ВШЭ, 2000. – 608 с.