

Transformation Of Political Culture in The Context of Digital Globalization: Ideosphere, Algorithmic Influence, And Civic Agency

Jo'raqulov Furqat Noryigitovich

Doctor of Political Sciences (DSc), Professor, International Islamic Studies Academy of Uzbekistan

Received: 10 May 2026; **Accepted:** 04 June 2026; **Published:** 30 June 2026

Abstract: This article provides a scientific and theoretical analysis of the changes occurring in the content, formation mechanisms, and functional structure of political culture in the context of digital globalization. Political culture is interpreted as an axiological-cognitive system linking the ideosphere of society, the communicative space, and civic behaviour. The influence of digital platforms, algorithmic filtering, and personalized information flows on political perception, trust, and civic agency is examined. The concept of "algorithmically mediated political culture" is substantiated, and axiological, informational, and institutional approaches to ensuring its stability are proposed.

Keywords: Political culture, digital globalization, ideosphere, algorithmic mediation, political communication, civic agency, political trust, media literacy, networked participation.

Introduction: The digital communication environment of the twenty-first century is transforming not only the outward forms of political processes but also the ways in which citizens understand politics, imagine the state and society, establish criteria of trust, and participate in public life. For this reason, the study of political culture solely as a historically established complex of values, customs, and norms of political behaviour is no longer sufficient to explain the complexity of contemporary developments. In the digital space, political meaning is no longer transmitted in a single direction through state institutions, political parties, or traditional mass media. It is continuously produced, interpreted, redistributed, and popularized through platforms, blogs, messaging applications, recommendation systems, artificial intelligence tools, and interactions among users.

In the classical interpretation of political culture, one of the principal criteria is the internalization of the political system in the knowledge, emotions, and evaluations of the population. This approach retains its theoretical importance in the digital era; however, a new intermediary has entered the process through

which the political system is internalized: the algorithmic communication environment. Before encountering political reality directly, an individual receives a version of it that has been selected, visualized, emotionally framed, and adapted to personal interests by a platform. Consequently, alongside the family, education system, local community, workplace, and traditional mass media, digital platforms have begun to function as autonomous institutions of political socialization.

METHODOLOGY

The article employs systemic, structural-functional, comparative, and conceptual-modelling methods to reveal the relationships among political culture, the ideosphere, and digital communication. The systemic approach makes it possible to understand political culture as an integrated relationship among values, knowledge, emotions, behaviour, and institutions. Structural-functional analysis serves to distinguish its normative-axiological, cognitive-informational, affective, and behavioural layers. The comparative approach identifies differences between traditional mass communication and platformized

communication. On the basis of conceptual modelling, the notion of “algorithmically mediated political culture” is developed as an operational analytical category.

The scientific novelty of the study is manifested in three respects. First, the transformation of political culture is interpreted more broadly than the mere digitalization of relations between institutions and citizens: it is understood as a change in the mechanisms through which political meanings are produced and received. Second, algorithmic filtering is substantiated as an independent mediation mechanism affecting political socialization, political trust, and civic participation. Third, a three-level model combining axiological, informational, and institutional factors is proposed in order to ensure the stability of political culture in the digital environment.

Political Culture and the Ideosphere of Society.

Political culture encompasses more than the aggregate of knowledge about a political system. It brings together within a single spiritual and cognitive field ideas about the legitimacy of power, justice, order, freedom, responsibility, the national interest, civic duty, and a shared future. The ideosphere of society is the ideological environment in which such ideas circulate, encounter one another, and acquire social significance. From this perspective, political culture appears as the political layer of the ideosphere, while the ideosphere functions as the informational and symbolic space in which political culture exists.

Digital globalization has made this relationship considerably more complex. On the one hand, it has provided citizens with access to political experiences, ideas, and debates from different parts of the world. On the other hand, the excessive proliferation of political content, the weakening of the hierarchy of sources, and the predominance of immediate emotional reactions have complicated the culture of reasoned judgement. Inglehart's theory of cultural change emphasizes that increasing economic and social security strengthens values of self-expression, choice, and participation. The digital environment expands the possibilities for these values to be expressed, while simultaneously creating the risk that they may be replaced by short-term emotional mobilization and symbolic activity.

Accordingly, digital political culture cannot be adequately measured only through technical skills or the frequency of internet use. Its essential indicator is the citizen's capacity to compare different sources of information, distinguish factual evidence from interpretation, differentiate emotional appeals from the public interest, express a position while preserving

legal and ethical responsibility, and engage in constructive dialogue with political institutions.

Manuel Castells interprets communication as the principal arena in which power and counter-power are formed, and shows that the network society has created the possibility of mass self-communication. This development has a dual significance for political culture. First, the citizen is no longer merely a consumer of political messages, but also becomes a producer, commentator, and distributor of such messages. At the same time, the mass circulation of information does not automatically guarantee its truthfulness, substantive depth, or orientation toward the public interest.

In traditional political communication, editorial institutions, experts, official bodies, and professional journalism performed the gatekeeping function of selecting information. In a platformized environment, this function is increasingly transferred to algorithms based on numbers of views, reactions, sharing velocity, and patterns of user behaviour. Habermas argues that the democratic potential of political communication depends on the relationship between an independent media system and an alert, responsive civil society. Under digital conditions this requirement becomes even more important: the openness of information flows enriches political culture only when it is combined with substantive pluralism, evidential reasoning, and responsible dialogue.

Algorithmically Mediated Political Culture.

Algorithms determine which messages users see, in what order they encounter them, and how frequently particular content is repeated. Tarleton Gillespie analyses algorithms as mechanisms that calculate “relevance” for the public and allocate the visibility or invisibility of information. On this basis, the term “algorithmically mediated political culture” is used in this article to denote the formation of political values, knowledge, emotional attitudes, and practices of participation within a communicative environment selected and structured by digital platforms.

Within the normative-axiological layer of this political culture, concepts such as justice, freedom, order, solidarity, and the national interest are reinterpreted through digital discourse. In the cognitive-informational layer, citizens' political knowledge is shaped under the influence of search engines, recommendation algorithms, and popular content circulating across networks. The affective layer is characterized by the rapid mobilization of emotions such as fear, anger, pride, hope, and dissatisfaction in relation to political events. The behavioural layer reflects the relationship among commenting, sharing,

online appeals, digital campaigns, collective initiatives, and participation in civic life beyond the digital sphere.

The social power of algorithmic systems does not arise solely from their technical complexity. By presenting their decisions in the form of neutral calculation, they embed implicit criteria concerning the importance of content into everyday practice. Users may perceive a frequently repeated message as the majority view, content elevated to a higher position as the most urgent issue, and recommendations corresponding to their own beliefs as an expression of the general political mood. As a result, platform architecture can imperceptibly narrow or expand the framework within which political reality is perceived.

Digital platforms construct individualized information environments on the basis of users' interests, location, social connections, viewing history, and reactions. This convenience brings political content closer to individual needs, yet it may also reduce the probability of encountering opposing evidence. Zeynep Tufekci demonstrates that the expanding agency of computational systems extends beyond the selection of information and influences the very structure of human choices and opportunities. Political manipulation should therefore not be reduced to the circulation of false information. The management of attention, the framing of issues in emotional terms, the continuous repetition of selected topics, and the concealment of others are likewise important forms of manipulative influence.

Shoshana Zuboff explains the transformation of data derived from human behaviour into an instrument of prediction and direction through the concept of "surveillance capitalism". From the perspective of political culture, the principal danger is that, while citizens may believe that they are forming decisions independently, their attention may be moving within information pathways modelled in advance. Under such conditions, civic agency is determined less by mere access to information than by the capacity to understand how informational choices are organized, critically assess algorithmic influence, and justify one's own position.

Agency within digital political culture rests on three foundations. The first is epistemic independence: the capacity to verify evidence, compare sources, and acknowledge uncertainty. The second is axiological stability: reliance on law, justice, human dignity, the national interest, and social responsibility when evaluating political situations. The third is communicative responsibility: expressing one's views through reason, evidence, and dialogue, without violence, insult, or falsehood.

The digital space has reduced the organizational costs of political participation. Citizens can unite around a problem in a short period, mobilize public attention, and appeal to institutions. Bennett and Segerberg explain these processes through the logic of "connective action," showing that the sharing of personalized content in digital networks has become a new form of collective mobilization. This phenomenon can activate political culture; nevertheless, online activity that does not develop into sustained civic responsibility and institutional engagement may remain confined to a short-term emotional campaign.

For this reason, the quality of political participation cannot be assessed solely through the number of posts, comments, or digital reactions. Mature political culture links online expression with legal literacy, understanding of the public interest, analysis of the causes and consequences of problems, the proposal of alternative solutions, and monitoring of the implementation of decisions. In this context, digital tools do not replace civic responsibility; rather, they create new opportunities for its practical realization.

In the context of digital globalization, strengthening political culture requires the integration of three interconnected directions. The first level is axiological stability. Fundamental values such as human dignity, the rule of law, national solidarity, tolerance, patriotism, and civic responsibility must be reinforced through lived experience and political practice. When values remain only in the form of promotional texts, they weaken in the face of accelerated information flows. Their strength is determined by their visible embodiment in the activity of state institutions, just decisions, and everyday social relationships.

The second level is informational independence. It encompasses media and information literacy, fact-checking, assessment of source credibility, verification of the authenticity of images and videos, and an understanding of the principles according to which algorithmic recommendations operate. UNESCO regards media and information literacy as a civic competence necessary for democratic discourse and social participation. Such competence should be formed continuously, beginning with general education and extending through higher education, the civil service, local communities, and the broader system of public communication.

The third level is institutional dialogue. Citizens' political trust develops when they feel that they are being heard, that their appeals are being considered, and that public decisions are being explained. Digital platforms can reduce the distance between the state and the citizen; however, unanswered appeals,

formalized communication, or delayed explanations weaken trust. Therefore, digital governance should be assessed not only by the number of services provided but also by the quality of communication, openness, feedback, and the influence of civic initiatives on decision-making processes.

Priority Areas in Uzbekistan.

In Uzbekistan, the digital transformation of political culture is associated with the large proportion of young people in the population, the widespread use of mobile communication, the digitalization of public services, and the development of mechanisms for dialogue with the public. In order to use these opportunities effectively, it would be appropriate to define “digital civic competence” as a distinct direction within programmes aimed at developing political culture. This competence should integrate legal knowledge, critical thinking, national and universal values, information security, algorithmic literacy, and the ethics of communication within a unified system.

First, the preparation of political and educational content requires evidence-based audience segmentation that takes account of age, region, profession, and patterns of information consumption. Personalization should not become a means of enclosing individuals within a closed information environment. Rather, it should serve to communicate complex issues in accessible language and foster responsible dialogue among different viewpoints. Second, monitoring the digital environment by state and public organizations should not be limited to identifying harmful content; it should also analyse public sentiment, the causes of social problems, and the dynamics of trust. Third, higher education and scientific research should regularly examine indicators of political culture, including institutional trust, reliance on evidence, tolerance, civic responsibility, information-verification skills, and constructive participation.

In an information society, information remains one of the principal resources influencing human behaviour and social consciousness. Yet the strength of national political culture is revealed not so much in restricting external information flows as in forming citizens' capacity to analyse them, compare them with the national interest, and draw informed conclusions. In this context, Shavkat Mirziyoyev emphasizes that progress requires mastery of digital knowledge and modern information technologies, together with the development of intellectual and spiritual potential in the younger generation .

Criteria for Assessing the Transformation of Political

Culture.

Political culture in the digital environment cannot be comprehensively assessed through numbers of users, views, comments, or electronic appeals. Such indicators reflect the external volume of activity, but do not reveal its substantive quality, civic responsibility, or institutional outcome. It is therefore appropriate to base the assessment system on five groups of indicators: cognitive, axiological, communicative, participatory, and institutional. Together, these groups reveal the interconnected state of political knowledge, the stability of values, the quality of communication, practical participation in public affairs, and mutual trust between citizens and state institutions.

Cognitive indicators may be measured through the citizen's ability to identify a source, distinguish fact from interpretation, compare opposing arguments, acknowledge uncertainty, and apply political and legal concepts appropriately to a given situation. Axiological indicators express the capacity to formulate a position on the basis of human dignity, the rule of law, justice, the national interest, tolerance, and responsibility to the public. If these two layers are not integrated, knowledge may serve manipulative purposes, while values may turn into an evidence-free emotional appeal. Mature political culture establishes a balance between evidence and values, and between critical thinking and social responsibility.

Communicative indicators reflect the degree to which participants in political debate refrain from insults, stigmatization, and incitement to violence; understand opposing views substantively; justify their own positions; and use language conducive to compromise. Participatory indicators encompass the conversion of digital engagement into actual civic action: studying a problem, preparing a proposal, joining a collective initiative, making a lawful appeal, and monitoring the implementation of decisions. Institutional indicators should not be limited to the speed with which public bodies respond to appeals; they should also assess the evidential basis, clarity, problem-solving capacity, and quality of feedback contained in the response. Political trust then develops not from one-way promotion, but as a relationship confirmed through citizens' everyday experience.

The study of these indicators requires a combination of surveys, focus groups, discourse analysis, digital content monitoring, and assessment of institutional responses. Conclusions drawn exclusively from digital traces may render invisible groups that remain silent online, communities with limited internet use, and territorial differences. Research segmented by age, region, education, profession, and patterns of

information consumption can therefore reveal the dynamics of political culture more accurately. Strict observance of privacy, data protection, and research ethics must remain an integral condition of such assessment.

CONCLUSION

Digital globalization does not eliminate political culture; it renews the channels through which it is formed, the forms through which it is expressed, and the mechanisms through which it exerts influence. Political values now exist in conjunction with the speed of networks, algorithmic filtering, visual symbols, and personalized information flows. Under these conditions, the central issue of political culture shifts from access to information toward the capacity for informed political choice.

According to the theoretical model developed in this article, algorithmically mediated political culture consists of the unity of four layers: normative-axiological, cognitive-informational, affective, and behavioural. Its stability depends on the interaction of an axiological foundation, informational independence, and institutional dialogue. Only when citizens can distinguish evidence from interpretation, popularity from truth, and emotional mobilization from the public interest can they act as active and responsible agents of the political process.

Thus, the principal task in developing contemporary political culture is neither to reject technology nor to accept it as an absolute force. It is to harmonize the opportunities created by digital communication with the individual's independence of thought, stability of values, and civic responsibility. Such harmony makes the ideosphere of society resilient to manipulative influence, renders political dialogue substantive, and strengthens trust in relations between the state and citizens.

REFERENCES

1. Almond, G. A., and S. Verba. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1989. 379 p.
2. Inglehart, R. F. "Modernization, Existential Security, and Cultural Change: Reshaping Human Motivations and Society." In *Handbook of Advances in Culture and Psychology*, Vol. 7. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018, pp. 1–59.
3. Castells, M. "Communication, Power and Counter-power in the Network Society." *International Journal of Communication* 1 (2007): 238–266.
4. Habermas, J. "Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension?" *Communication Theory* 16, no. 4

(2006): 411–426.

5. Gillespie, T. "The Relevance of Algorithms." In *Media Technologies: Essays on Communication, Materiality, and Society*, edited by T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, and K. A. Foot, 167–194. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014.
6. Beer, D. "The Social Power of Algorithms." *Information, Communication & Society* 20, no. 1 (2017): 1–13.
7. Tufekci, Z. "Algorithmic Harms Beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent Challenges of Computational Agency." *Colorado Technology Law Journal* 13, no. 2 (2015): 203–218.
8. Zuboff, S. "Big Other: Surveillance Capitalism and the Prospects of an Information Civilization." *Journal of Information Technology* 30, no. 1 (2015): 75–89.
9. Bennett, W. L., and A. Segerberg. "The Logic of Connective Action: Digital Media and the Personalization of Contentious Politics." *Information, Communication & Society* 15, no. 5 (2012): 739–768.
10. UNESCO. *Media and Information Literacy Curriculum for Teachers*. Paris: UNESCO, 2011. 192 p.
11. Muminov, A. *Uzbekistan: Toward an Information Society*. Tashkent: Turon Zamin Ziyoy, 2013. 164 p. [in Uzbek].
12. Mirziyoyev, Sh. M. *Yangi O'zbekiston taraqqiyot strategiyasi [The Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan]*. 2nd expanded ed. Tashkent: O'zbekiston, 2022. 416 p. [in Uzbek].