



INTERGENERATIONAL DIALOGUE AND DIGITAL EXPERIENCE SHARING: RECIPROCAL LEARNING AND MORAL RESPONSIBILITY IN YOUTH CYBERCULTURE

Uzakov Barkhayotjon Mukhammadievich

Independent researcher of Fergana State University

Orcid: 0009-0006-6616-873X

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23365042>

Abstract: Intergenerational digital help is examined as an exchange of knowledge, experience and responsibility. Conceptual comparison distinguishes technical skill from general authority over another person. Assistance, joint action and deciding on someone else's behalf are treated as different relationships. A matrix covers task definition, explanation, control and the possibility of renegotiating assistance.

Keywords: intergenerational dialogue, reciprocal learning, digital help, authority, trust, autonomy, responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

It is not enough to explain the intergenerational digital exchange with a one-track formula that "young people teach, adults learn." Correa studied the impact of young people on parental digital use based on data from family couples[1]. This study concerns the specific context in which the transfer of technical knowledge takes place from the bottom up; it does not follow the conclusion that all young people are more skilled than all adults. Technical assistance and life experience can be distributed differently in different areas.

The philosophical problem of cross-learning is how the preponderance of cognition becomes an authority, rather than who has the abundance of knowledge. Knowing how to use one program does not confer the right to dictate what information another person should share information or decide how. At the same time, the experience of a representative of the older generation is not an automatic basis for prohibiting a new method without realizing the technical capability. Instead of describing generations in terms of ready-made qualities, the article explores attitudes within the same task.

Research question: under what conditions does digital help expand the other's independence, and in what case does it become decision-making instead? The goal is to distinguish between help, cooperation, and authority substitution. Author's contribution in the development of the term "repayable care": the recipient should be able to understand the outcome, maintain control, and change the condition of the aid. This is a normative proposition of the study, not a universal rule that has been tested.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The conceptual analysis compared the limits of family digital mediation[2], learning in practical communities[3], and external influences on autonomy[4]. The country and age range of the empirical papers were retained as the limits of their applicability. The outcome about children is not directly translated into the relationships of adult youth; normative conclusions are separately justified.

The unit of analysis is not a general "numerical level" of the family, but rather an episode of help: who defined the task, what explanation was given, who performed the actions, and who

remained in final control? Attitudes toward personal information were differentiated by Nissenbaum's concept[5]. No primary family follow-up or interview was conducted. Voluntary pairs of 18-30-year-olds and adult loved ones cooperating with them are invited for future research.

RESULTS

The difference between the preponderance of knowledge and the authority of decision. The first result is that intergenerational knowledge is not reduced to a one-dimensional hierarchy. Technical practice, the purpose of the task, and the social meaning of the consequence require different knowledge. The younger generation may know the function of the phone, while the older generation representative may have a clearer understanding of who the family document belongs to. Thus, the answer to the question "who is the teacher?" changes throughout the task. Cross-learning is defined as the complementarity of different knowledge, not equal amounts of knowledge.

The second consequence is the separation of the three forms of assistance in relation to assistance. In providing assistance, the recipient performs the action himself/herself; in performing together, duty and responsibility are divided; instead, technical control in the performance passes to the assistant. The third is not always acceptable, since the individual may temporarily request such assistance himself. But the assignment of the task does not permit any change in its purpose or subsequent use of the information in any way. The scope of consent is important.

The Correa study examines the relationship between intergenerational technological transmission and family relationships[1]. And the continuation of authorship in the article is the separation of technical influence from moral authority. A good knowledge of technology cannot be a basis for excluding the information owner from explanation. On the contrary, if the recipient of assistance wishes to perform independently, a slower process should not be immediately judged as an inefficiency: the goal of learning is different from the goal of obtaining a result quickly.

Refundable assistance and dual responsibility. "Refundable assistance" does not mean technically canceling support at any time. It is an opportunity to renegotiate the boundary of the task, to understand the action performed, to retain the necessary access control, and to give up further assistance. Some digital actions can be difficult to reverse; therefore, an explanation in advance is even more significant. This is where the difference is made between the recurrence of the outcome and the renegotiation of the relationship.

Wenger's interpretation of social learning shows that meaning and skill are formed through participation[3]. Conclusion on this topic: the outcome of the assistance is learned not only at the end of the task, but also in who is able to perform the next action consciously. When the helper's responsibility is to explain and maintain boundaries, the helper's participation can manifest itself in clarifying the purpose of the task and saying where he or she does not understand. But not asking questions is not automatically perceived as conscious consent.

The Ethical Structure of Digital Aid. The matrix examines task-specific knowledge and competence instead of the general question "Which generation knows best?" It is not a point system that assigns families.

Table 1. Analysis Matrix of Intergenerational Digital Assistance

He pulled o'lch	Tadqiqot savoli	Verifiable Argument	Interpretation Range
Job	For what purpose was support requested?	Initial agreement and expectation.	Asking for help is not a general authority.
Science	Who knows what?	Technical and Vital Comments.	Age is not the only sign of knowledge.
Description	Has the meaning of the action been explained?	Question, comment, and clarification.	Silence does not prove understanding.
Control	Who has the final decision?	Scope of login, setting, and consent.	Technical support does not hold ownership.
Renegotiation	Is it possible to change the terms of support?	Correction and subsequent independent action.	Doing it fast is not the learning itself.

An explanation in a study is not examined simply by reciting a technical sequence by heart. It is important that the individual be able to explain why the action was performed, who it will affect, and what can be changed. And language fluency cannot be the only sign of this understanding.

Asking for re-help is not defined as a failure. The task may have changed, the system has been updated, or previous actions may have been forgotten. Giving a description of an inability to an individual without specifying the reason is beyond the scope of the matrix.

A contingent situation: creating an archive of family photographs. Let's assume that a young family member is helping to digitize old pictures. A representative of the older generation wants to keep the pictures from being lost; the assistant thinks it is useful to place them on an open creative page as well. While the task seems the same, the goals are different: preservation and sharing to the public are separate efforts. This example does not apply to a real family. It is cited to clarify the indirect change of purpose in the aid process.

Initially, the agreement to provide technical support is restored: only to create a file, distribute it to the family, or to publish it publicly. The interests of the other individuals depicted in the photographs are then taken into account. The consent of the owner or custodian of the photograph does not automatically express the attitude of each person in it to go out to another audience. In the Nissenbaum approach, the flow of information is evaluated depending

on the purpose and context[5]. Here, too, the availability of information does not permit any use of it.

In a conditional collaboration, it is possible to put the catalog together, determine who it will be shown, and agree separately on the open copy. The older generation explains the history of the paintings, explaining the young technical possibilities and constraints. As a result, knowledge moves in two directions. However, there is no claim that such collaboration necessarily increases trust. The participants' experience, sense of control, and the execution of the agreement should be studied separately.

Separating moral responsibility from general admonition. Responsibility does not end in this article with generic phrases such as "respecting the adult" or "giving way to the young." It requires determining whose information, whose decision, and whose mistake is the consequence of it. When an erroneous file is deleted, it is checked what the procedure for copying and explaining the actions was before looking for the culprit. It is not an escape of responsibility, it is an association of it with authority and opportunity.

The UNESCO Media Literacy approach combines critical awareness and responsibility in the use of information[6]. A future study can compare pre-intervention agreement, explanation at the time of help, and subsequent independent action. The information is valuable not because it is collected a lot, but because it shows which point of the decision was explained. Extensive access to family members' personal correspondence is not required; only episodes in which consent has been granted are analyzed.

DISCUSSION

The concept of cross-learning does not eliminate all power differences. When a device, account, or time resource is only on one side, the ability to agree on a choice may be limited. In such a case, the fact that the recipient says "maybe" is not complete proof of internal approval. However, it is also incorrect to define any dependency as coercion. Relying on the approach of Susser et al., the transparency of the impact and the condition of independent evaluation are examined separately[4].

Foreign findings on family mediation encourage us to view different forms of assistance and control as context-dependent[2]. This paper does not use them as a ready-made description of families. Age, language, health, and economic conditions are not exactly a factor with generational affiliation. For example, a representative of the older generation may have high technical skills, or the age may not know the same service. The study should not exclude such counter-cases.

An empirical test of the model may require separate conversations between the recipient and the helper, a record of agreement, and limited observation of task performance. An explanation of one is not a substitute for the experience of the other. The couple's joint response is not taken as conclusive evidence of whether there is a conflict or not. No such data are collected in this paper; no estimate of increased family trust, stability of skills, or generational differences is given.

CONCLUSION

The intergenerational digital exchange of experience was interpreted as a relationship of technical and vital competencies that changed depending on the task, rather than the transfer of knowledge in one direction. Assisting, doing together, and deciding in the place of another

person were differentiated. The principle of reciprocal assistance combined the possibility of explaining the boundary of the task, maintaining control, and renegotiating terms of support.

It has been suggested that moral responsibility in youth cyberculture should be explored through information, decision, and consequence relationships in the same care episode, rather than as a general quality based on age or status. The result is not an index that assesses families, but rather a conceptual framework that clarifies future research questions. Its application requires that the speed of care and the quality of learning, mutual trust, and personal autonomy not be combined into a single indicator.

References:

1. Correa T. Bottom-Up Technology Transmission Within Families: Exploring How Youths Influence Their Parents' Digital Media Use With Dyadic Data. *Journal of Communication*. 2014. Vol. 64, No. 1. P. 103–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12067>
2. Livingstone S., Ólafsson K., Helsper E. J., Lupiáñez-Villanueva F., Veltri G. A., Folkvord F. Maximizing Opportunities and Minimizing Risks for Children Online: The Role of Digital Skills in Emerging Strategies of Parental Mediation. *Journal of Communication*. 2017. Vol. 67, No. 1. P. 82–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12277>
3. Wenger E. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511803932>
4. Susser D., Roessler B., Nissenbaum H. Technology, autonomy, and manipulation. *Internet Policy Review*. 2019. Vol. 8, No. 2. <https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.2.1410>
5. Nissenbaum H. Privacy as Contextual Integrity. *Washington Law Review*. 2004. Vol. 79, No. 1. P. 119–158. <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol79/iss1/10/>
6. UNESCO. *Media and Information Literate Citizens: Think Critically, Click Wisely!* Paris: UNESCO, 2021. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/media-and-information-literate-citizens-think-critically-click-wisely>