

MARRIAGE READINESS AND VALUE ORIENTATIONS AMONG UZBEK YOUTH: GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ROLE EXPECTATIONS AND MORAL PREPAREDNESS

Alina B. Kadirova

Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Tashkent Branch Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This manuscript is a structured draft based on an empirical study of marriage readiness and value orientations among youth in Uzbekistan. The study used a cross-sectional online survey. Value orientations were assessed with the Axiological Orientation of Personality questionnaire, and marriage readiness was operationalized through moral readiness to marriage and role expectations/claims in marital domains. Nonparametric statistics (Spearman correlations, Mann–Whitney U test, and one-sample Wilcoxon test) were applied due to non-normality of distributions. The findings indicate that, in this sample, values of public life and leisure were expressed more strongly than family values, while material well-being and individuality were among the most pronounced personal values. Men demonstrated higher moral readiness to marriage than women, and gender differences were observed across most role-expectation domains. Value priorities were linked to marital role claims: higher material well-being was associated with lower claims in the emotional-psychotherapeutic domain, and higher public-life value was associated with lower household and parental claims. The draft discusses cultural and developmental interpretations and outlines implications for educational and counseling programs that support informed marital decision-making.

Keywords: marriage readiness; value orientations; youth; Uzbekistan; gender differences; marital roles; family psychology

Introduction

Marriage remains a central life transition in many societies, but its psychological prerequisites are shaped by cultural norms, economic conditions, and developmental tasks of adolescence and emerging adulthood. In Uzbekistan, family formation often occurs relatively early, which increases the practical importance of understanding how young people evaluate marriage, what they expect from spousal roles, and how these expectations relate to their value priorities.

In psychological research, value orientations are typically described as relatively stable preferences that guide goal-setting, decision-making, and meaning-making [1]. Value systems are linked to personal development and life strategies, including choices in the family sphere [6–8]. At the same time, marriage readiness is a multi-component construct that includes moral attitudes, motivation for family life, and representations of marital interaction, including role expectations and claims [10–12].

A role-based perspective suggests that marital satisfaction and stability depend not only on affection, but also on the degree to which partners' expectations about household tasks, parenting, emotional support, social activity, and intimacy are aligned [15–16]. When expectations are unrealistic or mismatched, role conflict may emerge and undermine relationship quality [16].

Empirical evidence on the interplay between values and marriage readiness is still limited for Uzbek youth, especially for samples that capture contemporary urban contexts and the influence of globalization-related value shifts. Therefore, the present study focuses on the association between value orientations and indicators of marriage readiness among young people in Uzbekistan, with attention to gender and age patterns.



Purpose of the study (insert and adapt): to examine the relationship between marriage readiness and value orientations among youth in Uzbekistan.

Research questions (example): (1) How are value priorities structured in the sample? (2) Are there gender differences in marriage readiness and role expectations? (3) Which values correlate with specific marital role claims?

Hypotheses (adapt from your thesis if relevant): H1–H7 ... [insert finalized hypotheses and operational definitions].

Note for the author: expand the introduction with a 1–2 paragraph overview of the Uzbek socio-demographic context using official sources and your institutional requirements.

Discussion

This section is intentionally written as a co-writing scaffold. Replace bracketed prompts with your final text and insert precise statistics (means/medians, U, Z, r, p values) where indicated.

1. Study Design and Measures (to be described succinctly)

- Sample: $n = 126$ (66 men; 60 women), age 15–30; residence: Tashkent and Bukhara; unmarried at the time of survey.
- Data collection: online questionnaire (Google Forms). Add ethics statement/consent procedure if required by the journal.
- Measures: (a) Axiological Orientation of Personality (A.V. Kaptsov; L.V. Karpushina) for values; (b) Moral Readiness to Marriage (E.K. Pogodina); (c) Role Expectations and Claims (A.N. Volkova) for marital domains.
- Statistics: nonparametric approach due to non-normality; Spearman r ; Mann–Whitney U for independent groups; Wilcoxon one-sample test where applicable.

2. Value Priorities in the Sample: Interpreting a ‘Family-Low’ Pattern

In the present sample, value priorities in life domains were not centered on ‘family’ as the highest-ranked sphere. Instead, public life and leisure appeared more salient, while family was comparatively lower. A plausible developmental interpretation is that emerging adulthood prioritizes exploration, social network building, and identity work, which can shift attention away from long-term family obligations. From a value-theory perspective, young people may be balancing autonomy, social recognition, and pragmatic considerations against traditional family expectations [1, 6, 8].

- Insert your descriptive results for life spheres (means/medians and confidence intervals).
- Add a short comparison to prior student/youth studies (Russia/other contexts) and note similarities/differences [11].
- Discuss cultural nuance: urban Uzbek youth may experience both collectivist/traditional and globalized/individualistic value pressures.

3. Gender Differences in Marriage Readiness and Role Expectations

Gender differences were observed in moral readiness to marriage and across multiple marital role domains. Men demonstrated higher moral readiness to marriage than women in this sample, which can be interpreted through a socio-cultural lens: women may perceive marriage as entailing greater long-term responsibility and constraints, while simultaneously investing in education and professional self-realization. A role-structure approach also suggests that gendered



socialization shapes expectations about household and parenting responsibilities, which can affect subjective readiness [10–12, 16].

- Insert your Mann–Whitney U results (U, p, mean ranks) for moral readiness and each role domain.
- Highlight the one domain without significant gender differences (emotional-psychotherapeutic expectations) and propose an explanation.
- If relevant, connect to gender-role flexibility/androgyny discussion [17] and modern partnership norms.

4. Values as Predictors of Role Claims: What Do the Correlations Mean?

The correlation patterns suggest that value orientations are linked to the way young people imagine their future contribution to marital life. Notably, stronger emphasis on material well-being was associated with weaker claims in the emotional-psychotherapeutic domain. One explanation is that an achievement- and security-focused orientation may prioritize instrumental goals, leaving less psychological space for an explicit self-image as an emotional ‘caregiver’ in the relationship. Similarly, prioritizing public life was associated with lower household and parental claims, which aligns with the idea that externally oriented social involvement can compete with time-intensive domestic and caregiving roles.

- Insert your key Spearman correlations with r and p values (e.g., material well-being × emotional-psychotherapeutic claims; public life × household/parental claims).
- Discuss whether correlations differ by gender; if yes, briefly report and interpret.
- Add theoretical linkage: values and meaning-making as regulators of behavior [7–8], and marital roles as a negotiated system [16].

5. Practical Implications

- Educational: premarital education modules for students (communication, conflict skills, role negotiation) [10, 12, 14].
- Counseling: value clarification and expectation alignment as counseling targets in young couples [10].
- Policy/community: culturally sensitive programs that respect tradition while supporting autonomy and informed choice.

6. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

- Sampling: urban and Russian-speaking youth; limited generalizability to rural regions or non–Russian-speaking populations.
- Design: cross-sectional self-report; no dyadic data from couples; potential social desirability effects.
- Measurement: discuss cultural adaptation of instruments and the need for local validation studies.
- Future work: longitudinal designs; qualitative interviews on marriage meanings; comparison across regions and languages.

Conclusion

The study supports the idea that marriage readiness among Uzbek youth is meaningfully connected to their value priorities and role-based representations of family life. In this sample, family values were not dominant relative to public-life and leisure values, and men reported higher moral readiness to marriage than women. Correlation patterns indicate that material and public-life priorities may be linked to reduced claims in emotional-care and domestic/parental



domains. These findings underline the need for culturally sensitive educational and counseling approaches that help young people articulate values, calibrate expectations, and develop practical skills for future family roles.

References

1. Rokeach, M. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
2. Maslow, A. *Motivation and Personality*. St. Petersburg: Piter, 2013.
3. Rogers, C.R. *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. Moscow: Progress, 2009.
4. Frankl, V. *Search for Meaning and Logotherapy*. In: *Psychology of Personality*. Moscow: MSU Publishing, 2010.
5. Fromm, E. *Psychoanalysis and Ethics*. Moscow, 2009.
6. Leontiev, D.A. *Method for Studying Value Orientations*. Moscow: Smysl, 1992.
7. Rubinstein, S.L. *Fundamentals of General Psychology*. St. Petersburg: Piter, 2002.
8. Yunitsky, M.S. *Value Orientations of Personality as a Dynamic System*. Kemerovo, 2008.
9. Gavriilyuk, V.V., & Trikoz, N.A. Dynamics of value orientations in the period of social transformation. *SOTSIS*, 2008(1), 96–105.
10. Aleshina, Yu.E. *Individual and Family Psychological Counseling*. Moscow: Klass, 2012.
11. Andreeva, T.V. *Psychology of the Modern Family*. St. Petersburg: Rech, 2012.
12. Grebennikov, I.V. *Foundations of Family Life: A Study Guide*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2009.
13. Dubrovina, I.V. Problems of psychological preparation of student youth for family life. *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 2015(4), 146–161.
14. Schneider, L.B. *Psychology of Family Relations*. Moscow: Aprel-Press, 2013.
15. Volkova, A.N. *Practicum in Experimental and Applied Psychology*. Moscow, 2009.
16. Eydemiller, E.G. *Family Diagnosis and Family Psychotherapy*. St. Petersburg: Rech, 2012.
17. Kletsina, I.S. *Psychology of Gender Relations: Theory and Practice*. St. Petersburg: Aleteya, 2010.
18. Ilyin, E.P. *Differential Psychophysiology of Men and Women*. Moscow, 2013.

