



A Praxeological Model For The Development Of Youth Military Culture: The Integration Of Social Institutions, The Education System, And Spiritual Factors

Ergashev Tursunboy Ilkhomjonovich,

Independent Researcher, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

ABSTRACT

This article substantiates the praxeological model for the development of youth military culture from a socio-philosophical perspective. The research interprets military culture as a unity of practical activity, social institutions, and a system of values, revealing the integrative role of the education system, civil society institutions, and spiritual factors in its formation. Based on a praxeological approach, the harmony of theory and practice, the goal-oriented nature of activities, and social effectiveness are analyzed. Furthermore, the institutional and spiritual mechanisms for developing youth military culture in the context of Uzbekistan are identified.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 24th March 2026

Accepted: 20th April, 2026

KEY WORDS: military culture, praxeology, youth, social institutions, education system, spiritual factors, integration, security, activity.

The growing complexity of the modern global security environment, the transformation of social systems, and the proliferation of factors influencing the minds of young people necessitate a re-examination of the issue of military culture formation at a new theoretical and practical level. Today, ensuring security is determined not only by military technology and strategic resources but is also inextricably linked to the human factor—specifically, the conscious preparedness, value-based stances, and practical engagement of the youth. Therefore, the process of developing military culture demands a comprehensive and systematic approach.

While traditional approaches often limited military culture to theoretical knowledge, ideological instruction, or military training, in modern conditions it is acquiring an action-oriented—that is, praxeological—content. This calls for interpreting military culture not just as a system of concepts, but as a dynamic system that manifests and takes shape in real-world social practice. It is from this perspective that the praxeological approach emerges as one of the effective methodological foundations for developing military culture among the youth.

In this context, social institutions, the education system, and moral factors are the primary components in the formation of military culture. Social institutions provide the organizational and institutional framework for this process, the education system develops knowledge and skills, and moral factors determine an individual's internal motivation and value system. The integration of these components allows for the comprehensive and effective development of military culture.

At the same time, in a post-classical risk society, young people, as the most dynamic subjects of social activity, are exposed to various threats. Informational pressure, global cultural influences, and social changes are creating contradictory tendencies in their consciousness. This requires that the formation of military culture involves not only imparting knowledge but also cultivating conscious activity, critical thinking, and a reflexive approach.

The praxeological approach has been established as a theoretical paradigm that studies the principles of organizing human activity toward a specific goal, revealing its internal logic, and increasing its effectiveness.

Within this framework, social phenomena, including military culture, are interpreted not as static concepts, but as dynamic systems that emerge and develop through the process of activity. For this reason, praxeology serves as a methodological foundation aimed at bridging the gap between theory and practice and ensuring their organic unity.

Philosophically, the roots of the praxeological approach trace back to activity theory—that is, the idea of transforming reality through conscious, purposeful human action. In this approach, a person is viewed not merely as a knowing subject, but as a subject who shapes and transforms social existence through activity. Therefore, the formation of military culture is not a passive transfer of knowledge, but a process that occurs through the active participation and experience of the individual.

One of the essential theoretical principles of the praxeological approach is **goal-orientation**. Any activity has a specific goal, and its content and outcome are determined by this goal. In the context of military culture, this principle manifests in connection with the tasks of shaping the security awareness of youth and transforming them into socially responsible and active subjects.

Another important principle is the **unity of means and result**. The means employed in the course of an activity not only lead to a result but also determine the quality of that result. Therefore, the methods applied in forming military culture—such as educational technologies, social practices, and communicative strategies—directly affect its effectiveness.

In the praxeological approach, **the category of effectiveness** plays a central role. Here, effectiveness is evaluated not merely by the existence of a result, but by its social significance, sustainability, and potential for reproduction. In the process of developing military culture, effectiveness is determined by the extent to which a stable system of values is formed in the minds of young people and manifested in their practical activities.

Furthermore, the praxeological approach includes **a structural analysis of activity**. Any activity consists of elements such as a goal, motive, means, process, and result. If the harmonious integration of these elements is not ensured in the formation of military culture, the process becomes fragmented and ineffective. For this reason, the praxeological model requires the systematic integration of all components of the activity.

In modern conditions, the importance of the praxeological approach is steadily increasing. This is because, in an information society, knowledge quickly becomes obsolete, whereas practical skills and reflexive abilities are considered more stable. Therefore, in the formation of military culture, practical activity, problem-solving, and real social experience are more significant than theoretical knowledge.

Within the praxeological model for developing youth military culture, the integration of social institutions emerges as a decisive methodological and practical factor. This is because military culture is a complex social system formed and reinforced not at the level of individual consciousness, but through the activities of various social institutions. Therefore, the effective organization of this process depends not on the separate activities of individual institutions, but on their harmonized and coordinated efforts.

The integration of social institutions, first and foremost, implies that they operate in functional unity. State institutions, educational establishments, civil society organizations, the family environment, and mass communication media each play a distinct role in shaping military culture. However, until these roles are organically linked, they remain fragmented and fail to yield the desired social outcome. Integration, in turn, transforms these separate functions into a single, purpose-oriented system.

From a praxeological perspective, the integration of social institutions serves to enhance the effectiveness of activities. Each institution possesses its own resources, capabilities, and mechanisms of influence. Their harmonization creates a synergistic effect, making the process of forming a military culture more systematic and stable. Here, integration encompasses not only organizational cooperation but also a unity of goals, values, and methods.

In this process, state institutions provide the normative-legal and strategic framework, the education system develops knowledge and skills, civil society institutions foster social engagement, and the family environment establishes the initial value system. Mass media and digital platforms, in turn, create the communicative space for this process. The synergy of these elements results in the formation of a stable and multidimensional military culture in the minds of the youth.

At the same time, the integration of social institutions should be viewed not only as an external system but also as a process that is internalized within the individual's consciousness. That is, the values and knowledge transmitted through various institutions must coalesce into a unified and coherent system in the individual's mind. Otherwise, inconsistencies between different institutions can create contradictory perceptions in the minds of young people.

In the conditions of modern digital civilization, the integration of social institutions is taking on new forms. The virtual space is becoming a critical platform for the activities of social institutions, expanding their interactions. However, this process is accompanied by an increase in informational threats and discursive conflicts. Therefore, integration requires not only cooperation but also a harmonized information policy.

In the context of Uzbekistan, the integration of social institutions is supported at the state policy level. Youth policy, the modernization of the education system, and spiritual-enlightenment work constitute the main directions of this process. However, to make these activities more effective, it is necessary to develop inter-institutional cooperation on a systematic and praxeological basis.

In the praxeological model for developing youth military culture, the education system emerges as the central institutional and functional domain. This is because it is through the educational process that knowledge, values, and practical skills are systematically formed, and stable social orientations are established in the individual's consciousness. In this sense, the education system should be viewed not merely as a means of shaping military culture, but as its internal structural element.

From a philosophical perspective, the education system acts as an intermediary between knowledge and activity. It is a mechanism that synthesizes theoretical knowledge with practical activity, and this synthesis is of decisive importance in shaping military culture. If knowledge remains purely informative in character, it will not sufficiently influence an individual's behavior. Conversely, when integrated with activity, knowledge manifests its true social function.

An important aspect of the education system is related to its **axiological function**. Education is not limited to imparting knowledge but also shapes an individual's value system. In the context of military culture, this process is accomplished through the conscious internalization of concepts such as patriotism, duty, and responsibility. Thus, the education system becomes the primary mechanism for shaping an individual's social consciousness.

Furthermore, the education system performs a **gnoseological function**. It systematically imparts knowledge about security, threats, and social processes to young people. In modern conditions, this knowledge must not be limited to traditional military subjects but should also encompass areas such as information security, media literacy, and critical thinking. This prepares young people to act consciously within a complex and evolving security environment.

Another important aspect of the education system is its **praxeological orientation**. That is, it must ensure not only the transfer of theoretical knowledge but also its application in practice. Through hands-on exercises, simulations, team projects, and educational methods based on real-world scenarios, young people internalize military culture through direct experience. This ensures that knowledge is deeply absorbed and retained.

In the context of modern digital civilization, the education system is undergoing a new transformation. Digital technologies are changing the form and content of the educational process, making it more interactive and flexible. At the same time, this process also presents new challenges, as the overabundance of information and its various sources increase the risk of fragmented thinking among young people. Therefore, the education system must function not only as a source of knowledge but also as a framework for developing the skills to filter and evaluate information.

The modern interpretation of developing military culture among youth requires an integrative praxeological model based not on a collection of separate elements, but on their harmonious interplay and functional unity. The essence of this model is that military culture is formed and developed through the organic integration of knowledge, values, and activity. Therefore, the primary emphasis is placed not on individual components, but on their systemic interrelationships.

Philosophically, the integrative praxeological model is founded on the principle of the integrity of activity. The process of forming military culture must not be fragmented, but rather consist of continuous and

interconnected stages. In this process, social institutions provide the organizational foundation, the education system provides knowledge and skills, and moral-spiritual factors provide internal motivation. Although each of these is individually important, only through integration do they become an effective system.

In this model, activity holds a central position. Military culture is not formed at the level of theoretical knowledge or declarative values, but in real social practice. For this reason, in an integrative approach, all components are unified through activity. Knowledge is applied in activity, values direct activity, and institutions organize this activity. As a result, military culture becomes a system that is reinforced through practical experience.

A key aspect of the integrative model is its **systemic nature**. Here, the process of fostering a military culture is structured around the integral connection between the goal, the means, and the result. The goal is to instill a stable military culture in the minds of young people; the means include education, social institutions, and communicative mechanisms; and the result is the development of a conscious, responsible, and active social agent.

Furthermore, the integrative praxeological model **must possess a reflexive character**. In modern conditions, the process of forming a military culture is not static but demands constant reassessment and adaptation. Young people develop consciously by analyzing their activities, decisions, and values. This, in turn, transforms the model into a dynamic and flexible system.

Another crucial aspect of the model is its **communicative integration**. In the digital age, fostering a military culture occurs not only through traditional institutions but also through the communicative space. Therefore, the harmonization of social institutions, the education system, and the information space is essential. Through this harmony, a consistent and stable system of values is formed in the minds of young people.

In the context of Uzbekistan, the implementation of an integrative praxeological model must be based on a harmony of national values and modern approaches. It is possible to achieve the comprehensive development of military culture by combining historical heritage, patriotic ideals, and modern educational technologies. Furthermore, cooperation between state policy, the educational system, and civil society institutions will ensure the effectiveness of this model.

An analysis of the praxeological model for developing military culture among youth reveals that this process is most effectively realized not through the influence of separate factors, but through their integrative and systemic synergy. Military culture is a complex social phenomenon formed by the unity of knowledge, values, and practical activity, and its stability depends on the organic connection between these very components.

The research findings indicate that social institutions create the organizational and normative basis for this process, the educational system provides its epistemological foundation by shaping knowledge and skills, and spiritual factors determine an individual's internal motivation and axiological orientation. As a result of the integration of these components, military culture is established not as a fragmented entity, but as a holistic and coherent system.

The advantage of the praxeological approach is that it bridges the gap between theory and practice, guiding the formation of military culture through tangible social activities. This enables young people to transform their knowledge into practical experience, internalize values, and manifest them in their social conduct. Consequently, military culture develops not as a mere declaration, but as an active and conscious social stance.

The significance of this model is further amplified in the context of the modern, post-classical risk society. Amid informational threats, social transformations, and global influences, shaping the consciousness of youth is becoming increasingly complex. Therefore, the integrative praxeological model must be developed to incorporate qualities such as reflexivity, critical thinking, and adaptability.

In the context of Uzbekistan, the development of military culture among youth can be achieved through a foundation of national values, the modernization of the education system, and effective cooperation among social institutions. Organizing this process based on the praxeological approach helps shape young people into prepared, responsible, and proactive agents in the face of modern threats.

In summary, the integrative praxeological model is a theoretically and practically grounded concept for developing military culture among youth, and it stands out as a critical factor in ensuring the sustainable development of society and national security.

Bibliography

1. Kotarbiński, T. (1965). *Praxiology: An Introduction to the Science of Efficient Action*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 225 p.
2. Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper & Row, 404 p.
3. Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System*. New York: Free Press, 575 p.
4. Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 402 p.
5. Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 116 p.
6. Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 183 p.
7. Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row, 116 p.
8. Toffler, A. (1993). *War and Anti-War: Survival at the Dawn of the 21st Century*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 365 p.
9. Huntington, S. P. (1957). *The Soldier and the State*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 534 p.
10. Habermas, J. (2000). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Moscow: Ves Mir, 688 p. [In Russian: Хабермас Ю. Теория коммуникативного действия. – М.: Весь Мир, 2000. – 688 с.]
11. Manoylo, A. V. (2003). *State Information Policy in the Conditions of Information War*. Moscow: Goryachaya Liniya-Telekom, 312 p. [In Russian: Манойло А. В. Государственная информационная политика в условиях информационной войны. – М.: Горячая линия-Телеком, 2003. – 312 с.]
12. Pochepstov, G. G. (2001). *The Theory of Communication*. Kyiv: Vakler, 656 p. [In Russian: Почепцов Г. Г. Теория коммуникации. – Киев: Ваклер, 2001. – 656 с.]
13. Castells, M. (2000). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Moscow: HSE Publishing House, 608 p. [In Russian: Кастельс М. Информационная эпоха: экономика, общество и культура. – М.: ГУ ВШЭ, 2000. – 608 с.]
14. Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 228 p.
15. Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: SAGE Publications, 260 p.