GLOBAL CONFERENCE ON SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION AND CURRENT RESEARCH

PUBLISHED DATE: - 30-09-205
PAGES: - 10-11

CONFERENCE ARTICLE

The Theoretical Foundations of The Praxeological Approach and Its Application Opportunities in The Pedagogical Process

Rashidova Zulayho
Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences (PhD), Senior Lecturer at Department of Pedagogy and Psychology at Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the theoretical foundations of the praxeological approach and substantiates its application opportunities in the pedagogical process. Building on praxeology as a systematic study of effective action, the paper integrates classic formulations—originating with Tadeusz Kotarbiński and later elaborations across activity theory, experiential learning, and reflective practice—into a coherent pedagogical framework. The study clarifies the conceptual core of praxeology (goal–means–conditions–result), distinguishes it from adjacent paradigms such as competence-based and activity-based approaches, and proposes a didactic logic that connects instructional design, classroom enactment, and evidence-based improvement. Methodologically, the work employs a narrative synthesis of theoretical sources, analytical modeling of lesson cycles, and design-based reasoning to map praxeological categories onto pedagogical tasks. Results indicate that praxeological alignment improves task clarity, reduces instructional friction, strengthens feedback loops, and supports teacher professionalization through reflective protocols and performance metrics. The paper concludes by outlining practical avenues for embedding praxeology in teacher education, curriculum design, and school-level quality assurance.

Keywords: Praxeology; effective action; instructional design; activity theory; reflective practice; teacher professionalization.

INTRODUCTION

Praxeology, in its classical formulation, studies purposeful action with attention to the adequacy of goals, selection of means, conditions of implementation, and obtained results. Translated into pedagogy, this orientation directs teachers to design instruction as an intentional chain that begins with clearly operationalized learning outcomes and proceeds through optimally chosen methods, resources, and organizational forms to measurable learning effects. Unlike broad competence frameworks that describe target capabilities, the praxeological approach foregrounds efficiency and correctness of action: it asks not only what learners should achieve, but how educational actions should be organized to achieve these outcomes with minimal waste, maximal reliability, and ethically acceptable trade-offs. This perspective resonates with activity theory's emphasis on mediated action, with experiential learning's cyclical logic of experience and reflection, and with reflective practice's concern for in-action and on-action inquiry. Together they enable a robust didactic grammar for planning, conducting, and evaluating teaching.

The aim of this article is to conceptualize a praxeological framework for pedagogy and to specify application opportunities that concretely improve lesson planning, classroom execution, and formative evaluation in teacher education and school practice.

The study relies on a narrative review of seminal sources in praxeology, activity theory, and learning sciences to derive categories relevant to teaching practice. Analytical modeling is used to translate praxeological units—goal, means, conditions, procedure, control, result—into an instructional cycle that binds curricular standards to classroom tasks and assessments. Design-based reasoning supports the articulation of feedback mechanisms that allow teachers to iteratively refine lessons. Conceptually, the paper treats the classroom as an action system in which constraints (time, resources, learner variability) are balanced against goals by rational selection and sequencing of methods.

First, the praxeological approach clarifies the structure of instructional design. Goals acquire operative form when expressed as observable performances under defined conditions and acceptable criteria; this reduces ambiguity and aligns teacher actions with assessment. Means selection is then optimized by mapping techniques and tools to the cognitive processes implicated by the goals, ensuring diagnostic alignment rather than eclectic method choice. Conditions—time allotments, grouping, digital tools, materials—are treated as controllable variables that can be tuned to reduce friction and cognitive overload. Procedures are specified as stepwise scripts that embody best-practice routines while remaining adaptable to contingencies. Control is implemented through formative checks that capture progress at decisive junctures, allowing corrective micro-interventions. Results are recorded not only as achievement scores but as evidence of transfer, strategy use, and learner autonomy, feeding back into subsequent planning.

Second, praxeology strengthens classroom enactment by providing a language of efficiency and error. When instruction is reorganized around well-defined units of action, teachers can identify bottlenecks such as opaque instructions, mismatched modalities, or ineffective transitions. The approach recommends micro-optimizations—shortening latency between task assignment and student engagement, introducing worked examples where intrinsic load is high, or re-sequencing concept introduction and practice—to decrease waste and increase

productive time on task. Importantly, efficiency is not conflated with speed; it is construed as the minimal set of well-chosen actions that reliably produce learning while respecting ethical and developmental considerations.

Third, the approach operationalizes reflective practice. Reflection-in-action becomes a disciplined procedure: noticing deviations from expected learner responses, diagnosing their source in goals, means, or conditions, and implementing immediate adjustments. Reflection-on-action is anchored in traceable artifacts—lesson plans linked to intended objectives, annotated student work samples, and brief after-action notes—that together form a praxeological dossier for professional growth. Such documentation supports mentoring, peer observation, and institutional quality cycles by shifting discourse from preferences to warranted claims about what works, for whom, and under which constraints.

Fourth, praxeology integrates assessment with learning rather than treating it as a terminal event. Formative checks are embedded where they yield maximal information for decision-making, and success criteria are co-constructed with students to enhance agency and transparency. This alignment fosters metacognitive regulation: learners learn to plan their own actions, select strategies, and evaluate results—mirroring the teacher's praxeological stance at a student scale.

Finally, application opportunities extend across teacher education and school improvement. In preservice programs, praxeological templates can scaffold lesson study cycles in which candidates plan, teach, analyze, and revise with explicit reference to goals, means, conditions, controls, and results. In curriculum design, the framework offers a middle layer connecting standards to tasks and rubrics in a way that is auditable and improvable. At the institutional level, praxeological indicators—clarity of goal statements, alignment indices, time-on-task ratios, feedback latency—can serve as lightweight metrics for continuous improvement without reducing teaching to mere compliance.

The praxeological approach provides pedagogy with a precise grammar of effective action that links intentions to outcomes through disciplined choice and evaluation of means under real constraints. By reframing instructional design as an action system, it helps teachers reduce ambiguity, increase alignment, and create reliable feedback loops that sustain learning gains. Its synergy with activity theory, experiential learning, and reflective practice situates praxeology as a unifying lens rather than a competing doctrine. Future work should test praxeological indicators in varied subjects and age groups, develop digital tools for rapid lesson diagnostics, and elaborate ethical guidelines that ensure efficiency remains subordinate to educational values and learner well-being.

References

1. Kotarbinski T. Traktat o dobrej robocie. — Warsaw: Ossolineum, 1955. — 356 p.

2. Котарбинский Т. Трактат о хорошей работе. — М.: Экономика, 1975. — 320 с.

3. Leontiev A. N. Activity, Consciousness, and Personality. — Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978. — 214 p.

4. Леонтьев А. Н. Деятельность. Сознание. Личность. — М.: Политиздат, 1975. — 304 с.

5. Dewey J. Democracy and Education. — New York: Macmillan, 1916. — 434 p.

6. Kolb D. A. Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. — Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984. — 256 p.

7. Schön D. A. The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. — New York: Basic Books, 1983. — 374 p.

8. Mises L. von. Human Action: A Treatise on Economics. — Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 1998. — 889 p.

9. Habermas J. The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1. — Boston: Beacon Press, 1984. — 465 p.