



## **THE SYSTEM OF SPIRITUAL AND MORAL TECHNOLOGIES IN TRAINING MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL**

Oripov Shukhratjon

Independent Researcher Institute for Social and Spiritual Studies  
under the Republican Center for Spirituality and Enlightenment

+99895 1176006,

shuxrat.orif@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

This article analyzes the role and significance of spiritual and moral technologies in the training of managerial personnel. It highlights the potential of modern pedagogical and moral technologies in developing ethical culture, social responsibility, justice, and civic values among leaders. The study substantiates the effectiveness of a systemic and integrative approach in the professional training of managerial staff.

**Keywords:** Managerial personnel, spiritual and moral technologies, professional competence, educational system, social responsibility.

### **Introduction**

The increasing complexity of modern societal development, the intensification of globalization processes, and the deep penetration of digital technologies into the sphere of governance impose on managerial personnel not only a high level of professional competence, but also a heightened spiritual and moral responsibility. Contemporary management practice demonstrates that the effectiveness of leadership is no longer determined solely by technical knowledge, organizational skills, or strategic planning, but is directly linked to the moral position of the leader, their sense of social responsibility, commitment to justice, and awareness of accountability to society. From this perspective, the training of managerial personnel emerges not merely as a problem of professional preparation, but as a complex scientific issue of profound spiritual and socio-philosophical significance within modern management education.



In the context of globalization and digital transformation, the acceleration of decision-making processes, the expansion of algorithmic recommendations, and platform-based evaluation systems confront leadership activity with new ethical challenges. While technologies optimize decision-making, they simultaneously increase the risk of shifting moral responsibility onto the “system,” the “platform,” or the “algorithm.” As a result, the formation in leaders of qualities such as conscious moral choice, the ability to foresee consequences, and the willingness to assume social responsibility becomes particularly urgent. Under these conditions, the need arises to scientifically study and practically implement a system of spiritual and moral technologies in the training of managerial personnel.

The system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training presupposes moving beyond the random or fragmentary inculcation of moral values toward their purposeful, systematic, and technologically well-designed formation through the pedagogical process. This system views education and upbringing as an inseparable unity in preparing leaders and aims, alongside the development of professional competencies, to cultivate moral culture, social responsibility, patriotism, and civic position. In this sense, spiritual and moral technologies make it possible to evaluate leadership activity not only in terms of instrumental efficiency, but also through the categories of social trust and moral legitimacy.

Researching the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training requires, first of all, interpreting leadership as a complex interaction among personal qualities, organizational culture, and the technological environment. In this process, moral education is not limited to teaching ready-made rules, but is directed toward developing the leader’s reflective thinking, the ability to assess the social consequences of decisions, and the formation of a responsible subject. Therefore, within modern pedagogical approaches, technologies such as dilemma-based training, reflexive exercises, simulations, and the analysis of real management situations acquire particular importance.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the theoretical foundations of the system of spiritual and moral technologies in the training of managerial personnel, to determine its role in contemporary pedagogical and managerial practice, and to substantiate the effectiveness of an integrative and systemic approach. In achieving this goal, key mechanisms for forming ethical culture, social



responsibility, and civic position in leadership activity are identified, and an attempt is made to interpret the training of managerial personnel as a means of forming a spiritually stable and socially trusted management elite.

### **Literature review**

The system of training managerial personnel in modern society appears as a complex socio-philosophical process aimed not only at developing managerial competencies, but also at technologically fostering the spiritual and moral profile of the individual. In this process, spirituality is interpreted not merely as a set of normative-ethical values, but as a system of structured technologies applied in designing, implementing, and monitoring governance activities. In this sense, spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training serve as a mechanism balancing the complex dialectical relationship between society's social demand and individual personal development. In socio-philosophical literature, the issue of the spiritual image of the leader is primarily linked to the integration of spiritual processes into the governance system. In particular, M.B. Yuldashev evaluates the leader's spirituality as the internal foundation of managerial culture and emphasizes that "the spiritual image of a leader is the main factor ensuring the moral legitimacy of decision-making in society" [1.]. Although conceptually sound, this approach insufficiently reveals the technological dimension of spirituality, leaving the mechanisms, methods, and institutional tools of forming a leader's spirituality at a general level.

One of the systematic treatments of spiritual and moral technologies can be found in the works of I.A. Nurmatova, who explains the stabilization of the spiritual environment of society through technologies of moral norm-setting and notes that "technologies of moral norm-setting not only regulate interpersonal relations but also ethically orient the decision-making style of governance subjects" [2.]. This approach is significant for leadership training as it interprets spirituality not as an abstract notion but as a normative-technological system. However, the adaptability of such technologies to the individual leader—namely, personalization mechanisms—is insufficiently substantiated.

Approaching leadership training within the context of innovative development, A.A. Tojaliyev links the spiritual component with innovative competencies. According to him, "under conditions of innovative development, the personnel



training system must systematically form not only technical knowledge but also spiritual qualities such as responsibility, conscience, and social accountability” [3.]. This highlights the need to adapt spiritual and moral technologies to an innovative environment. However, in Tojaliyev’s approach, spiritual processes are viewed more as outcomes, while the technological structuring of the process itself remains secondary.

B.E. Yuldashev, who provides a profound philosophical analysis of the leader’s social image, associates it with the category of social trust, defining the modern leader’s image as a synthesis of moral legitimacy and public trust [4.]. Although theoretically robust, this interpretation remains largely phenomenological and does not fully disclose the spectrum of concrete spiritual and moral technologies involved in shaping the leader’s profile.

Linking spiritual processes with societal development, J.A. Jabborov explains the spiritual maturation of the leader through the theory of needs, stating that “the elevation of spiritual needs forms a layer of responsible and conscious leaders within the governance system of society” [5.]. This perspective underlines the importance of motivational and spiritual factors in leadership training, yet the organizational and technological mechanisms for elevating such needs remain insufficiently clarified.

In the context of a renewing Uzbekistan, M.M. Mamatov systematically outlines the principles of spiritual development and connects leadership training with the education of a harmoniously developed generation, emphasizing that “the principles of spiritual development serve as a methodological foundation for training personnel for public administration” [6.]. While this approach allows leadership training to be viewed within the broader context of spiritual policy, its technological detailing remains largely conceptual-programmatic.

Overall, the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training functions as a social mechanism ensuring a complex balance between society’s spiritual needs, the demands of innovative development, and governance effectiveness. Although existing studies sufficiently reveal the normative and conceptual foundations of spiritual processes, there remains a need to enrich them with concrete technologies such as training, monitoring, assessment, and mechanisms of institutional implementation. From this perspective, developing



spiritual and moral technologies as an integrative, adaptive, and result-oriented model remains a pressing scientific and practical task.

In modern management education and personnel policy, the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training represents a complex socio-philosophical mechanism aimed at purposefully forming not only professional competencies but also ethical responsibility, a hierarchy of values, and reflective thinking. Under conditions of digital transformation, when leadership training unfolds under the influence of information speed, algorithmic recommendations, and platform-based evaluations, this system demands a normative approach that foregrounds social consequences, justice, and trust, rather than absolutizing “speed” and “efficiency.” Thus, it strengthens conscious and responsible subjectivity, separating moral choice from automated procedures.

Linking moral leadership with educational technologies, L. Kohlberg explains moral development as a stage-based process, noting that “the capacity for moral judgment develops not through lectures but through confrontation with complex problems and dialogue” [7.]. This underscores the need to design spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training through dilemma-based training, ethical case studies, and debates. In digital environments, simulations and artificial scenarios can demonstrate the consequences of decisions, yet they must aim at deepening moral reflection rather than identifying a “correct answer.”

R. Greenleaf, associating leadership with the ethics of service, writes that “the moral measure of leadership is its impact on the growth of others and on the least privileged” [8.]. This substantiates the institutional incorporation of empathy, service orientation, and social justice into spiritual and moral technologies. However, in contexts dominated by digital evaluation systems, such qualities often escape metrics; therefore, training technologies should be enriched with behavioral observation and reflective reporting.

D. Schön emphasizes the role of reflective practice in leadership preparation, stating that “professionals learn under conditions of uncertainty, and it is reflection that leads them to responsible decisions” [9.]. This requires spiritual and moral technologies to include mechanisms of self-assessment, acknowledgment of errors, and correction. On digital platforms, reflection can be supported through journals, portfolios, and mentoring networks.



K. Vallor introduces the concept of “technological virtues,” arguing that “in the digital age, virtues must be reinterpreted through speed, transparency, and responsibility” [10.]. This points to the necessity of integrating digital literacy, algorithmic fairness, and data ethics into spiritual and moral technologies, without reducing ethics to mere compliance but rather revealing the values underlying decisions.

P. Senge, from the perspective of institutional pedagogy, notes that “leaders harmonize personal and organizational ethics through systems thinking” [11.]. This implies that spiritual and moral technologies must align with organizational culture, incentive structures, and evaluation systems; otherwise, individual ethical competencies may erode under institutional pressure.

L. Introna warns that “technological systems shape moral decisions in hidden ways” [12.]. Therefore, digital platforms and evaluation algorithms used in leadership training must undergo ethical expertise to ensure fairness, transparency, and explainability; otherwise, spiritual and moral technologies may unintentionally reproduce biased norms.

A. MacIntyre emphasizes that virtues become stable only within institutional practices, stating that “virtues are sustained within practices and in harmony with their internal goods” [13.]. Hence, spiritual and moral technologies should be embedded in institutional design rather than confined to isolated courses.

C. Gilligan, from the perspective of ethics of care, notes that “moral maturity begins not with indifference but with care and attention to context” [14.]. This implies constructing interactive scenarios that cultivate empathy and stakeholder awareness.

J. van den Hoven, through the approach of value-sensitive design, argues that “technologies are not value-neutral; they embody values in their design” [15.]. Thus, platforms and assessment algorithms must themselves meet ethical standards.

K. Argyris proposes “double-loop learning,” emphasizing that genuine learning requires openly discussing errors and revising rules [16.]. This supports reflective, rather than punitive, approaches in spiritual and moral technologies.

H. O’Neill links trust with transparency, noting that “transparency alone is insufficient; it must be combined with honesty and accountability” [17.]. Hence, leadership training must cultivate the ability to justify and explain decisions.



Finally, R. Audi emphasizes that “moral knowledge is insufficient if it cannot guide decisions at the moment of choice” [18.]. Therefore, leadership training should include simulations under time pressure, resource scarcity, and uncertainty, including VR/AR environments that stress-test moral maturity.

### **Research Methodology**

The methodology for researching the system of spiritual and moral technologies in the training of managerial personnel appears as a complex scientific approach that integrates the epistemological, axiological, and technological foundations of contemporary management education. This methodological framework is based on interpreting the phenomenon of leadership not merely as a set of professional competencies, but as a multi-layered socio-practical phenomenon in which spiritual processes, moral choices, and technological tools intersect. Therefore, the research methodology is constructed on the conceptual integration of normative ethics, reflective pedagogy, systems thinking, and value-sensitive technological solutions. Within this approach, the process of training managerial personnel is viewed as an open and dynamic system in which spiritual and moral technologies are analyzed not only as means of shaping personal qualities, but also as a methodological architecture that ensures institutional culture and the moral legitimacy of managerial decisions.

Within this methodology, the technologization of spiritual processes is considered a distinct scientific problem, since in modern leadership training ethical values are formed not only through normative instructions or moral exhortation, but through reflective training, dilemma-based case studies, simulation models, digital portfolios, and institutional assessment mechanisms. From this perspective, the system of spiritual and moral technologies is interpreted not as a set of declarative moral knowledge, but as an integral conceptual structure that develops in the leader conscious moral choice, the ability to foresee consequences, and the competence to assume responsibility. Such an approach makes it possible to interpret leadership preparation as a transition from knowledge transmission to practical decision-making competence.

Methodological analysis shows that the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training should not be limited to educational influence at the individual level, but must be formed as an institutional-mechanistic solution



integrally connected with organizational culture, evaluation criteria, incentive mechanisms, and digital platforms. In the context of digital transformation, where decision-making speed and algorithmic recommendations gain priority, the methodology requires a critical analysis of the risk that moral responsibility may be concealed behind the “system” or the “algorithm.” Thus, the research methodology interprets leadership not as technological rationality, but as a form of reflective governance activity associated with responsibility for consequences, justice, and social trust.

This methodological approach develops within a reflexive-interpretative paradigm, since moral choices in leadership activity often arise under conditions of uncertainty, conflict of interests, and time pressure. Therefore, in studying spiritual and moral technologies, qualitative approaches that reveal reflective analysis, moral reasoning, and subjective experience gain priority over purely quantitative indicators. Moral development in this methodology is viewed not as a linear process, but as an iterative one that deepens through continuous re-analysis and self-assessment. As a result, the system of spiritual and moral technologies appears not as a static model, but as a dynamic and adaptive methodological architecture.

A systemic and integrative approach serves as the central pillar of this research methodology. The process of training managerial personnel is analyzed not as a collection of separate modules or trainings, but as a complex interrelation among personal moral development, organizational culture, and technological infrastructure. In this process, spiritual and moral technologies function as a conceptual structure that reinforces such qualities in the leader as justice, social responsibility, patriotism, and open accountability. The methodology moves beyond evaluating leadership solely through individual success or instrumental efficiency and instead interprets it as a process that ensures social trust and moral legitimacy.

### **Analysis and results**

The methodology for studying the system of spiritual and moral technologies in the training of managerial personnel is formed as an integral methodological architecture that elevates ethics from the level of declarative norms to practical managerial competence, while transforming technology from a neutral instrument



into an environment that strengthens moral responsibility. It is precisely this scientific–methodological approach that substantiates the process of leadership training as an effective scientific and practical mechanism aimed at forming a responsible managerial elite grounded in sustainable development, social justice, and public trust. The system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training is one of the central issues of modern management education, requiring leadership to be interpreted not merely as instrumental efficiency or a set of organizational skills, but as a complex ethical and social practice in which spiritual processes and technologies intersect. In contemporary conditions, as managerial personnel operate within digital platforms, algorithmic evaluation systems, rapid decision-making environments, and global communication networks, the system of spiritual and moral technologies performs the function of transforming ethics from declarative norms into practical managerial competence. From this perspective, it appears as a reflexive mechanism harmonizing personal qualities with institutional culture and technological design.

In the context of modern social development, the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training manifests not simply as a set of educational activities, but as a complex socio-philosophical mechanism aimed at managing, directing, and technologizing spiritual processes. Within the scientific field of “spiritual processes and technologies,” this issue requires investigation in direct connection with the leader’s social responsibility, moral legitimacy, ideological stability, and strategic thinking.

Sh. N. To‘rayev раскрывая the essence of spiritual processes, emphasizes that “spiritual processes represent a complex system expressing the continuous dynamic state of social consciousness, value systems, and ideological relations in society” [1.]. This idea provides scientific grounds for viewing spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training not as random propaganda tools, but as pre-designed, monitored, and result-oriented technological systems. However, To‘rayev’s approach insufficiently concretizes the integration of spiritual processes into specific pedagogical and managerial technologies, thus limiting his concept mainly to a theoretical level.

A. A. Lutfullayev, analyzing the problem of spiritual threats in the information society, concludes that “the spiritual immunity of the leader becomes a decisive factor in making stable managerial decisions under conditions of information



pressure” [2.]. This perspective allows the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training to be interpreted as a protective mechanism ensuring ideological stability. At the same time, the author focuses mainly on describing threats and pays insufficient attention to developing practical technological models aimed at their neutralization within leadership training.

J. K. Juraqulov, examining the transformation of human spiritual existence in the information society, writes that “the spiritual image of the modern leader is formed in direct interaction with information flows, which further complicates managerial responsibility” [3.]. This underscores the need to integrate spiritual and moral technologies with digital literacy, critical thinking, and information culture. However, the author’s approach remains largely socio-cultural and does not sufficiently disclose mechanisms for forming leadership competencies.

O‘. N. Ahmedova, analyzing the development of spiritual education through a technological approach, states that “technologies of spiritual education possess strategic significance in shaping the individual as a subject of social governance” [4.]. This position substantiates the integration of spiritual and moral technologies with institutional governance technologies in leadership training systems. Nevertheless, the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of these technologies remain insufficiently developed.

S. S. Jabborova, examining spiritual potential as a source of social development, concludes that “the spiritual potential of the leader is a key factor ensuring the stability of societal development” [5.]. This view allows spiritual and moral technologies to be assessed as a strategic resource in leadership training. At the same time, the broad interpretation of spiritual potential lacks methodological clarity in adapting it to practical management technologies.

Overall, the analysis shows that the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training is a complex socio-philosophical mechanism serving to manage spiritual processes, form a culture of ethical decision-making, and ensure ideological stability. Its effective implementation requires the technologization of spiritual processes, the development of evaluation indicators, and their harmonization with management practice — an urgent scientific task.

P. Ricoeur, analyzing the modern paradigm of moral education, emphasizes responsibility and selfhood in the context of leadership, noting that “the moral subject understands themselves through obligation to others and to the future”



[6.]. This suggests that spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training should deepen the leader's self-awareness. Reflective seminars, ethical diaries, and decision analysis organized through technology help leaders understand the moral distance between "self" and "others."

J. Rest links ethical governance with a competency-based approach, stating that "moral behavior is an integration of knowledge, sensitivity, motivation, and will" [7.]. This concept substantiates designing spiritual and moral technologies as a multi-stage model: enhancing moral sensitivity, moral reasoning, motivation, and practical decision-making.

M. Power, through the concept of "audit culture," warns that "evaluation technologies shift moral responsibility from internal conviction to external indicators" [8.], highlighting the risk of reducing moral development to measurable outputs.

N. Bostrom emphasizes that "technological systems should not diminish human responsibility but make it clearer and more transparent" [9.].

I. Janis notes that "ethical errors in leadership often arise from lack of discussion and suppression of critical thinking" [10.].

M. Nussbaum interprets leadership as "an ethical project aimed at expanding human capabilities," stressing that education should form responsible citizens rather than merely efficient specialists [11.].

J. Rawls asserts that "justice is the first virtue of institutions" [12.].

L. Winner states that "technologies themselves have political and moral consequences" [13.].

P. Freire reminds that "education is never neutral; it either liberates or domesticates" [14.].

H. Nissenbaum proposes "contextual integrity," noting that the morality of information flows depends on social context [15.].

M. Senge highlights systems thinking as the basis of leadership [16.].

J. Habermas argues that "legitimacy is produced through communication" [17.].

H. Jonas emphasizes that technological power increases responsibility for long-term consequences [18.].

A. MacIntyre stresses that virtues are sustained within practices possessing internal goods [19.].



J. Rest's four-component model reaffirms iterative moral competence formation [20.].

J. van den Hoven's value-sensitive design demonstrates that technologies embody values [21.].

D. Schön highlights reflective practice under uncertainty [22.].

S. Vallor's concept of "technological virtues" stresses reinterpretation of virtues in the digital age [23.].

### **Conclusion/Recommendations**

The system of spiritual and moral technologies in the training of managerial personnel should be formed as an integral model that integrates virtue ethics, reflective pedagogy, value-sensitive design, and communicative legitimacy. Such a model transforms ethics from external control into internal decision-making competence, and technology from a neutral tool into an environment that strengthens moral responsibility. Only this approach can turn leadership training into a real mechanism capable of reinforcing social trust and forming a stable and responsible managerial elite.

The analyses conducted in this article demonstrate that the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training is not an auxiliary element of modern management education, but rather its spiritual and methodological foundation. The research findings confirm that when the formation of leadership competencies is limited solely to professional knowledge and organizational skills, issues of ethical legitimacy of managerial decisions, their social consequences, and the maintenance of public trust remain insufficiently addressed. Therefore, the system of spiritual and moral technologies should be regarded as an integral methodological mechanism that develops conscious moral choice, reflective thinking, and responsibility within the leader's personality.

The study also shows that in the context of globalization and digital transformation, excessive orientation of leadership training toward paradigms of speed and efficiency increases the risk of concealing moral responsibility behind technological procedures. The system of spiritual and moral technologies serves precisely to counter this risk, bringing the social consequences of decisions, justice, and trust to the center of managerial activity. It has been substantiated that the effectiveness of moral preparation is ensured not by the assimilation of



declarative norms, but through dilemma-based exercises, reflective training, simulations, and the analysis of real managerial situations.

As practical recommendations, first, spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training programs should be introduced not as a separate subject or module, but as an integrated conceptual system embedded in all educational and practical processes. Second, assessment and certification mechanisms should prioritize not only performance indicators, but also the ethical justification of decision-making processes, the management of conflicts of interest, and the ability to explain responsibility. Third, digital platforms and evaluation algorithms used in leadership training should undergo ethical expertise to ensure transparency, impartiality, and explainability. Fourth, in order to strengthen reflective practice, it is recommended to institutionalize ethical diaries, mentoring mechanisms, and “after-action review” methods.

In conclusion, the system of spiritual and moral technologies in leadership training should develop as a sustainable model integrating virtue ethics, reflective pedagogy, systems thinking, and communicative legitimacy. This approach makes it possible to establish leadership not merely as instrumental efficiency, but as morally mature managerial activity grounded in social responsibility, justice, and public trust.

### **References:**

1. Yuldashev M.B. Boshqaruvda rahbar ma’naviy qiyofasining axloqiy asoslari. – Toshkent, 2014. – 27–35-betlar.
2. Nurmatova I.A. Jamiyat ma’naviy muhitini barqarorlashtirishda axloqiy me’yorlashtirish texnologiyalari. – Andijon, 2023. – 19–28-betlar.
3. Tojaliyev A.A. Innovatsion rivojlanish va kadrlar tayyorlashning milliy tizimi. – Andijon, 2021. – 41–49-betlar.
4. Yuldashev B.E. Zamonaviy rahbar ijtimoiy qiyofasini yuksaltirishning ijtimoiy-falsafiy muammolari. – Samarqand, 2022. – 33–40-betlar.
5. Jabborov J.A. Ma’naviy ehtiyojlar yuksalishi jamiyat rivojlanishining muhim omili sifatida. – Samarqand, 2023. – 22–30-betlar.
6. Mamatov M.M. Yangilanayotgan O‘zbekistonning ma’naviy taraqqiyot tamoyillari – barkamol avlodni tarbiyalash omili. – Toshkent, 2023. – 58–66-betlar.



7. Dewey J. Democracy and Education. — New York: Macmillan, 1916. — 240–270-betlar.
8. Weber M. Politics as a Vocation. — New York: Oxford University Press, 1946. — 30–45-betlar.
9. Etzioni A. The Moral Dimension: Toward a New Economics. — New York: Free Press, 1988. — 1–25-betlar.
10. Floridi L. The Ethics of Information. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. — 200–230-betlar.
11. Greenfield A. Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life. — London: Verso, 2017. — 45–75-betlar.
12. Alexander J. The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. — 35–60-betlar.
13. Kohlberg L. Essays on Moral Development. Vol. 1. — San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981. — 1–50-betlar.
14. Greenleaf R. Servant Leadership. — New York: Paulist Press, 1977. — 1–30-betlar.
15. Schön D. The Reflective Practitioner. — New York: Basic Books, 1983. — 60–90-betlar.
16. Vallor S. Technology and the Virtues. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. — 100–140-betlar.
17. Senge P. The Fifth Discipline. — New York: Doubleday, 1990. — 150–190-betlar.
18. Introna L. Ethics and Information Technology. — Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005. — 80–120-betlar.
19. MacIntyre A. After Virtue. — Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981. — 180–200-betlar.
20. Gilligan C. In a Different Voice. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982. — 25–45-betlar.
21. van den Hoven J. “Design for Values.” — Ethics and Information Technology, 2013. — 1–15-betlar.
22. Argyris C. On Organizational Learning. — Oxford: Blackwell, 1999. — 1–30-betlar.
23. O’Neill O. A Question of Trust. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. — 20–40-betlar.



24. Audi R. Moral Knowledge and Ethical Character. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. — 100–130-betlar.
25. To‘rayev Sh.N. Mafkuraviy tahdidlarning ma’naviy jarayonlarga ta’sirini oldini olishning ijtimoiy-falsafiy asoslari : DSc dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati. — Toshkent, 2023. — 27–38-betlar.
26. Lutfullayev A.A. Xalqaro yagona axborot maydonining kengayishi sharoitida ma’naviy tahdidlarga qarshi kurashish : PhD dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati. — Buxoro, 2023. — 17–25-betlar.
27. Juraqulov J.K. Axborotlashgan jamiyatda inson ma’naviy borlig‘ining ijtimoiy-madaniy transformatsiyasi : PhD dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati. — Toshkent, 2023. — 20–28-betlar.
28. <sup>1</sup>Ahmedova O‘.N. Jamiyat muhitida ma’naviy tarbiyani rivojlantirishning strategik texnologiyalari : PhD dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati. — Namangan, 2023. — 23–30-betlar.
29. <sup>1</sup> Jabborova S.S. Ma’naviy salohiyat – ijtimoiy taraqqiyot manbai : PhD dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati. — Buxoro, 2023. — 26–33-betlar.
30. <sup>1</sup> Ricoeur P. Oneself as Another. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. — 150–190-betlar.
31. <sup>1</sup> Rest J. Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory. — New York: Praeger, 1986. — 1–40-betlar.
32. <sup>1</sup> Power M. The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. — 1–25-betlar.
33. <sup>1</sup> Bostrom N. Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. — 70–110-betlar.
34. <sup>1</sup> Janis I. Groupthink. — Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982. — 1–30-betlar.
35. <sup>1</sup> Nussbaum M. Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities. — Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010. — 1–40-betlar.
36. <sup>1</sup> Rawls J. A Theory of Justice. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971. — 1–30-betlar.
37. <sup>1</sup> Winner L. The Whale and the Reactor: A Search for Limits in an Age of High Technology. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. — 19–40-betlar.
38. <sup>1</sup> Freire P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. — New York: Continuum, 2000. — 25–50-betlar.



39. <sup>1</sup> Nissenbaum H. *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life*. — Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010. — 120–150-betlar.
40. <sup>1</sup> Senge P. *The Fifth Discipline*. — New York: Doubleday, 1990. — 60–90-betlar.
41. <sup>1</sup> Habermas J. *Between Facts and Norms*. — Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996. — 1–40-betlar.
42. <sup>1</sup> Jonas H. *Das Prinzip Verantwortung*. — Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979. — 30–55-betlar.
43. <sup>1</sup> MacIntyre A. *After Virtue*. — Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981. — 180–200-betlar.
44. <sup>1</sup> Rest J. *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory*. — New York: Praeger, 1986. — 1–40-betlar.
45. <sup>1</sup> van den Hoven J. “Design for Values.” — *Ethics and Information Technology*, 2013. — 1–15-betlar.
46. <sup>1</sup> Schön D. *The Reflective Practitioner*. — New York: Basic Books, 1983. — 60–90-betlar.
47. <sup>1</sup> Nissenbaum H. *Privacy in Context*. — Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010. — 120–150-betlar.
48. <sup>1</sup> Habermas J. *Between Facts and Norms*. — Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996. — 1–40-betlar.
49. <sup>1</sup> Vallor S. *Technology and the Virtues*. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. — 100–140-betlar.