



IMPORTANCE OF USING THE FSMU METHOD IN MILITARY EDUCATION

Kuchkarov Rustam Razzakovich¹

¹Instructor in Armament and Shooting, Department of Combined Arms
Training, University of Public Security and Defense of the Republic of
Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23792208>

Abstract: The article examines the potential of the FSMU method in military education for substantiating thoughts and developing a culture of professional discussion. Based on the analysis of methodological sources, the stages of stating the point, reasoning, providing an example, and generalizing are distinguished. Using a conditional training example concerning a commander's consideration of individual characteristics when distributing tasks, the procedure for applying the method is developed. Instead of the degree of agreement with an opinion, it is proposed to evaluate the logic of the evidence and the correspondence of the conclusion to the conditions.

Keywords: FSMU, military education, substantiation of thoughts, professional discussion, individual approach, reflection.

In military education, expressing a professional thought concisely and clearly, indicating its reason, and substantiating it with an example is an important educational task. If only a correct answer is required, the trainee's path to the conclusion remains invisible. The purpose of this article is to adapt the FSMU method to seminar discussions related to military management. The work is based on the analysis of methodological sources and the development of an author's scenario; no claims of empirical effectiveness are made.

The name FSMU represents the stages of stating the point (Fikr), reasoning (Sabab), example (Misol), and generalization (Umumlashtirish). In D. Tojiboyeva's manual, the method is described in the order of transitioning from individual work to small group and general discussion [1, pp. 225–226]. This source is dedicated to teaching special subjects; transferring it to military education is the methodological adaptation proposed in this article.

At the F stage, the trainee expresses a clear claim. At the S stage, they explain why this claim is acceptable. At the M stage, they provide a specific situation related to the reason. At the U stage, rather than merely repeating the initial thought, they formulate a conclusion that takes into account its limits of application. Each step must be logically connected to the previous one.

The pedagogical potential of the method is that it allows the instructor to see a break in the trainee's reasoning. For instance, if the thought concerns an individual approach, but the example is provided solely regarding discipline, the connection is not sufficiently substantiated. Furthermore, a single successful example does not prove the correctness of a decision in all situations. The instructor guides the generalization to reveal this limitation.

Conditional Practical Situation in Military Education

The following thought is given in the seminar: a commander must consider the individual preparation and characteristics of servicemen when distributing training tasks. A conditional study group is described to the trainees: one trainee knows the theoretical material well, but

struggles to explain it publicly; the second speaks actively, but makes mistakes in written planning. The group must formulate a training plan and present it.

Exemplary F: preparation disparities must be taken into account when distributing tasks. S: the complexity of the assignment and the provided assistance must match the trainee's developmental needs. M: the trainee struggling with written planning drafts the plan project, while their partner checks it based on criteria; the trainee struggling with public speaking performs the short part of the presentation. U: an individual approach should serve not only to utilize existing strengths, but also to provide controlled practice for weaker skills.

The instructor plans a 35-minute activity: problem and rules—5 minutes; individual FSMU writing—8 minutes; verifying reasoning and examples in pairs—7 minutes; group discussion—10 minutes; final conclusion—5 minutes. In addition to the group's general response, individual worksheets are also retained.

During the discussion, the instructor asks an additional question: how would the proposal change if the deadline is very short or the task requires special qualification? The expected response distinguishes between the goal of development and the necessity of fulfilling the established requirements of the task. Accounting for individual characteristics cannot serve as a basis for bypassing mandatory safety requirements. All details of the session are conditional training examples.

Evaluation and Conditions of Application

In the proposed evaluation, each of the four stages is graded with 0–2 points; an additional 2 points are allocated for indicating a counter-example or the limits of application. Total: 10 points. 0 — part missing or irrelevant to the topic; 1 — partially connected; 2 — clear, consistent, and substantiated answer. The conformity of the opinion in FSMU to the instructor's viewpoint does not yield separate points.

Such criteria-based evaluation is adapted to the rubric approach of breaking down tasks into components [2]. The instructor maintains the rule of objecting to the opinion rather than the person. Differences in military service rank are not turned into a criterion for prioritizing unsubstantiated thoughts in the classroom. However, seminar discussions are not mixed with service execution procedures.

The FSMU has the risk of oversimplifying a complex issue into a four-part template. It cannot replace gathering new evidence or examining alternative decisions in detail. When necessary, the trainee must work with additional sources and counter-arguments. Mastery can be tested by having trainees write independent FSMU responses in subsequent topics.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The FSMU serves in military education to consistently express thoughts, separate reasoning from examples, and practice cautious generalization. It is appropriate to use it at the end of seminars, in professional debates, and during written reflection. The main requirement is to evaluate the logical connection of each stage and allow for various well-founded perspectives. In future testing, it is recommended to compare trainees' initial and final writings using identical criteria.

References / Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar / Литература

1. Tojiboyeva D. Maxsus fanlarni o'qitish metodikasi. O'quv qo'llanma. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2007. pp. 225–226. Available at: <https://arm.ssuv.uz/frontend/web/books/661fad1ed3cfc.pdf> [Accessed: October 29, 2026].
2. Carnegie Mellon University, Eberly Center. Grading and Performance Rubrics. Available at: <https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/designteach/teach/rubrics.html> [Accessed: October 29, 2026].