



ANALYSIS OF PEDAGOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MECHANISMS OF DEVELOPING COLLABORATIVE SKILLS OF STUDENTS BASED ON A MULTI-VECTOR APPROACH

Turemuratova Aziza Begibaevna

Assistant, Department of Pedagogy and Psychology,
Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh,
Republic of Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan

Tursunboyeva Guljahon Kuroilboy kizi

Yusupova Kumushkhon Ismoil kizi

Sultanova Zebokhon Safarbay kizi

Students of Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13943486>

Abstract. This work is devoted to the definition of the concept of "collaboration" in the system of pedagogical sciences, as well as the study of collaboration as a form of pedagogical interaction. The relevance of the study is due, on the one hand, to the increasing frequency of references by pedagogical researchers to the concept of "collaboration", and on the other hand, to the high degree of inconsistency of scientists in defining this phenomenon in the system of educational sciences.

Keywords: pedagogical collaboration, pedagogical interaction, collaborative learning, collaboration, pedagogy of cooperation, educational interaction, collective learning.

INTRODUCTION

In modern pedagogical research, the concept of "collaboration" (collaborative learning) is increasingly encountered. At the same time, a review of scientific literature has made it possible to identify the problem of the lack of unanimity of opinion among researchers regarding the concept of collaboration in the field of education. A number of researchers use the term "collaboration" to combine the concepts of "joint activity", "activity performed jointly", "group form of interaction organization", "educational cooperation" [1].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

There are also references to collaborative learning as a general term for a group of educational technologies based on the process of collective educational interaction: for example, project technology, case technology, learning in cooperation, etc. According to G.P. Sinitsyna, collaboration is one of the components of the educational strategy of learning in partnership [2]. N.V. Pavelyeva believes that collaborative learning should be understood more broadly: as a pedagogical approach based on close interaction between



participants in the educational process [3]. A.V. Kulikov defines collaboration in the educational environment even more broadly, noting that collaboration is a philosophy of education, the original concept of joint activities, training and professional-academic interaction [4].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The use of the discourse analysis method to study the terminological development of the concept of "interaction" up to the time of its first mention in descriptions of the phenomenon of collaboration was aimed primarily at determining the moment of transition of the observed phenomenon into the area of social relations. This step was necessary to identify the signs of mutual activity of subjects, which, as a superstructure over the key meaning-forming element, contributed to the emergence of the concept of "collaboration" as an independent unit of scientific discourse. In other words, the task was to determine whether the concepts of "collaboration" and "interaction" are synonymous in the system of social sciences.

The core of materialistic dialectics was the transfer of the philosophical understanding of interaction to the area of social relations. According to F. Engels, social development is basically reduced to interaction in the form of struggle between different social classes. This form is based on the interaction of opposites. The understanding of society as a product of human interaction, which is one of the main provisions of dialectical materialism, was further developed in the philosophical works of V.I. Lenin, who considered social relations as a process of changing the properties and qualities of external reality as a result of human activity. An appeal to the nature of interaction can be traced in V.I. Lenin's definition of human activity as a change in various properties and qualities of external reality based on the goal-setting activity of man. As V.V. Davydov noted, Lenin introduced into materialistic dialectics the concept of transformative human activity as the interaction of goals, means and actions of the subject in relation to objective reality, thus highlighting the basic components of interaction in the area of social relations: goal-setting, selection and use of external tools, verification of the coincidence of the subjective and objective.

M. Weber in his work "Basic Sociological Concepts" defined the formula of social interaction as the sum of purposefulness and orientation towards others. The scientist identified four types of social interaction: traditional (following certain patterns of behavior), rational (correlation of goals and means), affective (emotional) and value-rational. Somewhat later, the American sociologist T.



Parsons, continuing his attempts to establish the relationship between social interaction at the level of individual groups and the type of a specific society, began to consider social interaction more broadly than a single act, adding to Weber's formula also the situational environment of the subject of activity. The general structure of social interaction is presented by Parsons in the form of five pairs of opposite poles: affectivity - neutrality, orientation towards oneself - orientation towards the collective, universalism - particularism, quality - effectiveness, specificity - diffusion.

The idea of the determinacy of a single social interaction by symbols and signals of the environment surrounding the subject was developed in the sociological paradigm of symbolic interactionism by J. Mead, the origins of which were, on the one hand, the direction of pragmatism in philosophy, and on the other hand, the theory of behaviorism in psychology (E. Thorndike, I.P. Pavlov, B. Skinner, etc.). J. Mead represented the structure of social interaction in four phases of action: impulse, perception, manipulation, reaction. The process of orientation in each of these phases is carried out by interpreting and producing symbols, the most important of which are the symbols of language. J. Mead considered the mechanism of role acceptance, i.e. the acceptance by individuals of the role of another in order to generate a response symbol adequate to a specific community, to be the means of such manipulation of symbols to maintain social interaction. J. Mead's ideas were subsequently reflected not only in the general typology of interactions, but also at a more specific level in identifying the mechanisms of social interaction.

Thus, collaboration in the specified period was defined as the joint work of several physical or economic entities with common goals and interests; as a collective form of organization of interacting entities, implying the unification of efforts, resources and results of intellectual labor to create a common product; or as joint creative activity of a project nature, etc. [3].

However, greater rigor in the description of the phenomenon of collaboration was brought about by the attempts of researchers to approach the issue of typologization of social interactions in the late 1970s. It was the desire to systematize various forms of mutual activity of entities that allowed researchers to identify distinctive characteristics of interaction that were sufficient to distinguish elements within a specific typology.

It should be noted that social interaction by the end of the 20th century is increasingly defined as a system of interdependent and interdependent social actions, in which the actions of one entity are simultaneously the cause and



effect of the actions of another entity, thus forming a cyclical social dependence. In this regard, studies of the mechanisms of social action from different research positions have led to the emergence of various typologies of social interaction. First of all, as A.V. Kandaurova notes, existing typologies are conditioned by the different initial grounds of researchers for the typologization process itself [4].

CONCLUSION

The results of content and discourse analysis presented in the study allow us to classify collaboration as a form of social cooperation. It was possible to establish that this form of social interaction has a number of distinctive characteristics that allow us to distinguish between the concept of collaboration and cooperation. The conducted analysis of scientific and pedagogical literature allowed us to identify the presence of a relationship between the typology of social and pedagogical interaction when choosing the nature of acts of subject-subject interaction as the basis for classification.

References:

1. Neznanov A.A. et al. Collaborative technologies in education: how to build effective support for hybrid learning? / A.A. Neznanov // University management: practice and analysis. - 2019. - Vol. 23. - No. 1-2. - P. 101-110.
2. Sinitsyna G.P. Strategy of learning in partnership: collaborative learning / G.P. Sinitsyna // Science of man: humanitarian studies. - 2019. -No. 2 (36). - P. 78-82.
3. Pavelieva N.V. Collaborative learning as a model of effective implementation of the educational process / N.V. Pavelieva // Education. Career. Society.- 2010. - No. 3 (29). - P. 30-37.
4. Kulikov A.V. Distance collaborative learning systems and some aspects of their development technology / A.V. Kulikov // Conference proceedings of the Research Center Sociosfera. — Vedecko vydavateľske centrum Sociosfera-CZ sro, 2012. — No. 8. — P. 105–107.
5. Laal M., Ghodsi S.M. Benefits of collaborative learning / M. Laal, S.M. Ghodsi // Procedia-social and behavioral sciences. — 2012. — Vol. 31. — p. 486–490.

