

PEDAGOGICAL PROFILACTICS OF COGNITIVE-PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIERS THAT ARISE IN THE PROCESS OF INNOVATIVE ACTIVITY

Norboyev Farxod Chorshanbiyevich

Teacher, Termez State University

Abstract:

In recent years, scientific and technological innovation has rapidly penetrated the educational space in the course of reforms in our education system. However, regardless of whether it is open or secretive or passive or active intentional or without intent, various psychological barriers impede innovative changes in the psychological barriers that manifest themselves in the innovative pedagogical process and the problem of overcoming them.

Keywords: *barrier, innovation, change, manifest, overcome*

Introduction

The integration of the results from two fields of educational inquiry, school effectiveness research and school improvement analysis, was approached in a straightforward way, going back to earlier analyses of this relationship. According to these analyses, school improvement and school effectiveness are basically seen as consecutive causal processes: School effectiveness yields school characteristics that optimise particular learning outcomes, and school improvement addresses factors and processes that establish these effectiveness enhancing factors. Effectiveness-enhancing factors at the school and classroom levels are depicted as the “intermediate outcomes” of school improvement at the school and classroom levels. The scientific merit in this linear modelling of school improvement and school effectiveness is the heuristic value for designing research studies. School improvement activities, when empirically assessed for stimulating effectiveness enhancing factors (the intermediate outcomes in the diagram), could realistically be expected to provide “effective school improvement”. This research approach could free the field of school improvement from its current predominant dependence on case studies and “holistic” normative reflections. The practical merit is that an integrated view on school improvement and school effectiveness would provide a substantive direction for school improvement (next to promoting change for change’s sake, and promoting the capacity for schools to keep up with environmental dynamics). Brown, Duffield, and Riddell (1995, p. 6) stress the fact that “school effectiveness research offers policymakers the engaging prospect of being able to identify the characteristics of effective schools and then make use of these findings to bring about improvements in less effective institutions”. Nevertheless, to know what is effective and what is not, does not offer the assurance to know how to move from one position—less effective—to another—more

effective—by the most efficient way. In other words, the knowledge of a static (or steady) state, following a good diagnosis, does not offer a prescription of an effective action to move to a better state. It is important to consider a more complex model, as was tried in the ESI project, and to take care as well of the states and the transitions between them. The fact that a good solution in one situation could be a very bad one in a different context is not a reason to skip all attempts to formalise the field of school improvement, but it is an excellent incentive to study in more depth all contextual aspects as in the field of school effectiveness. It is also a good reason to pay attention to socioeconomic variables and other “external” aspects usually neglected in the field of school improvement. By making this point, we suggest, with Brown et al. (1995), that improvements are not “context free”. The theory-based mechanisms that were discussed in the main body of this article provide a basis for establishing and verifying more generally, effective ways of school improvement. om for autonomy and “self-regulation” at lower levels in the system. This is a particularly helpful phenomenon in education systems, given the usually large degree of professional autonomy of teachers, and tendencies to increase school autonomy as a result of decentralisation policies. Learning organisation theories have a positive attitude towards heterogeneity, which is deliberately created inside each school to make capital out of it. Effectiveness is linked with management of the heterogeneity of pupils in each school as opposed to public choice theories, where effectiveness is linked with diversity in the offer, which means creation of various school types in which heterogeneity is small. The functioning conditions of a learning organisation are on the one hand based on the autonomy left to schools to organise methods such as differentiated pedagogies, and on the other hand on the ability to produce institutional knowledge. Learning to learn pedagogies may be implied as well. At the student level, this means learning high taxonomy level strategies such as metacognitive thinking. Teachers have to organise their practices to help pupils to integrate such strategies (Palincsar & Brown, 1992). Contrary to behavioural theories that take place in a stable/secure economical context and promote pragmatic objectives, learning organisation theories develop objectives centred on adaptability to change. Moreover, objectives that are worked towards by those innovation-oriented theories, have passed beyond the individual orientation to become more socially oriented. From closed programmes and strict conformity regulation we move progressively to a more systemic approach involving also goals’ adaptation and self-regulation. A greater and greater number of actors are recognised as partners, not only to execute orders but also to define goals and means. Learning organisations turn into different types of directions with the concept of pilotage better understood in French-speaking countries or with the more Anglo-Saxon concept of development. According to Demeuse and Baye (2001), the French term pilotage refers to a model which aims at providing the systems with the possibility of reaching their objectives. At this level, the organisation is mainly characterised by the ability to modify its objectives during the course of development. This adaptation of the objectives requires a

continuous anticipation of the constraints of the environment. Even if the ideas from public choice theory and the application of market mechanisms are not followed to the letter by putting all one's money on approaches like free school choice, merit pay of teachers, or voucher systems, they may still be seen as pointing at a few important more general principles. Concern with the needs of parents and other stakeholders, the importance of external pressure to improve, as well as the need for school to operate with a certain degree of autonomy were considered as important elements for a conceptual model of effective school improvement. The next theoretical principle to be discussed replaces “market mechanisms” by “evaluative control and information provision”. This principle is still to be seen as belonging to the rational model, but it is more retroactively (learning from experience) rather than proactively oriented.

References

1. Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1992). Classroom dialogues to promote self-regulated comprehension. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. 1, pp. 35 – 72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
2. Reynolds, D. (1996). *Making good schools: Linking school effectiveness and improvement*. London: Routledge.
3. Riley, D. D. (1990). Should market forces control educational decision making? *American Political Science Review*, 84, 554 – 558.
4. Scheerens, J. (2002). *Effective schooling, research, theory and practice*. London: Cassell.
5. Van den Berg, R., Vandenberghe, R., & Sleegers, P. (1999). Management of innovations from a cultural-individual perspective. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 10, 321 – 351.
6. Weber, M. (2007). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. London: Oxford University Press.