

GENERAL DIDACTIC FOUNDATIONS OF AN INTEGRATIVE APPROACH TO THE ORGANIZATION OF TRAINING

Aziz Tojkhonov

Researcher of the Namangan State University, g.
Namangan, UZBEKISTAN

ABSTRACT

The theory of teaching primary school teachers, being a concretization of the general theory of instruction, should be based on a certain general didactic system. The didactic basis of an integrative approach to the organization of training of primary school teachers is the concept of developing education.

Keywords: Theory, primary school, general didactic system.

INTRODUCTION, LITERATURE REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

As a general didactic basis of the theory of teaching of primary school teachers, we accept the modern didactic system of higher education, complemented by the integrative principle of the organization of education.

There is no single understanding of the term "didactic system" in modern scientific and methodological literature [2; sixteen]. Moreover, the authors make opposite judgments about the characteristic properties of this concept [3. S. 122-123] or dispense with examples of specific didactic systems.

In view of the fundamental importance of this concept for the realization of the goals of our study, we single out the essential signs of understanding the "didactic system".

V.P. Kuzmin defines the system [1, p. 111] as "a set of interconnected elements (components) that form a stable unity and integrity, with integrative properties and laws." Under the pedagogical system T.A. Ilyin [5. P. 16] understands "an ordered set of interconnected elements, singled out on the basis of certain characteristics, united by a common goal of functioning and unity of management and acting as an integral phenomenon in interaction with the environment."

AT 8. P. 84] the pedagogical system is called "a lot of interconnected structural elements, united by a single educational goal of personality development and functioning in the whole pedagogical process." IN 3. P. 102] the didactic system is called "... a set of elements that form a single integral structure and serve the achievement of learning goals. The description of the system is reduced to the characterization of goals, the content of education, didactic methods, means, forms of training and its princi - pov. " The author identifies the concepts of "psychological-pedagogical conception" and the didactic system, referring to the volume of this concept of the system of Y. Komensky, I. Pestalozzi, I. Herbart, D. Dewey, G. Kershensteiner, V. Lai. At the same time, the author calls the systems of P. Halperin, L. Zankov, V. Davydov, C. Rogers, J. Bruner "directions" that "create a modern didactic concept." Moreover, the concept of "pedagogical system" goes beyond the framework of narrowly understood personalization (B. G. Gershunsky).

The class of “author’s pedagogical systems” includes the pedagogical systems of Ya.A. Comenius, K.D. Ushinsky, L.N. Tolstoy, A.S. Makarenko, V.A. Sukhomlinsky, B.A. Karakovsky. Systems L.V. Zankova, D.B. Elkonina and V.V. Davydova, M.M. Makhmutova, P.Ya. Erdnieva called "author's didactic systems".

The category “pedagogical system” is used to indicate the characteristics of the vertical cut of pedagogical activity depending on the level of education being considered, for example, the pedagogical system of kindergarten, the pedagogical system of higher education, etc. [6].

For all the variety of definitions of the concept "pedagogical system" or "didactic system", an essential sign is the presence of: ideas; many interconnected elements (educational content, principles of instruction, methods, means, forms of instruction) and the functional side (object of application — environment — and methods of interaction).

From a scientific point of view, the pedagogical system can be considered as a "kind of pedagogical paradigm" [1. P. 18], meaning recognized by all scientific achievements, which for a certain time provide a model for posing problems and their solutions to the scientific community.

We interpret the didactic system as a model of the pedagogical system from the standpoint of practical application. The in-variability of the pedagogical system is supplemented by specific conditions of application (specification of goals, choice of an object, form of existence, temporary deployment, etc.). The concept of "learning system" is a form of manifestation of the concept of "didactic system", for example, "a system of developing education in elementary school." The stability of the paradigms in pedagogy is very relative, because "objective social needs gradually lead to the need for periodic clarification and even change of individual components of the pedagogical paradigm" [5] (goals, ways of interaction). In this case, the primary change is the specific training systems as the implementation of subjective and objective social needs. The training system is a formative factor in pedagogical interaction "with the aim of solving the problems of education, aimed both at meeting the needs of society and the individual in its development and self-development" [8. P. 84], i.e. defines the learning process.

Two components of the pedagogical process are distinguished: the content of education and the means of education, which include pedagogical ones — forms, methods, and techniques. The content and means of education are necessary and sufficient for the emergence of any pedagogical system [8].

The isolation in the pedagogical theory of the idea of a complex approach and its transformation into an independent pedagogical problem originates in the writings of progressive teachers of different eras - A.Ya. Comenius, I.G. Pestalozzi, A. Disterweg, K.D. Ushinsky and others. They approached the problem from different perspectives, but each was characterized by a desire to provide students with a system of knowledge about the world. Considering the structure of science, K.D. Ushinsky noted that "in addition to special concepts that belong to each science in particular, there are concepts common to many, and others to all sciences" [6. S. 600].

An important stage in determining the study of a unified approach to learning from the perspective of the formation of a knowledge system (educational function) and the foundations of a scientific worldview (educational function) was the research of B.G. Ananyeva and Sh.I. Ganelina in the 50s. The main area of research concerned the paths to the consistent implementation of the interconnections between leading ideas and the concepts of related courses (external side of integration). The theory of integrated learning was further developed in the works of Yu.K.

Babansky, V.V. Davydova, L.V. Zankova, I.F. Isaeva G.M. Kojaspirova, V.M. Maximova, N.A. Menzhinsky, A.I. Mischenko, M.N. Skatkina, V.A. Slastenin, G.F. Fedorets, E.N. Shiyano-va, D. B. Elkonin et al. The provisions of the developed theories were based on the idea of a systematic didactic interconnected process of training, education and development. The study of integration processes in training was carried out mainly in two directions.

The first direction emphasized the presence of intersubject connections, their decisive role in the formation of the worldview aspect of knowledge (P. G. Kulagin, V. N. Maksimova, G. F. Fedorets [1. 130; 208]). G.F. Fedorets suggests classifying intersubject communications:

- in composition - objects, facts, concepts, theories, methods;
- by the method - logical and methodological techniques and forms of the educational process;
- focus - the formation of common skills in solving educational problems.

In later works based on the study of intra-subject relationships, refined classifications are given; For example, V.A. Dalinger [67] subdivides relations: in terms of composition - into substantive, operational, methodological, organizational; according to the method, chronological, chronometric; in direction - multilateral, bilateral, one-sided. These classifications are based on the identification of "leading concepts", the main meaning of which is not only informational. They serve the purpose of deeper understanding and study [7. S. 21]. The need to single out a group of "target knowledge" in relation to the process of preparing a future teacher of a profile school as the basis for integrative processes is described in [7]. It should be noted that for all the diversity of interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary connections in the learning process, they reflect the "static" nature of the description of integration.

The second direction of the study of the integrative essence of training can be called the allocation of leading ideas of a worldview nature in the organization of the learning process (MN Skatkin, V.V. Davydov, L.V. Zankov, etc.) and, first of all, the ideas of training activity, the scientific justification of which is given in the works of L.S. Vygotsky. The essence of educational activity is manifested in the assimilation of objective products of social experience (V.V. Davydov, I.Ya. Lerner, A.K. Markov, etc.). In the process of educational activity, based on the method of scientific knowledge, worldview ideas seem to be "overgrown" with theories, concepts, facts, forming a holistic scientific system of knowledge about nature and society.

The concept of developing learning as a training of a certain kind of mental activity is reflected in the didactic principles of developing learning: teaching at a high level of difficulty, the principle of the leading role of theoretical knowledge, teaching at a fast pace, awareness of the learning process, etc. (L.V. Zankov). The integrating essence of developing learning is manifested in the invariant nature of cognitive activity. This direction of integration is fundamental for building a training system for primary school teachers due to the specifics of the teaching process at the faculty and the features of professional activity.

Speaking about the didactic foundations of integrated education, it is important to note that the principle of the holistic reflection of science in the unity of theory and method, in the system of relations of science with other forms of social consciousness and practice (MN Skatkin, V.V. Kraevsky, I. Ya. Lerner, etc.) reveals the essence of the concept of a subject as a unity of knowledge, methods and relations, formed in the process of studying science, the branch of human activity. Consideration of the model of the subject as a generalized model of knowledge based on the function of information in the process of human education (G.S. Sukhobskaya, Yu.A. Sherkovin, V.Ya. Yadov, etc.) allows us to isolate three components in it: epistemic, instrumental, motivational and evaluative, each of which can be the basis of integration.

According to a number of studies, the content of education is a model of the subject area of science (Yu.K. Babansky, V.P. Bepalko, B.C. Lednev). The principles and methods of construction that underlie the construction of models can serve as an objective basis for integration, isolating the class of objective tasks corresponding to a given level of abstraction.

Based on the foregoing, it can be concluded that the current state of development of pedagogy as a science allows for integrative learning within the framework of the didactic system of higher education on various system-forming grounds.

REFERENCES

1. Bepalko V.P. Fundamentals of the theory of pedagogical systems. Voronezh: publishing house of Voronezh University, 1997-304 p.
2. Pidkasisty P.I. Pedagogy: Textbook. allowance. 1995.680 p.
3. Pedagogy: Textbook for students of pedagogical institutions / V.A. Slastenin, I.F. Isaev, A.I. Mishchenko, E.N. Shiya-nov. -M. : School-Press, 1997. -512 p.
4. Kuzmin V.P. Principles-systems in the theory and methodology of K. Marx. -M., 1986. -460 p.
5. Ilyina T.A. System-structural approach to the organization of training. -M., 1972. -220 s.
6. Ursul A.D. Integrative and general scientific tendencies of cognition and philosophy // Questions of philosophy. 1977.-№ 1. -C. 114-124.
7. Interdisciplinary communication in the learning process. -L.: LPTI, 1983.
8. Fedorets G.F. Intersubject communications of pedagogy with psychology. -L. : Publishing house Leningrad. Ped. Institute, 1988. -87 p.