



## Methodology for Teaching Pedagogical Dispute in the System of Professional Teacher Training

Burieva Nilufar Rasulovna

Teacher of Karshi State University, Uzbekistan

The article presents the general characteristic of the model of teaching future teachers to the pedagogical dispute as a professionally significant statement, describes the course of the formation in students of special knowledge and skills associated with a comprehensive assessment of the situation of the dispute from the point of view of its genre parameters and modeling of effective and correct speech behavior in specific conditions of pedagogical interaction.

**Keywords:**

professional competencies, teaching technique, pedagogical dispute, genre features of a pedagogical dispute, educational-speech situation

**Introduction.** In the system of professional competencies of future teachers, a significant place is occupied by communicative competencies, which are associated with the organization and implementation of pedagogical communication and their own speech behavior within the framework of the educational process. Among such competencies should, in our opinion, include those skills that are necessary for a teacher in a situation of pedagogical dispute as one of the most frequent and difficult in his professional practice, especially since, according to N. I. Makhnovskaya, "... the ability to argue their views and actions in various situations of pedagogical communication and constitutes to a greater extent the essence of cooperation pedagogy" [2, p. 4].

As observations of teachers' speech activity show, the level of development of their argumentative and discussion skills, special communication skills (assessing the degree of conflict in a situation; taking into account the psychological characteristics of the addressee; selecting appropriate arguments and speech tactics depending on the conditions of the dispute situation, etc.) is insufficient for successful modeling speech behavior in the context of an educational-speech dispute

situation; the main difficulties in conducting a pedagogical dispute are caused by the lack of special knowledge about the genre nature of a pedagogical dispute [2]; Despite the frequent nature of the occurrence of a dispute situation and the various conditions of its functioning, teachers, and after them trainees, most often use destructive speech tactics as ways of "emergency" resolution of a dispute situation in the lesson, which is obviously associated with the predominantly authoritarian style of professional communication between teachers and the stereotyping of their behavior in conflicts. Thus, constructive argumentative behavior in a situation of pedagogical dispute, primarily in the context of a lesson as the main unit of education, must be purposefully taught at a university as part of the communicative training of a future teacher.

The purpose of the article is to characterize some conditions for the implementation of the methodology for teaching students pedagogical dispute and briefly present the progress of the formation of the necessary communicative genre skills.

In order to improve the professional communicative training of future language arts teachers, we have developed an experiential training program aimed at developing

argumentative speech in the process of a professionally significant dispute with students (note that this program is universal in nature and can be applied in the training of other subject teachers). The training included 2 classroom sessions and was associated with the study of genre features of pedagogical dispute and its varieties. The general goal of the classes is to develop the skills necessary to conduct a constructive pedagogical debate in a real educational and speech situation of a lesson. To achieve this, a system of communicative tasks was developed, including: a) tasks of an analytical nature, involving an in-depth, meaningful or comparative analysis of samples (positive and negative) of pedagogical dispute; b) tasks of an analytical-constructive nature, aimed at analyzing the proposed situations, adjusting the negative communicative behavior of the teacher and creating options for his verbal interaction in a pedagogical dispute; c) creative tasks that require the implementation of a pedagogical dispute in laboratory or real-life conditions of school lessons during the period of teaching practice. When determining the place of tasks of different types in the program, we were guided by the need to constantly update and consolidate the acquired knowledge and previously developed skills.

The choice of training participants - 3rd year students - was determined by the following: firstly, pedagogical dispute is one of the most common professional genres of language teacher speech, and the skills necessary to conduct it, in our opinion, are advisable to develop in the early stages of the formation of future teachers; secondly, by the 3rd year students had mastered the basic (basic) psychological and communication skills that are important for modeling speech behavior in educational and speech dispute situations; thirdly, it provided an opportunity to consolidate the developed skills in real school conditions during the period of teaching practices of 4–5 years.

Let us imagine the progress of developing the skills necessary for effective and situationally determined modeling of the appropriate speech behavior of a teacher in a dispute with students.

The key objectives of this lesson were the following: to update students' knowledge about the dispute and its features; determine the place of the pedagogical dispute in the system of professionally significant statements of the teacher; to form an idea of the features of the educational and speech situation of a pedagogical dispute; identify the main causes of disputes in school settings; identify the specifics of the main thematic groups of pedagogical disputes.

At the beginning of the lesson, a conversation was organized, during which the frequency of disputes between teachers and students was revealed: students recalled incidents from their own school life that confirmed the relevance of the topic being studied. Further in the conversation, combined with an analysis of a video fragment from the film "We'll Live Till Monday," dir. S. Rostotsky (dispute between a history teacher and a student about Lieutenant Schmidt), students characterized the educational and speech situation of the pedagogical dispute in order to identify its features. In particular, it was noted that, by the nature of extralinguistic conditions, communication in a pedagogical dispute is official, since it takes place in an official setting (in the classroom), and there are status-role relationships between the teacher and students. At the same time, students drew attention to the characteristics of communicators in a pedagogical dispute: both a student and a teacher can initiate a dispute, but the teacher must take and maintain the position of a communicative leader by virtue of his profession. Among the teacher's intentions were: "to change the attitude towards the material being studied," "to interest students in the subject," "to prove the objectivity of knowledge assessment." Students noted that the teacher in a dispute strives to influence students with the help of interesting, ambiguous facts, his personal attitude to the topic under discussion, that is, his statements perform an influencing function in a dispute in a lesson. As the subject of pedagogical dispute, students indicated educational facts, grades, discipline, etc. When characterizing the teacher's speech, it was noted that it was an argumentative text

with elements of narration and description. Students focused on the fact that the teacher uses nonverbal means that give his speech an emotional, persuasive character (“approaches the student, puts his hand on the shoulder to make communication more confidential”).

The next stage of work was aimed at specifying information about the genre characteristics of a pedagogical dispute in comparison with an ordinary dispute. In the course of completing tasks, students were required to fill out the table “Genre characteristics of dispute and pedagogical dispute”, taking into account such factors as: type of speech, functional-semantic model of the text, structure, linguistic features, setting and nature of the relationship between communicants, intention, topic, addressee and addressee, duration in time. A comparative analysis showed that dispute and pedagogical dispute have similar features in terms of type of speech, functional-semantic model of the text and structure: they are polylogical statements, they are based on an argumentative text, and have a three-part structure. As one of the distinctive features of the pedagogical dispute, students noted the teacher’s intention: the teacher in the lesson solves a system of tasks (teaching, developmental and educational), which he must take into account in the dispute, that is, the teacher’s communicative intention is complex.

To characterize the addressee, students were asked to analyze a video fragment from the film “The Key Without the Right of Transfer,” dir. D. Asanova (the situation with marking in a chemistry lesson) and other examples of pedagogical disputes, answering the following questions: Who is the initiator of the dispute? Is the teacher the communicative leader in this debate? If not, what prevented him from arguing in positions of communicative leadership? As a result of analyzing the samples, students came to the conclusion that the main reasons why teachers did not become communicative leaders in the dispute are the following: the teacher’s communication style, his attitude to the profession, the lack of evidence of his positions, the use of “complaining intonation”, aggressive vocabulary, etc. Thus, the students noted the

need for the teacher to observe speech etiquette in a pedagogical dispute, since it is “one of the components of professional identity.”

The experience of communicating with a teacher who violates the requirements for the modern process of pedagogical interaction has a negative impact on the formation of the child’s personality. In this regard, the characteristics of the addressee in a pedagogical dispute were characterized, in particular, its multi-level system: in addition to the direct student-opponent, the influence of the teacher extends to the entire class, which from a simple observer becomes an indirect addressee in a pedagogical dispute. Analyzing the examples, the students came to the conclusion that the teacher’s actions in pedagogical communication in general and in pedagogical disputes in particular shape the student’s character, his value system, and worldview, which, in turn, determines the interaction of students with others in the future. Thus, another feature of the addressee was identified - his “perspective” (“the teacher determines the future attitude of the students to people, to the world and therefore must take into account the possible consequences of the dispute in his speech behavior”). Characterizing the factor of temporal extension, students found out that a pedagogical dispute is limited in time by the teacher’s intention, the topic of the dispute, the appropriateness of its conduct at a certain stage of the lesson and, ultimately, by the scope of the lesson itself.

The next task was related to identifying the reasons why disputes arise between the teacher and students. In the process of analyzing samples and updating life experience, students indicated as frequent reasons: disagreement with the mark, with the point of view expressed by the teacher, or with his requirements, violation of discipline, poor knowledge of the subject, actual mistake of the teacher, lack of clear criteria for assessing knowledge, desire to change students’ attitude to the academic subject, events, actions, etc., violation of ethical standards, etc. The result of the task was filling out the table “Causes of pedagogical disputes”, taking into account their subjectivity/objectivity.

In order to determine the types of disputes by topic and identify their typical arguments and methods of persuasion, students were asked to analyze samples of educational and speech dispute situations and answer the questions: What is the subject of the dispute in the presented fragments? What arguments and persuasive techniques does the teacher use in these disputes? How appropriate and effective are they in these situations? While completing the task, the students concluded that, regarding the subject of the dispute, the whole variety of situations of pedagogical disputes between the teacher and students can be divided into five thematic groups:

evaluative, disciplinary, educational, methodological and moral and ethical. The results of identifying a system of arguments and methods of persuasion were included in the table template "Thematic varieties of pedagogical disputes. Basic arguments and speech tactics."

The first lesson ended with a generalizing task, which consisted of analyzing the proposed pedagogical dispute (a fragment from N. Solomko's work "The White Horse is Not Mine": the situation of a disciplinary conversation between the teacher - Lola Ignatievna - and the class) taking into account the following aspects: reason, topic of the dispute, teacher's speech behavior (maintaining communicative leadership, taking into account the addressee, arguments and persuasion techniques).

The results of the lesson were summed up in a general conversation, during which the information received about the genre characteristics of the pedagogical dispute and its thematic varieties was systematized. The homework for the first lesson is to compile a memo "Features of pedagogical disputes" based on the obtained theoretical information and analysis of samples (the memo can be updated throughout the lessons).

The main tasks to be solved in this lesson: to give an idea of the specifics of the types of pedagogical disputes on various grounds; teach to distinguish between constructive and destructive tactics of influence in the process of pedagogical dispute; to form a conscious attitude toward constructive pedagogical

debate; teach how to use indirect influence tactics in a dispute; to develop the ability to use nonverbal means in pedagogical dispute.

To repeat information about the genre features of the pedagogical dispute and identify its varieties, a video fragment was proposed for analysis (a fragment of the series "Simple Truths" directed by E. Starkov, series "Boycott": the head teacher, having taken a letter from one of the students, refuses to return it). Students evaluated the presented controversy in terms of relevance. During the assignment, students came to the conclusion that not all disputes may be appropriate in the lesson. The criteria for the appropriateness of a dispute in a lesson were the topic and the significance of the dispute for solving the problems of the lesson or for students.

The second task was related to identifying ways to avoid unimportant disputes during the lesson. Let us give one example of a dispute for analysis: The beginning of a Russian language lesson in 6th grade. Everyone hands in their notebooks, but Volodya refuses, citing the fact that the teacher is marking incorrectly and biasedly. The teacher begins to object, and gradually the whole class gets involved in the argument. The teacher understands that the children simply want to disrupt the lesson and ends the protracted argument with the phrase: "We will talk about this topic in class, but now let's get back to the lesson."

Considering the proposed fragments, future teachers identified such basic ways of avoiding a dispute in the lesson as direct refusal of the dispute, reference to the class, reference in time, silence, reticence, etc.

In completing the following task, students were required to analyze samples containing pedagogical disputes and identify the types of pedagogical disputes by the number of participants, as well as indicate their characteristic features. As a result of the analysis, students identified two types of pedagogical disputes based on the number of participants: interpersonal and public. It was noted, in particular, that an interpersonal dispute presupposes a trusting relationship between the student and the teacher, which implies frankness in statements; The reasons

for the interpersonal nature of a pedagogical dispute may be the specifics of the subject of the dispute itself, the age and psychological characteristics of students, the student's status in the class, and the teacher's intentions. In a situation of public dispute, the participation of the teacher was determined as necessary, since the subject of the dispute affects the interests of the entire class and is significant for everyone. Then the students' attention was drawn to such an important characteristic of the dispute as its effectiveness. Taking into account this parameter, such types of pedagogical dispute as effective, ineffective and promisingly effective/ineffective were indicated. The main criteria for determining the effectiveness of a pedagogical dispute were the verbally expressed consent of the student, the actions of students confirming their agreement with the teacher, the approval and support of the entire class, etc.

Next, students were asked to compare the behavior of teachers in a similar situation and determine the nature of the proposed options for the dispute. For comparative analysis, a description of the following situation was used: "In a Russian language lesson, the teacher makes a factual error. The student, noticing this, throws out the phrase: "You give us grades for the subject, but you yourself don't know anything!"

Option 1: The teacher sharply remarks in response: "Look for mistakes in your notebook! Smart guy has emerged! Better remember what you wrote the dictation for!.."

Option 2: Teacher, addressing everyone: "Guys, I'm sorry, I really made a mistake. Like anyone, I can make mistakes. And Sasha is great: since he noticed the mistake, it means he was well prepared for the lesson. Be careful!"

The purpose of this task is to identify destructive and constructive types of pedagogical dispute, their characteristics and consequences. Analyzing the options, students indicated that in the first case, the teacher creates a statement of an obviously destructive nature, which destroys interpersonal relationships in the class, has a stressful effect on students, and forms a negative attitude towards both the teacher and the academic

subject as a whole. In the second example, the teacher's behavior was characterized as constructive, since he seeks to avoid conflict in a professionally unpleasant situation, adequately recognizing the rightness of his student. Thus, the influence of the nature of the dispute on the pedagogical process was noted, and the results of the discussion were recorded in the comparative table "Constructive and destructive pedagogical disputes".

The next group of tasks was aimed at considering the linguistic features of a pedagogical dispute (speech tactics). Students were asked the task: role-play fragments of the previous assignment and answer the question: What speech means model the destructive/constructive nature of conducting a pedagogical dispute?

As the students noted, in the first case, the teacher spontaneously implemented destructive elements: "reciprocal aggression - attack," "ridicule," "remembering past mistakes." In addition to verbal aggression, the teacher also used a harsh tone, offensive intonation, and threatening gestures. Such behavior of the teacher creates a negative attitude not only towards himself, but also towards the academic subject, worsens the quality of joint activities, and psychologically traumatizes children. In the second example, the teacher, without responding to the student's aggressive statement, removes the conflict of the situation with the help of such constructive elements of speech influence as "admitting one's mistake," "referring to common weaknesses," "praise," and "involvement in joint activities." In addition, the teacher uses non-verbal means of influence: a calm tone, a direct gaze, moderate gestures.

The next task involved identifying speech tactics in a pedagogical dispute and determining their nature. Using multi-colored markers, students identified constructive and destructive speech tactics used by the teacher during the argument. Such work made it possible to develop the ability to analyze the teacher's communicative behavior for the presence of speech means that influence the nature of the dispute, as well as to determine their constructiveness/destructiveness. Based on the

analysis of fragments, the most frequent destructive and constructive speech tactics of the teacher in a dispute were identified. Constructive tactics included: "praise" ("Good girl for noticing my mistake!.."); "compromise" ("I won't give you a bad mark today, but prepare both topics for the next lesson: prove to us that you know my subject well. Agreed?.."); "arbitration court" ("If you think I'm wrong, let's turn to your classmates..."); "manifestation of grief" ("You make me very sad with your behavior..."; "I didn't expect this from you"); "partial agreement", etc. The following destructive tactics were named: "mockery" ("You've found a smart guy!"; "If you're so smart.."); "remembering past mistakes" ("Remember what you wrote on the test!"); "categorical statement" ("Whatever I earned in a year, I delivered!"); "authoritative person" ("Here I decide who gets what!"), etc. Completion of this task was accompanied by the compilation of a summary table "Constructive and destructive speech tactics in a dispute with students" (the contents of the table can be supplemented based on observations of speech behavior of teachers during teaching practice). The next stage of the work was to identify indirect influence tactics (hints, jokes) and determine the validity of their use in the process of pedagogical dispute. Here it was important to focus students' attention on the fact that resorting to tactics of indirect influence can be completely justified, since during a dispute, due to the increased emotionality of its participants, direct tactics do not always achieve results, and sometimes lead to opposition from students, therefore, in some situations, it is appropriate to use indirect tactics that promote the teacher's unobtrusive influence on his students [1, p. 23]. As a result of the analysis of the fragments, it was concluded that the use of indirect speech tactics helps to increase the effectiveness of communication, helps to avoid edification and conflict situations.

Note that one of the proposed indirect tactics was initially controversial in relation to destructiveness/constructiveness, which led to a dispute among students, as a result of which it was concluded that sometimes the same speech tactics can be both constructive and destructive

in terms of the nature of the impact depending on the paralinguistic characteristics of the teacher's speech. Thus, the discussion of the issue that arose allowed us to move on to the peculiarities of the rhythmic and intonation design of the teacher's speech in a pedagogical dispute. In this regard, students were asked to analyze a video fragment from the movie "We'll Live Until Monday" (situation in a literature lesson: the teacher was outraged by the content of an essay on a free topic by one of the students). The result of the analysis of the rhythmic and intonation means of expressiveness of the teacher's speech in a dispute was the conclusion that the teacher influences students not only with the help of linguistic means, but also through pause, intonation, intensity and pitch of the voice, tempo of speech, etc. In addition, it was noted that pantomimic means of expressiveness of the teacher's speech, in particular, various gestures (for example, touching with a hand), facial expression, distance between the teacher and the student, postures, etc., are of no small importance in the pedagogical dispute.

At the final stage of the lesson, students were offered a role-playing game, during which theoretical information about the peculiarities of the situation of a pedagogical dispute, its varieties, as well as speech tactics was consolidated. Students received a set of pedagogical dispute situations and, using the acquired knowledge, individually created and analyzed a model of a pedagogical dispute, choosing the most appropriate and effective arguments and speech tactics in specific conditions for a constructive resolution of the dispute (the task was completed in pairs). When completing this task, students also paid attention to paralinguistic and nonverbal means of influence. An element of competition was introduced into the game process: a competition was announced for the optimal constructive solution to the situation of a pedagogical dispute (all participants in the game acted as judges). Let us give an example of one of the situations proposed to students: "The literature teacher gives a "2" to a student who has not learned the assigned poem. The student is indignant: "Just think, I didn't memorize the

verse! And in general, why learn it by heart when you can read it from a textbook..." In response, the teacher..."

The role play was accompanied by analysis. At the end of each speech, a discussion was organized in order to evaluate the teacher's speech behavior in terms of the relevance of the dispute, the teacher's communicative leadership, his intentions, argumentation, constructiveness of speech tactics, and nonverbal features. Thus, the final task of the second lesson prepared future teachers to independently conduct pedagogical disputes in laboratory and real teaching and speech conditions.

**Conclusions.** The results of experimental training indicate that the training program we presented allows, firstly, to arouse future teachers' interest in a pedagogical dispute with students as a professionally significant statement of an argumentative type, and secondly, to take into account as much as possible the features of a teacher's communicative activity in a dispute (in accordance with with the requirements for modern conditions of pedagogical communication and interaction between teacher and students) and, finally, to form the necessary speech skills based on the idea of a pedagogical dispute as a special speech work, thereby increasing the professional communicative competence of the future teacher.

#### Literature:

1. Burieva Nilufar Rasulovna. (2022). CONDITIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGICAL CONFLICT. *Innovative Technologica: Methodical Research Journal*, 3(09), 128–133. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/YWK4S>
2. Afanasenko O. B. Tactics of indirect speech influence as a way of developing critical thinking among schoolchildren // *Problems of modern pedagogical education. Ser.: Pedagogy and psychology. - Collection of scientific papers. - Yalta: RIO GPA, 2017. - Issue. 54. - Part 5. - pp. 21–28.*
3. Zotova T. Yu. Genre specificity of pedagogical dispute in the conditions of educational and speech situation // *Problems of modern pedagogical education. Ser.: Pedagogy and psychology. - Collection of scientific works: - Yalta: RIO GPA, 2017. - Vol. 55. - Part 5. - pp. 92–102.*
4. Makhnovskaya N. I. System of teaching argumentative skills in the course of rhetoric at university and school: abstract. dis. ...doc. ped. Sci. - Moscow, 2004. - 39 p.
5. Kuzmina, N.V. Psychological structure of a teacher's activity [Text] / N.V. Kuzmina, N.V. Kukharev. - Gomel: Gomel State Publishing House. University, 1976, - 57 p.
6. Natanzon, E. Sh. Psychological analysis of student actions [Text]: a book for teachers / E. Sh. Natanzon. - M.: Education, 1991. - 126 p.
7. Potashnik, M. M. Pedagogical situations [Text] / M. M. Potashnik, B. 3. Vulfov. - M.: Pedagogy, 1983. - 144 p.
8. Spirin, L. F. Theory and technology for solving pedagogical problems [Text] / L. F. Spirin. - M.: Russian Pedagogical Agency, 1997. - 173 p.
9. Dergunova, T. A. Formation of students' ability to critically analyze pedagogical innovations [Text] / T. A. Dergunova // *Siberian Pedagogical Journal. - 2008. - No. 2. - P. 170-175.*
10. Shcherbakova, V.V. On the issue of professional competence [Text] / V.V. Shcherbakova // *Siberian Pedagogical Journal. - 2008. - No. 2. - P. 139-145.*
11. Akhmetova, M. N. Problem-modular and task-based approaches in preparing students for the design and implementation of pedagogical technologies [Text] / M. N. Akhmetova // *Siberian Pedagogical Journal. - 2008. - No. 4. - P. 7-20.*