REFLECTION AND MONITORING IN TEACHER'S ACTIVITY
THEORETICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL BASIS OF HARMONIZATION

Xudayberganova Zumrad Farxodovna

Master's student at Asia International University

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21411948

Abstract: The article examines the theoretical and pedagogical foundations of the integration of the processes of reflection and monitoring in the professional activity of a teacher. The author reveals the complementary nature of these two processes: reflection gives meaning to the objective information provided by monitoring, while monitoring connects reflection to concrete evidence. The work substantiates methodological approaches to combining them into a single pedagogical system.

Keywords: reflection, pedagogical monitoring, feedback, teacher competence, harmonization model, professional development.

Modern schools require teachers not only to have a thorough knowledge of the subject, but also to regularly analyze and improve their work. However, in practice, most teachers evaluate their lessons on an emotional level: “it went well” or “it didn’t work today.” Such an assessment is subjective. On the other hand, monitoring in schools — control work, ratings — often remains an official report and has little impact on the teacher’s next lesson. Thus, two valuable tools work in isolation, without showing their full power.

Bridging this gap is, in our opinion, one of the most important resources for teacher professional growth. Therefore, this article will theoretically examine why and how reflection and monitoring can be combined.

Reflection: an internal analysis mechanism

The concept of reflection has its roots in philosophy, but it was introduced into pedagogy by J. Dewey. The scientist defined reflective thinking as an active and careful consideration of a belief or knowledge in terms of the foundations that underlie it [1]. That is, it is not random thinking, but purposeful, consistent mental work. Later, D. Schön brought reflection to professional activity: in his opinion, real work consists of ambiguous and unique situations that cannot be solved only by applying ready-made rules - a specialist “reads” the situation again and again during his work [2].

Practical models of reflection have also been developed. D. Kolb's experiential learning cycle presents it as a closed circle consisting of concrete experience, observation, generalization, and new testing stages [11]. G. Gibbs further elaborates the model, presenting it as a cycle that includes description, emotion, evaluation, analysis, conclusion, and action plan [12]. The common logic of these models is the same: experience — its analysis — renewed action. It is

this cyclicality that creates a natural basis for combining reflection with monitoring, since monitoring also supplements the same "observation and analysis" stage with objective information.

Pedagogical reflection has also been studied in depth by CIS scientists. AA Bizyaeva justified it as a factor of personal and professional growth within the framework of the psychology of a "thinking teacher" [3]. Thus, reflection is a mechanism for a teacher to critically understand and reconstruct his or her own activities. But there is a subtlety here: if reflection is not based on objective information, it can easily turn into subjectivity. A teacher can "feel" himself or herself both good and bad — this feeling may not reflect reality.

Reflection occurs at several levels. The technical level assesses whether a particular method works, the practical level considers educational goals, and the critical level focuses on understanding the ethical implications of pedagogical activity. BZ Vulfov and VN Kharkin developed the conceptual apparatus of reflective pedagogy and considered it an integral part of the teacher's professional growth [13]. S. Brookfield interprets critical reflection as a teacher's consideration of his or her practice from different perspectives, including through the eyes of students [14].

Monitoring: an objective observation tool

This is where monitoring comes in. AN Mayorov defines it as a technology for systematic observation, measurement and forecasting of the state of the education system [4]. S.Ye. Shishov and VA Kalney, having developed specific criteria and indicators for monitoring the quality of education, present it as a source of information for management decisions [5]. Monitoring performs informational, diagnostic, prognostic and corrective functions.

But monitoring itself has its limitations. It only answers the question "what happened?" Numbers—for example, half of the class did not master a topic—do not change anything on their own. These numbers become useful only when they are analyzed and understood. In other words, monitoring provides information, but does not make decisions.

The power of monitoring depends on the quality of the indicators. A good indicator must meet three requirements: it must measure what is needed, be stable in repeated measurements, and be understandable to the teacher. For example, a sheet that records not only the grade but also the type of error encountered provides much richer material for reflexive analysis. Otherwise, the collected numbers will become lifeless for the teacher.

Intersection point — feedback

The natural meeting point of reflection and monitoring is the phenomenon of feedback. P. Black and D. Williams interpreted formative assessment as information used to change the activities of teachers and students, showing the strong impact of regular feedback on the result [6]. J. Hattie and H. Timperley identified feedback as one of the most effective pedagogical factors [7]. It is feedback that turns the objective information provided by monitoring into the subject of reflexive analysis.

At this point, the connection between the two processes becomes clear. While monitoring asks "what happened and how much has changed?", reflection asks "why did it happen this way

and what can I change now?" One is incomplete without the other: reflection becomes subjective without evidence, monitoring becomes formal without analysis.

In fact, the combination of reflection and monitoring is a pedagogical manifestation of the direction of "informed practice" in modern education: decisions are made on the basis of evidence, not assumptions. In Uzbek pedagogy, the teacher's professional skills and ability to analyze his or her own activities are also recognized as leading trends [15]. However, in practice, the two processes are often separated: teachers are not specially trained in reflection, and monitoring is associated with control, which causes distrust. So, the problem is not a lack of opportunities, but a lack of a methodological solution that systematically connects them.

The idea of harmonization and its methodological foundations

The above analysis leads us to the following conclusion: combining reflection and monitoring means building a self-improvement system based on objective information. Such a system works in the form of a closed cycle: goal setting - activity - monitoring - reflexive analysis - correction of activity. Each new cycle begins on the basis of the conclusions of the previous one and refines the teacher's working ideas.

This model relies on several approaches. The systemic approach requires that reflection and monitoring be viewed as interconnected elements of a single system, not as separate activities. The active approach makes them natural stages of a teacher's activity. The competency-based approach, on the other hand, determines the result - the literacy of reflection and monitoring is developed as a component of the teacher's competence; this also corresponds to the requirements of the Law "On Education" [8]. The person-centered approach adapts the model to the individual path of each teacher. As K. Zeikner and D. Liston note, a reflective teacher should be a researcher, not a passive performer of his or her practice [9].

It should also be added that these approaches are not mutually exclusive. They serve the same goal from different perspectives - the formation of a teacher's informed, reflexive professional position. Mezirov's theory of adult education also confirms this: real change occurs only when a person critically reconsiders his experience [10].

Essentially, these approaches place the teacher in a metacognitive position: he observes, evaluates, and directs his own thinking and activity "from above." He measures his work through monitoring, and directs through reflection. It is this aspect that gives the model psychological depth and distinguishes it from a simple reporting mechanism.

One more thing to remember: the teacher is the subject of adult education. Adults learn not by force, but because they see the meaning of their own experience. Therefore, it is important that reflection and monitoring are not a task imposed on the teacher from the outside, but are presented as a tool for his own growth. Only then will they not become a formal requirement and will they be truly effective.

Conclusion

Reflection and monitoring are two important mechanisms of teacher activity, which, taken separately, are not fully effective. While reflection gives meaning and direction to monitoring, monitoring provides an objective basis for reflection. Combining them into a single cycle raises the teacher's self-improvement from the level of subjective reflection or formal reporting to the

level of conscious practice based on information. These theoretical foundations will serve as a basis for further research to develop a specific organizational and pedagogical model and test it in practice.

References

1. Dewey J. How We Think. — Boston: DC Heath & Co., 1933. — 301 p.
2. Schön DA The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. — New York: Basic Books, 1983. — 374 p.
3. Bizyaeva A.A. Psychology develops dumayushchego uchitelya: pedagogical reflection. — Pskov: PGPI im. S.M. Kirova, 2004. — 216 p.
4. Mayorov A.N. Monitoring and education. — M.: Intellect-Center, 2005. — 424 p.
5. Shishov S.E., Kalney V.A. Monitoring kachestva obrazovaniya v skole. — M.: Rossiiskoe pedagogicheskoe agentstvo, 1998. — 354 p.
6. Black P., William D. Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment // Phi Delta Kappan. — 1998. — Vol. 80, No. 2. — P. 139–148.
7. Hattie J., Timperley H. The Power of Feedback // Review of Educational Research. — 2007. — Vol. 77, No. 1. — P. 81–112.
8. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Education", September 23, 2020, O‘RQ-637. // lex.uz.
9. Zeichner KM, Liston DP Reflective Teaching: An Introduction. — 2nd ed. — New York: Routledge, 2014. — 120 p.
10. Mezirow J. Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning. — San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991. — 247 p.
11. Kolb DA Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. — Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1984. — 256 p.
12. Gibbs G. Learning by Doing: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Methods. — Oxford: Further Education Unit, 1988. — 129 p.
13. Wolfov B.Z., Harkin V.N. Pedagogical reflection. — M.: Magister, 1995. — 112 p.
14. Brookfield SD Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher. — San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995. — 296 p.
15. Mavlonova RA, Rakhmonkulova NH, etc. General pedagogy. — Tashkent: Science and Technology, 2018.