

## PEDAGOGICAL PECULIARITIES OF STUDYING GROUP SOLIDARITY IN THE STUDENT COMMUNITY

<sup>1</sup>Ibraimov Xolboy Ibragimovich, <sup>2</sup>Z. E. Azimova, <sup>3</sup>Z. Otaboeva

<sup>1</sup>Director of the Scientific Research Institute of Pedagogical Sciences of Uzbekistan named after T.N.Kori Niyozhi. Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor

<sup>2</sup>ASPI, Doctor on Pedagogical Sciences

<sup>3</sup>Researcher

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10283979>

**Abstract.** *Current pedagogical practice shows that it is not promising to maintain the previous system of education, upbringing and training. The social order for the preparation of specialists in all spheres of society's activity, meeting the needs of the society can be achieved only with the use of integrated pedagogical methods. This article will focus on these issues.*

**Key words:** *teacher-student, subject-object, vertical relations.*

One of the directions of integral pedagogy is the study of individual integral characteristics of students as a comprehensive description of the sum of their characteristics in the system of interpersonal relations. The basis of pedagogical methods and implementation technology of this approach is the creativity of the pedagogue, the need to create a special environment for the full implementation of pedagogical innovations.

The main principle of integral pedagogy is to create conditions for the development of students' creative abilities. That's why we tried to study intragroup interpersonal relations of students, because without knowing them, it is impossible to open the creative possibilities of the pedagogue, besides, it is impossible to form positive relations in the "teacher-student" system. Naturally, an integral assessment of the dynamics of the student body can be observed only by using integral diagnostic methods. In this case, the object and subject of psychological-pedagogical study of the educational process is a group of students as an integrated system.

This is consistent with the state education policy aimed at improving the national education system. It is impossible to complete the assigned tasks without applying the ideas of integral pedagogy in daily practice, in particular, they cannot be carried out without pedagogical control, which allows to get an objective picture of the condition of a group and an individual student according to a number of indicators with the help of integral diagnostic tools.

Pedagogical system is based on the nature of relations in "subject-object", "subject-subject" role exchange or interpersonal as well as communication in general. It is precisely in the process of communication that mutual exchange of interests and ideas takes place, character traits are transferred to each other, and the target direction and position of a person is formed.

Communication is one of the needs of people that arise in the course of their cooperative activities in a certain team or group, and it is a characteristic of people that represents the process of entering into mutual relations during their activities. Active interpersonal communication is the only factor that confirms that the educational process is focused on a specific goal. (Encyclopedia of Pedagogy. Volume II, "National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan" State Scientific Publishing House, Tashkent-2015, p. 355).

The uniqueness of personal relationships, especially conscious and unconscious and, above all, individual preferences is the main indicator that determines the level of formation of a group.

That is why it is important to reveal this complex side of human nature. Inability to understand different communicative situations often separates people from each other and leads to conflicts. In this regard, the issue of group solidarity, the analysis of its internal mechanisms and means of formation becomes of some urgent importance. Research on the issue of group solidarity relies on understanding the group, first of all, considering it as a specific system of interpersonal relationships with an emotional basis.

**1. Group solidarity** is the orderliness, consistency and consistency that ensures the stability and durability of the group's vital activities in interpersonal communication within the group (M.S.Kagan "Человеческая деятельность". /M.S. Kagan. - М.: Politizdat, 1974. - 328 s.) The beginning of the systematic study of group solidarity dates back to the 40s of the 20th century, because it was during this period that special studies were carried out. Group solidarity appears as a result of the interaction of individuals within it. It reflects the sum of all forces that affect all group members equally and creates group closeness (К.Албуханова. Личность в условиях дефицита общения /К.Албуханова // *Vospitanie shkolnikov*. - 2000. - No. 10. - P. 4-8. ). These "powers" are explained by the individual's need for the group or the satisfaction of group membership. But both desirability and satisfaction are analyzed by determining the group's attitude in a purely emotional direction. Therefore, solidarity in this case is considered as a certain description of the system of emotional preferences of group members. This definition lacks the concept of positive forces, which express terms such as the direction, vector, that affects the individual, that is, the individual is attracted to the group, not pushed away from it.

There is also a different approach to studying the issue, according to which group cohesion depends not only on specific group characteristics, but also on the matching of these characteristics to the needs of group members and the positive results expected from them. Here, the main emphasis is on emotional description. The forces of group cohesion have two generating types: 1- the attractiveness of one's own group; 2- the power to attract other worthy groups. As a result, a group can be defined as a unit of individuals, each of those who join the group perceives the benefits of joining as more than those outside the group. It can be concluded that any group is united from time immemorial. However, even when we consider the initial solidarity, it is not necessary to ignore the issue of its continuity and growth. As a result, it is timely for researchers to find tools to measure the existing level of group cohesion and to determine how to increase it.

It is also necessary to determine the level of closeness of interpersonal relations: the relation of acquaintance is one, the relation of friendship is another. This is a somewhat deeper differentiation of interpersonal closeness, which includes not only quantitative, but also qualitative differences in growth. Bilateral closeness-distance, liking-disliking between individuals acquires a special meaning, and it is the main condition for the formation of strong didactic relations. The greater closeness they feel in themselves, the more compassion they tend to have, and, consequently, the more consistency and commonality in their behavior. On the other hand, closeness cannot be realized without mutual respect and a certain harmony and agreement in values. Getting to know someone a little better based on proximity gives you the ability to anticipate their actions even in new situations. In other words, bilateral consciousness and unconsciousness not only carry an emotional load in interpersonal relations, but also perform a regulatory function in the acceptance and understanding of partners.

Thus, studying the mechanisms of interpersonal closeness, distance, and unconsciousness becomes important not only theoretically, but also practically.

Measuring group cohesion consists of two closely related methodological approaches. The first is to measure the emotional likeability of group members. It is based on the following assumption: The more members of a group like each other, the more likeable the group as a whole. The higher the group cohesion. The methodological apparatus can consist of different variants of social measurement techniques or special scales of consciousness. The coefficient of the social dimension of group cohesion is a part of the division of the theoretically possible number of bilateral positive choices. Using scales, examinees rate bilateral awareness at opposite ends of a continuum from "very much like" to "very much dislike". The final indicator is calculated as the arithmetic mean mutual evaluation of group members.

The second methodological approach is to study the emotional evaluation of the group in general. It consists of a technique of increasing questions. In some cases, the test takers give a general assessment of the group: "How pleasant is the group for you?", "To what extent are you connected to the members of the group?" In other cases, he evaluates his level of group membership. "Would you like to remain a member of this group?", "If you had the opportunity to do the same work for the same salary in another group, how would you feel about moving from one group to another?". The final indicators are determined based on the average of individual data. Evaluating this methodical method, we come to the opinion that it is difficult to get honest answers to such "transverse" questions. The only form of existence of group solidarity is preference for individual emotionality. The main factor in studying solidarity in a practical way is to assess the level of satisfaction of an individual. In the stream of the social dimension, solidarity is located in direct relation to the level of development of interpersonal relations. This observation confirms the value of our methodology and its suitability for assessing group cohesion. In contrast to traditional social measurement research, we analyze mutual choices qualitatively rather than quantitatively. Moreover, we do not artificially limit the number of mutual choices to some specific number (for example, three or four choices out of ten possibilities), but rather encourage the assessment of one's attitude towards each member of the group without exception. In the approach described above, the main emphasis was on the number of mutual choices. Cohesion can depend on interpersonal attraction. Mutual attraction is about understanding mutual love. Love is one-sided (and even unrequited) and two-sided. Friendship is not one-sided, the word itself implies a two-sided relationship. A more complete and accurate definition of group solidarity belongs to Myers, who writes: "Solidarity is the feeling of "We", the level of connection of group members with each other, for example, occurs at the expense of mutual consciousness (D. Myers, *Sotsialnaya psichologia*: Perv. p. English / D. Myers. - SPb.: Peter, 1997. - 688 p.)

In our opinion, on the one hand, it is necessary to distinguish solidarity as a feeling of common belonging to a single group, that is, "I am part of "We", on the other hand, as a unity (or sum) of positive relations between group members and their strength, "glue" closeness. Then interpersonal the tighter the ties, the stronger the group's solidarity. It is also necessary to consider the ability to see the whole group as an individual and the ability to speak on behalf of the group. The general solidarity in the group may not correspond to the level of closeness of the group's relationships.

In a developed student community, the relationship between people forms a complex variable and interconnected system, in which anonymous, that is, for the purpose of research, relationships can be divided into several types. Each of them cannot exist without dependence on the other. That is, their freedom is relative and there is no clear boundary between them. However,

they are qualitatively different. Relationships in the student community can be divided into the following types:

**1. Official relations.** They appear on the basis of position, are determined by law, are controlled by statutes, regulations, etc.

**2. Informal relationships.** They arise on the basis of personal relationship between people, and there are no generally accepted laws and norms, strictly established requirements and rules for these people. This type of relationship is the subject of our research.

**3. Vertical relations.** These are interpersonal relations, which can be formed between a leader and his employee, leaders and other members of the team, and people in general.

**4. Horizontal Relationship.** It is the interpersonal relationship between members who occupy the same formal or informal position in the team. This definition is not clear in our view. The concept of horizontal relations is unreasonably limited. A group can have both vertical and horizontal relationships. These cannot be contrasted.

**5. Interpersonal practical relations.** They arise due to people working together or for this reason.

**6. Personal relationships** are relationships between people regardless of their work. They can be arranged both vertically and horizontally. In a developed team, a personal and practical system of mutual relations is formed, which complement each other well and play a different role in meeting the demands and needs of team members.

**7. Rational interpersonal relations.** Their basis is the extent to which people know each other and the objective assessment of the people around them.

**8. Emotional relationships.** This is a subjective assessment based on a person's personal, individual views of a person. Such relationships occur only in connection with positive or negative emotions; they are not always based on accurate and objective information about a person.

**9. Relations** built on the basis of the main activity are called relations reflected in the content of the activity.

**10. Relations reflected in the content of the activity.** They will not be directly associated with this activity. It should also be noted that the basis of a developed community is the joint social activity and the communication and interaction of the participants formed in it.

In our opinion, the list of types of attitudes in the student body is not so well established. It mixes different principles in the set of relationships. There is no shared common activity in the group of students because it is limited. Studying is an individual process of acquiring knowledge. Students work simultaneously, but rarely together. The "joint activity" of the students during the lesson in a group, naturally, gives halal to the teacher and stops such activities in order to maintain discipline. Leisure communication is now a joint activity that solves the problem of socialization. In this case, personal relations, all their types and manifestations are shown as a pedagogical tool of socialization. The nature of social relations and the nature of interpersonal relations are sharply different from each other, but, nevertheless, the link that connects them is the emotional basis. Interpersonal relations can be considered as a factor of psychological "climate" in a group. The emotional basis of interpersonal relations appears and is formed on the basis of certain qualities born in people towards each other. Knowing interpersonal relationships, one can think about the social psychological environment in a group. A.N. Lutoshkin developed a unique concept of determining the emotional state in the team. He writes: "The psychological atmosphere in the team is the general emotional mood of the team, in which the mood of people, their mental experiences,

their relationship to each other and to work are combined". - M.: Pedagogy, 1988. - 128 p.)

After studying the social aspiration, social reaction, and social perception of each group member, the scale of interpersonal compatibility that we have created allows us to determine the relationship of people to each other not only in terms of quality, but also in terms of quantity. The listed concepts are part of the emotional elements of the social psychological environment. Mental states in a group are explained by different levels of awareness. And they can be determined based on our research. The psychological environment in the team is manifested in the attitude of people to each other and to the common work, and also inevitably affects the attitude of people to the whole world. It follows that the community is a model of attitude to the world (A.N.Lutoshkin). The fact that the interactions between the students in the group have a special character, their spiritual influence and importance are also reflected in the works of pedagogues who created in the beginning of the 20th century. It is interesting that in the pages of works on pedagogy of this period, a new theme of relations between children appeared - leadership combined with the concept of leadership. Thus, for modern pedagogical thinking, interactions in the peer group have already become a special scientific problem, which has entered scientific research on a large scale. Even at the beginning of the 21st century, this problem remains relevant and promising.

Famous pedagogues who have worked on the problem of team education believe that the improvement of the educational process is the regulation of the perspective of the formation of team relations based on the team's emotional capabilities.

### **Conclusion**

The most important task of the science of pedagogy is to use this resource, to achieve its objective collection and practical application. Therefore, if the pedagogue-practitioner does not have at his disposal reliable methods of studying and evaluating the emotional capabilities of the student body, then it is impossible to hope for a solution to the problem.

A high level of moral environment, friendly attitude, sense of duty and responsibility, and mutual demands are considered a characteristic feature of a spiritually healthy team. It is much easier to work and improve one's knowledge in such an environment.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Ibragimovich Kh.I. Peculiarities of using credit-module technologies in the higher education system of Uzbekistan //Integration of science, education and practice. Scientific-methodical journal. - 2021. - P. 209-214.
2. Ibraimov Kh. "Theoretical and methodological basis of quality control and evaluation of education in higher education system." International journal of discourse on innovation, integration and education 1 (2020): 6-15.
3. Ibragimov, X., Abdullayeva Sh. "Pedagogika nazariyasi (darslik)." T.: Fan va texnologiya 288 (2008).
4. Ibraimov X.I., M.Quronov. Umumiy pedagogika (darslik). –T., “Shaffof”, 2023, 416-bet.
5. Ibragimovich I. K. et al. PEDAGOGICAL ABILITIES OF A TEACHER, STRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT //湖南大学学报 (自然科学版). – 2021. – Т. 48. – №. 12.
6. Ибрагимов Х. И. ПЕДАГОГИКА И ВОСПИТАНИЕ //Экономика и социум. – 2021. – №. 1-1 (80). – С. 608-611.
7. Ibragimovich, Ibraimov Kholboy. "Intensive methods of teaching foreign languages at university." Вопросы науки и образования 27 (39) (2018): 78-80.

8. Ибраимов Х. И. Педагогические и психологические особенности обучения взрослых //Academy. – 2019. – №. 10 (49). – С. 39-41.
9. Ибрагимов Х. И. Организация самостоятельной работы студентов в условиях цифровизации вузовского образования //Наука и образование сегодня. – 2020. – №. 7 (54). – С. 74-75.