Analysis of theoretical model of innovation involvement in Educational Practice

Rozigul Umarova

Associate Professor Tashkent State Transport University,Uzbekistan

---***---

Abstract   Bringing the theoretical model of innovation as a system closer to educational practice is a criterion - the requirements for the introduction of a criterion of activity that allows to create an idea about the size and scope of innovation, the research conducted in this direction is analyzed.

Key words: Innovation, real practice, theoretical models, reproductive, productive, autonomy, individualization.

INTRODUCTION

The experience of philosophical methodological research shows that any attempt to reflect "living" life, real practice in theoretical models and schemes is always full of contradictions, which does not fully reflect the richness of the actions and relationships of the phenomenon. The proposed model of categorizing innovation is no exception. It only fully reflects the logic of the innovation process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This process can be reproductive-executive or productive-creative, depending on the nature of its active basis. In our view, this difference alone will be the basis for clarifying the content of the concept of innovative activity. Thus, in order to bring the theoretical model of innovation as a system closer to educational practice, it is necessary to introduce at least one more criterion - an activity criterion that allows to form an idea of the scope and scale of innovation. A definite step in this direction can be found in the research of Yu.A. Karpova. Based on a theoretical analysis of the various approaches formed in the process of understanding the phenomenon of innovative activity, he describes it as follows: "... innovative activity is a metaphor aimed at changing the set of

personal means that allow the subject not only to adapt to rapidly changing social and professional realities, but also to influence it".[1,68].

In our opinion, two cases are noteworthy in this description. The first is the emergence of 'metaphysics', i.e., as we mentioned above, an important feature of innovative activity is the transformation of other activities. At the same time, from the management point of view, this is an "activity management activity", but from an innovative point of view, it is a practical change in the nature of the activity. The second is to reach the level of understanding the changing nature of innovative activity (as opposed to the adaptive nature). Such a distinctive difference can only be enhanced by changing the location of the seeds: innovative activity involves not only adapting to social and professional realities, but also changing them. This emphasizes the nature of innovative activity, creating an opportunity to distinguish between the content of activity and process concepts, which are often confused in both practice and theory. At the same time, the target of the innovative activities outlined in this description is questionable. Why is this activity focused solely on changing the 'personal means of the subject'? Doesn't such an understanding narrow the subject of innovative activity to the level of an individual? If we agree with this description, first of all, we have to admit that innovative activity is carried out only on a personal level, which is unimaginable.

Second, is innovative activity focused solely on changing the 'subject's means'? After all, tools are the instrumental support of activity. This software can be integrated as a set of methods, techniques, etc. at the level of professional

competence. When it comes to innovative activity, it is, in our view, appropriate to change methods, not to change the set of tools, because only the discovery of a method requires a literal re-understanding and change of the subject's content, which in turn changes the subject's activities. The above requires clarification of the methodological basis for the classification of innovations as organized activities, including educational activities and pedagogical activities. "Activity is a form of active attitude of a person to the environment around him," says E.G. Yudin. In his view, the content of the activity is determined by the purposeful transformation of this environment on the basis of the assimilation and development of existing forms of culture. Since "activity" is a gender-specific concept to describe the essence of innovative activity, the above description can be used as a basis for feedback[2, 267-268]. In our view, the natural nature of an activity, especially an innovative activity, requires the determination of its self-determining basis. Although purposefulness is an important feature of an activity, it does not allow for the complete separation of the two specific types of activities. On the one hand, any activity that is goal-oriented, reproductive, impersonal, defined by specific programs and contexts is considered expedient, because according to the purpose one or another means can be used, the necessary methods selected and applied, the relationship of purpose and outcome observed [3, 307].

But the goal is given from the surface and then there is a change in the quality of the subject. It acts not as a subject of activity, but as a subject of consistent and purposeful action. Consequently, its position is limited by functionality, in which it does not have its own subjective basis - goal setting. This framework is called "a goal-oriented, productive, creative activity that expands the scope of the subject."

allows you to edit. It is worth noting here another distinctive feature of the activity - the free definition of content and purpose, because compulsory activity, which uses the given conditions, goals and means using technologically given methods, can not serve as a means to realize its potential, behavior "robotizes" them. That is why innovative activity is also a problem of spiritual choice from the point of view of a certain type of activity, because "the subject that creates schemes, norms and ideals of its activity in the process of choosing a cultural path is a person who determines the prospects of its development." [4, 122]. Goal setting not only "subjectivizes" an activity, but also defines its integrity as a dialectical unit of goal and outcome. This creates such a harmonious unity of productive and reproductive basis, factors of creation and performance, production and reproduction that it overcomes the shortcomings of the identified, stable laws of interaction of subject and object "... , mastering aspects, etc., and eliminating them on the basis of creating ways to use them to enter the world (culture) of people. Then, in our opinion, the result of the activity does not disappear in need, but serves as a factor in further expanding the content of the goal, that is, setting the goal. Thus, the social mechanism of self-development of innovative activity is provided.

Innovative activity is not limited to the realization of the ability to change the object of activity. It lays the groundwork for "reprogramming" the subject's foundations or "subject self-construction" in the process of fully interacting with the various aspects of the object, as changes in essence, structure, and relationships that occur when the goal is achieved inevitably create a state of uncertainty. In short, the new interactions of an object are new to it as well. It uses the capabilities of rational-reflexive consciousness, which allows you to analyze the real objective situation, its problematicity and

constructive ways out of this problem. From this comes another feature of innovative activity. Its boundary allows and implies an approach to the system of subject-object and subject-subject relations in terms of the manifestation of the forces that determine the essence of man. Here is one of the important features of the organization of innovative activities in education. Modern educational concepts are based on the understanding of the educational process as a subject-subject relationship, and the task of its pedagogical support is to naturalize artificially designed pedagogical systems, ie to create a socio-pedagogical space for the manifestation of human forces. In this case, the educational process is based on the humanistic process (man does not act as a means to an end, it is not used as a tool of labor), and in its nature - on the humanitarian process (human connection with knowledge and its acquisition, knowledge in the process of realizing the meaning of life) provided. The educational process and its innovations create a separate space for the exchange of activities, ie interaction. At the same time, the activities of each of its participants directly develop the content created as a result of this interaction. A special integrity is created, which is characterized by a relationship of interdependence and interdependence. Therefore, it is possible to add to the two types of relations distinguished by VN Sagatovsky - "subject-subject" and "subject-object" relations "object-object" and "object-subject". It should be noted that the nature of social interactions, which are determined by the educational process, ie the process of interaction in education, allows to subordinate these relations as "factors" of the manifestation of the whole system as a whole. The educational process and its innovations create a separate space for the exchange of activities, ie interaction. At the same time, the activities of each of its participants directly develop the content created as a result of this interaction. A special integrity is created, which is characterized by a relationship of

interdependence and interdependence. Therefore, it is possible to add to the two types of relations distinguished by VN Sagatovsky - "subject-subject" and "subject-object" relations "object-object" and "object-subject". It should be noted that the nature of social interactions, which are determined by the educational process, ie the process of interaction in education, allows to subordinate these relations as "factors" of the manifestation of the whole system as a whole [5, 124]. In our view, this (independent type or 'factor') is irrelevant at the level of the rule that the property of subjectivity and objectivity itself acquires a functional feature rather than an attribute. For example, any individual can acquire both the subject property and the object property in the process of interaction, acting in a single interaction pair (teacher-student), or acting in a large number of interactions (teacher-student-student).

The typological feature of the interaction in terms of function is provided by the fact that the subject-subject relationship has a coordinating functional nature, and the subject-object relationship always represents subordination. Other features play a supporting role in relation to those mentioned above. For example, in the subject-object relationship, at least three system-forming functions find their material expression. Among them, the motivational function determines the primary source of activity, the regulatory function serves to determine the subject of activity and its level of intensity, the subordination function determines the level of involvement of the subject in the activity. The last function does not exist in subject-subject interaction - where the culture of monologue gives way to a culture of dialogue, and the content is created in harmony.

As for the object-object relationship, it can occur within the common area of interaction, under conditions in which equally moving objects

are targeted at a single subject. An example of this is the relationship between educational institutions. The core of the activity of any educational institution is the educational process, which is equally far from the governing body as a subject of administrative activity. Their interaction with each other in the organization of the educational process has the object-object nature of coordination (coordination) of activities in relation to a single subject. The study of this type of interaction is especially relevant in the context of the processes of autonomy of educational institutions (striving for independence and freedom) and individualization (striving to separate from others) [6,7-8].

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the above analyzes, in our view, the object-subject interaction, which is directly related to the two-way communication function in the system of management activities, the core of the activity of each educational institution, is in fact wider. Not all changes in the object become the subject of the organization of management action. However, they have a direct and indirect effect on the system of interactions of different social mutations. This effect is particularly pronounced in the education system, including open social systems.

The basis of the object limits the scope of the content of the object of innovation, places it in a particular system of activities and relationships, and the subject chooses the subject itself, that is, the appropriate system, thus finding the optimal combination of content and form of innovation. It is known that the educational process is the system-building basis of any innovation in the field of education. It is it that defines the nature of innovative research. It should be noted that the traditional education system is based on the ideas of A. Fitrat, A. Avloni and other founders of scientific pedagogy in Central Asia in the late XIX - early XX centuries, aimed at training people who

know the education system. Today, this model should be complemented by a goal aimed at training a person who understands (understands other people, representatives of other cultures). In a world where everything is interconnected, a person who is unable to understand other people, communicate with them, overcome their selfishness acquires a socially dangerous trait. After all, the availability of philosophically observant, highly qualified personnel in the country should become a more important and attractive factor than the presence of missiles, oil and territory.

REFERENCES

1. Karpova U.A. Innovation, intellect, education. - M .: 1998. - p. 68.
2. Yudin E.G. System approach and the principle of validity. - M .: 2008 – p. 268 .
3. Kasavin I.T. Ratsionalnye granitsy i perspektivy chelovecheskoy deyatelnosti // Deyatelnost: teorii, metodologiya, problemy. - M., 1990. - 307-p.
4. Zlobin N.S. Deyatelnost - trud - rezultat // Deyatelnost: teorii, metodologiya, problemy. - M., 1990. - 122-p.
5. Fofanov V.P. Social activity as a system. - Novosibirsk, 1981.- p.124
6. Bondarevskaya E.V. Obrazovatelnыy region: novyy vzglyad na razvitie sistemy obrazovaniya // Innovatsionnaya shkola. 1995. №1. - p.7-8.