ORGANIZING CURRENT FRONTAL CONTROL AND ITS ROLE IN STUDENT ASSESSMENT

Akbarova Dildora Akhtamjon Kizi
Interpreter of Innovative Academy
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17382750

At the present time, one of the most important issues is to ensure that education is more effective in higher education institutions, and that classes are up-to-date and widely used. Wide conditions are created in our country for the training of highly qualified personnel and wide use of their skills, use of information technologies and modern science. Current frontal control increases the effectiveness of the lesson. Now the teacher will be able to evaluate all students at the same time. There are many specialists who are now contributing to the development of students' knowledge using frontal methods. Let's imagine. The introduction of current frontal controls using mobile technology will save time, and the use of information technology in classrooms will confront young people with time. This teaching method is based on simultaneous work with all students in the class at the same time. In other words, it represents interaction between the teacher and the entire classroom. The method is sometimes referred to as “frontal teaching,” since the teacher stands at the front of the class and imparts his knowledge to the students, while at the same time supervising their activities during the lesson. The teacher and the students interact by conducting a dialog according to the “to-and-fro” principle. The teacher can also initiate a discussion among the students, but he always maintains a central position and leads the debates. This work method makes it possible to communicate with all of the students at the same time and follow the general rules while relaying knowledge to everyone present. But it requires that the teacher be particularly attentive and capable of holding the attention of all students present so that all of them have the chance to absorb the new material. The teacher must be able to control the class leaders without allowing attention to wander. Extensive research on this issue indicates that this particular teaching method creates unequal conditions for the students, since it leads to the illusion that everyone learns the same way when in actuality – every student absorbs new information in his own way and at his own pace.

learning with new media have been developed, e.g., web-based learning, videoconference systems, social software. Nowadays in many high education institutions, predominantly those offering study programs oriented towards technology and technical sciences, a substantial amount of educational activities has been conducted through, with and by means of computers and similar devices in an advanced technological teaching/ learning environment. This situation is even more pronounced at the faculties of applied studies. High tech educational facilities in technological fields have very often a de facto case of enforcing individual instruction methods for a simple reason; namely, practical instruction on highly specialized software and/or hardware solutions and tools requires an individual approach and pace of learning in order to impart profound and applicable knowledge and aptitude to use any such tool or solution. This specific need for individual pace of learning that can be so often met on technical faculties clearly exposes all the fallacies of the classic, frontal ex cathedra educational system model, unfortunately still dominant in higher education institutions. Such situation presents a problem for students, but also for teachers who invest a lot of energy in the teaching process that is not properly adjusted to the existing situation. In such situation, teaching approaches that can provide conditions for more individual approach to the student are required. These approaches usually facilitate student-centered, self regulated learning. Various self-regulated learning theories share three basic assumptions, namely that self-regulated learners are able to (a) personally improve their ability to learn through selective use of metacognitive and motivational strategies; (b) proactively select, organize, and even create advantageous learning environments; and (c) play a significant role in choosing the form and amount of instruction they need. In other words, students set their own learning goals, use many cognitive and metacognitive strategies to monitor, control, regulate, and adjust their learning to reach these goals. For educators two

strategies are generally used to nurture students' self regulatory capabilities. One is to have teachers directly teach students skills needed for self-regulated learning in classroom. The other is an indirect approach of designing a learning environment in which students are offered authentic practices to actively experience the key processes of self-regulated learning (i.e. cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational), facilitated by educator or cognitive and metacognitive tools built in the computer-based learning systems.

Let's compare some teaching methods with frontal method. Next one is the collective teaching method. It is used more frequently than the others in the traditional school setting. In the first school grades, where the children are still adapting to the overall educational program and class size is high, this form of teaching is viewed as preferable. The method is also widely used in the older grades, although complemented by other methods. For instance, classes are divided into two groups – a kind of interim step between frontal, formal teaching and study in groups. It's a strategy that allows the teacher to reduce student number while still working in the collective group. Many schools and classes are taking advantage of the recent advancements in technology which has enabled us to develop a high-tech approach to learning. This is great if students want to work at their own pace, but if there's a slow internet connection it's near impossible to use this method. All in all, the widespread use of mobile technology in the establishment of current frontal controls has led to unexpected results. This is evidenced by numerous experiments. we can see that mobile devices are a great asset for education and communication.

References:

1. Keyton, J., (2011). Communication research asking questions, finding answers.New York: McGraw Hill.
2. Lorde, A., (1980). The cancer journals. San Francisco: Sheba.
3. Ott Anderson, J., & Geist Martin, P., (2003). Narratives and healing: Exploring one family's stories of cancer survivorship. Health Communication.
15(2), 133-143.
4. Perry, B. L., (2013). Symptoms, stigma, or secondary social disruption: three mechanisms of network dynamics in severe mental illness. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 31(1), 32-53. doi: 10.1177/0265407513484632
5. Richardson, M., Cobham, V., McDermott, B., & Murray, J., (2013). Youth mental illness and the family: parents' loss and grief. Journal of Child and Family Studies. 22, 719-736. doi: 10.1007/s10826-012-9625