



SITUATIONS ARISING IN PREPARING THE "FUTURE TEACHER" THROUGH DEVELOPING STUDENTS' REFLECTIVE ABILITIES AND SOLUTIONS TO THEM

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20302725>

Scientific supervisor: p.f.d.(DSc). professor

Xodjamqulov Umid Negmatovich

Researcher: Master student of CSPU,

Hilola Absalamova

Abstract: *This article investigates the situations that arise in preparing future teachers through the development of students' reflective abilities and proposes evidence-based solutions to these situations. Reflective ability is widely recognized as a core component of professional pedagogical competence, yet its development during university study encounters a range of persistent difficulties that are neither accidental nor easily resolved. The study addresses the gap between the theoretical recognition of reflection as essential for professional teaching and the practical reality of teacher education programmes where reflective development is often superficial, unsystematic, or resisted by students themselves. The purpose of the article is to identify and classify the typical problematic situations that emerge when reflective abilities are developed in future teachers, to analyse their causes from pedagogical and psychological perspectives, and to propose specific solutions grounded in both international and Uzbek scholarly literature. The research is based on a systematic analysis of studies on reflective practice in teacher education, including the foundational frameworks of Schön, Dewey, Korthagen, and Moon, as well as the contributions of Uzbek scholars who have addressed issues of professional formation and pedagogical skill development. The article identifies six categories of problematic situations: motivational resistance, cognitive superficiality, emotional avoidance, methodological confusion, contextual isolation, and evaluative distortion. For each category, the underlying causes are analysed and specific pedagogical solutions are proposed. The main result is a diagnostic-corrective framework that connects each type of situation with appropriate intervention strategies, enabling teacher educators to respond to reflective development difficulties not reactively but proactively and systematically. The study concludes that reflective ability is not a natural by-product of teaching experience but a deliberately cultivated professional capacity that requires sustained pedagogical support, psychologically safe conditions, and methodologically structured guidance throughout the period of university preparation.*



Keywords: *reflective abilities, future teachers, teacher preparation, reflective practice, professional development, pedagogical situations, problem-solving, teacher education, self-analysis, metacognition*

СИТУАЦИИ, ВОЗНИКАЮЩИЕ ПРИ ПОДГОТОВКЕ «БУДУЩЕГО УЧИТЕЛЯ» НА ОСНОВЕ РАЗВИТИЯ РЕФЛЕКСИВНЫХ СПОСОБНОСТЕЙ СТУДЕНТОВ, И ПУТИ ИХ РЕШЕНИЯ

Аннотация: *В статье исследуются ситуации, возникающие при подготовке будущих учителей на основе развития рефлексивных способностей студентов, и предлагаются научно обоснованные решения этих ситуаций. Рефлексивная способность широко признаётся ключевым компонентом профессиональной педагогической компетентности, однако её развитие в период вузовского обучения сталкивается с рядом устойчивых трудностей, которые не являются ни случайными, ни легко разрешимыми. Исследование обращается к разрыву между теоретическим признанием рефлексии как необходимого условия профессионального преподавания и практической реальностью программ педагогического образования, в которых развитие рефлексии нередко остаётся поверхностным, бессистемным или встречает сопротивление самих студентов. Цель статьи — выявить и классифицировать типичные проблемные ситуации, возникающие при развитии рефлексивных способностей будущих учителей, проанализировать их причины с педагогической и психологической точек зрения и предложить конкретные решения, основанные на международной и узбекской научной литературе. В статье выделяются шесть категорий проблемных ситуаций: мотивационное сопротивление, когнитивная поверхностность, эмоциональное избегание, методическая неясность, контекстуальная изолированность и оценочное искажение. Для каждой категории анализируются причины и предлагаются конкретные педагогические решения. Основным результатом является диагностико-корректировочная рамка, связывающая каждый тип ситуации с соответствующими стратегиями вмешательства. Исследование заключает, что рефлексивная способность не является естественным побочным продуктом педагогического опыта, а представляет собой целенаправленно формируемую профессиональную способность, требующую устойчивой педагогической поддержки, психологически безопасных условий и методически структурированного руководства на протяжении всего периода вузовской подготовки.*



Ключевые слова: *рефлексивные способности, будущие учителя, подготовка учителей, рефлексивная практика, профессиональное развитие, педагогические ситуации, решение проблем, педагогическое образование, самоанализ, метакогниция*

TALABALARNING REFLEKSIV QOBILIYATLARINI RIVOJLANTIRISH ASOSIDA «KELAJAK O'QITUVCHISI»NI TAYYORLASHDA YUZAGA KELADIGAN VAZIYATLAR VA UNGA YECHIMLAR

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu maqolada talabalarning refleksiv qobiliyatlarini rivojlantirish asosida kelajak o'qituvchisini tayyorlashda yuzaga keladigan vaziyatlar o'rganiladi va ularga ilmiy asoslangan yechimlar taklif etiladi. Refleksiv qobiliyat kasbiy pedagogik kompetensiyaning asosiy komponenti sifatida keng tan olingan, biroq uni universitet tahsili davrida rivojlantirish bir qator barqaror qiyinchiliklarga duch keladi, ular na tasodifiy, na oson hal etiladigan. Tadqiqot refleksiyaning kasbiy o'qitish uchun zarur shart sifatida nazariy tan olish va pedagogika ta'limi dasturlarining amaliy voqeligi o'rtasidagi tafovutga murojaat qiladi, chunki bu dasturlarda refleksiv rivojlanish ko'pincha yuzaki, tizimsiz yoki talabalarning o'zlari tomonidan qarshilik bilan kutib olinadi. Maqolaning maqsadi bo'lajak o'qituvchilarda refleksiv qobiliyatlarni rivojlantirishda yuzaga keladigan tipik muammoli vaziyatlarni aniqlash va tasniflash, ularning sabablarini pedagogik va psixologik nuqtai nazardan tahlil qilish hamda xalqaro va o'zbek ilmiy adabiyotlariga asoslangan aniq yechimlarni taklif qilishdan iborat. Maqolada muammoli vaziyatlarning oltita toifasi aniqlanadi: motivatsion qarshilik, kognitiv yuzakilik, emotsional qochish, metodik chalkashlik, kontekstual ajralganlik va baholovchi buzilish. Har bir toifa uchun asosiy sabablar tahlil qilinadi va aniq pedagogik yechimlar taklif etiladi. Asosiy natija har bir vaziyat turini tegishli aralashuv strategiyalari bilan bog'laydigan diagnostik-korreksion ramkadir.*

Kalit so'zlar: *refleksiv qobiliyatlar, bo'lajak o'qituvchilar, o'qituvchilarni tayyorlash, refleksiv amaliyot, kasbiy rivojlanish, pedagogik vaziyatlar, muammolarni hal qilish, pedagogika ta'limi, o'z-o'zini tahlil qilish, metakognitsiya*

INTRODUCTION

The ability to reflect on one's own professional actions is one of the defining characteristics of a competent teacher. A teacher who simply performs instructional routines without analysing their effects, without questioning their assumptions, and without considering

alternative approaches is limited to the level of technical execution. A teacher who reflects — who examines what happened in the lesson, why it happened, what could have been done differently, and what this experience means for future practice — operates at a qualitatively different professional level. This



distinction, first articulated by Dewey (1933) and later developed by Schön (1983), has become foundational in teacher education worldwide.

Dewey defined reflective thinking as the active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends. For Dewey, reflection was not a passive process of looking back at experience but an active intellectual engagement with experience that leads to new understanding. Schön extended this idea by distinguishing between reflection-on-action, which occurs after a professional event, and reflection-in-action, which occurs during the event itself. A teacher who reflects in action can adjust a lesson in real time based on observations of student responses, while a teacher who reflects on action can improve future lessons based on systematic analysis of past experience.

Korthagen (2001) proposed the ALACT model for structured reflection in teacher education: Action, Looking back on the action, Awareness of essential aspects, Creating alternative methods of action, and Trial. This model has been widely adopted in teacher training programmes because it provides a concrete procedural framework for what is often experienced as an abstract and undefined activity. Moon (2004) contributed a theory of reflective learning that distinguishes between descriptive reflection, dialogic reflection, and critical

reflection, arguing that each level represents a deeper engagement with experience and a more transformative learning outcome.

In the Uzbek pedagogical tradition, the concept of self-analysis and self-improvement has deep cultural roots. The classical Eastern educational philosophy, as expressed in the works of Abu Ali ibn Sino, Abu Rayhon Beruniy, and Alisher Navoiy, emphasized the importance of self-knowledge, self-examination, and continuous personal development as foundations of a wise and virtuous life. In modern Uzbek pedagogical scholarship, To'rayeva (2006) examined the formation of professional self-awareness in future teachers, arguing that reflective self-analysis is an essential component of professional identity development. Djurayev and Turgunov (2006) addressed the methodology of developing professional pedagogical skills, including the role of self-assessment and reflective practice in the formation of pedagogical mastery. Muslimov (2014) provided a comprehensive treatment of professional competence formation in pedagogical education, emphasizing that reflective abilities are integral to the development of adaptive, self-improving teachers.

Despite this theoretical consensus on the importance of reflection, the practical reality of teacher education reveals persistent difficulties. Students often resist reflective activities, viewing them as vague, time-consuming, or irrelevant. When they do engage in



reflection, the results are frequently superficial — descriptive accounts of what happened without analysis of why it happened or what it means. Some students experience emotional discomfort when asked to examine their own weaknesses and mistakes. Others are confused by the methodology of reflection, unsure of what exactly they are supposed to do. These difficulties are not signs of individual failure but symptoms of systemic problems in how reflective abilities are developed in teacher education programmes.

The research problem of this article can be formulated as follows: what are the typical problematic situations that arise when reflective abilities are developed in future teachers, what are their causes, and what pedagogical solutions can address them effectively? The purpose of the study is to identify and classify these situations, to analyse their pedagogical and psychological roots, and to propose a systematic framework of solutions. The object of the study is the process of developing reflective abilities in students of pedagogical universities. The subject is the problematic situations that arise in this process and the pedagogical strategies for resolving them.

The hypothesis of the article is that problematic situations in the development of reflective abilities are not random or unpredictable but fall into identifiable categories, each with specific causes and corresponding solutions. When teacher

educators understand these categories and possess a repertoire of targeted interventions, the development of reflective abilities becomes more effective, more consistent, and less dependent on the personal intuition of individual instructors. This systematic approach transforms reflective development from an uncertain aspiration into a manageable pedagogical process.

METHODS

The article employs a theoretical and analytical research design. The method includes systematic literature review, problem situation analysis, causal modelling, and solution framework development. The literature base covers international research on reflective practice in teacher education, cognitive and developmental psychology of reflection, and Uzbek pedagogical scholarship on professional formation and pedagogical skill development.

The analytical procedure was organized in four stages. At the first stage, the theoretical foundations of reflective ability were examined, including the frameworks of Dewey, Schön, Korthagen, and Moon, and the contributions of Uzbek scholars. At the second stage, problematic situations reported in empirical studies and professional literature were collected, compared, and classified into categories based on their primary characteristics. At the third stage, the causes of each category of situation were analysed from pedagogical and psychological



perspectives. At the fourth stage, solutions were developed for each category, drawing on evidence-based strategies from both international and Uzbek sources.

The article does not present original experimental data. Its contribution is analytical and design-oriented: it provides a structured diagnostic-corrective framework that teacher educators can use to identify, understand, and address difficulties in reflective development. This approach is justified because the existing literature on reflective practice tends to either advocate reflection in general terms or report specific empirical findings without offering a systematic

typology of problems and solutions. A framework that bridges theory and practice is therefore needed.

RESULTS

1. Six categories of problematic situations

The first result of the analysis is the identification of six categories of problematic situations that arise when reflective abilities are developed in future teachers. These categories are not mutually exclusive — a single student may experience difficulties from more than one category simultaneously — but they represent distinct types of problems that require different pedagogical responses.

No.	Category	Typical manifestation	Primary cause
1	Motivational resistance	Students view reflection as unnecessary, abstract, or a waste of time; they complete reflective tasks formally without genuine engagement	Lack of understanding of the professional value of reflection; previous educational experience that did not include reflective practice
2	Cognitive superficiality	Students describe what happened but do not analyse why it happened or what it means; reflection remains at the descriptive level	Insufficient development of analytical thinking skills; absence of structured frameworks for guiding reflection
3	Emotional avoidance	Students avoid examining their mistakes, weaknesses, or uncomfortable experiences; they present only positive aspects of their practice	Psychological insecurity; fear of negative evaluation; absence of a psychologically safe reflective environment
4	Methodological confusion	Students do not understand what reflection involves concretely; they confuse reflection with summary, description, or self-praise	Lack of explicit instruction on reflective methods and procedures; vague or unclear reflective tasks
5	Contextual isolation	Reflective activities are disconnected from real pedagogical experience; students reflect on	Reflection is organized as an academic exercise separate from teaching practice; insufficient



No.	Category	Typical manifestation	Primary cause
		hypothetical rather than lived situations	integration with practicum
6	Evaluative distortion	Students write what they think the instructor wants to read rather than what they genuinely think; reflection becomes performance rather than learning	Reflective work is graded in ways that reward positive self-presentation rather than honest self-analysis

2. Detailed analysis of situations and solutions

Situation 1: Motivational resistance.

Motivational resistance is one of the most common and most challenging situations in reflective development. It manifests as passive compliance: students complete reflective journals, write self-analysis reports, and participate in reflective discussions, but without genuine cognitive or emotional engagement. Their entries are formulaic, their analyses are predictable, and their conclusions are conventional. The root cause is often that students have not experienced the professional value of reflection in their own learning. If their previous education consisted primarily of lectures, memorization, and examinations, they have no personal reference point for understanding why reflection matters.

The solution to motivational resistance involves three strategies. First, demonstration of professional relevance: students should encounter concrete examples of how reflection has helped practising teachers solve real problems, improve their lessons, and develop

professionally. Video interviews with experienced teachers who describe their reflective practices can be particularly effective. Second, early success experience: students should be given reflective tasks that are simple enough to produce genuine insights even at the beginning of the programme. Korthagen's (2001) ALACT model provides a useful starting structure because it breaks reflection into manageable steps. Third, gradual integration: reflective activities should be introduced gradually, beginning with short, focused exercises and expanding to more complex analytical tasks as students develop confidence and skill. Djurayev and Turgunov (2006) emphasized that pedagogical skills, including reflective skills, develop through graduated practice rather than through sudden immersion.

Situation 2: Cognitive superficiality.

Cognitive superficiality occurs when students describe their experience but do not analyse it. A typical superficial reflection reads: I taught the lesson on fractions. I used a presentation with pictures. The students were active. The lesson went well. This description



contains no analysis of why certain methods were chosen, how student responses indicated understanding or confusion, what difficulties arose, or what the teacher learned from the experience. Moon (2004) identified descriptive writing as the lowest level of reflection, distinct from dialogic reflection where the learner engages in an internal dialogue about competing interpretations and from critical reflection where the learner examines assumptions and considers alternative frameworks.

The solution to cognitive superficiality involves providing structured analytical frameworks. Prompt questions such as What surprised you in this lesson and why? What did you expect to happen that did not happen? What would you change if you taught this lesson again and what is your reason? guide students beyond description toward analysis. Another effective strategy is modelling: the instructor demonstrates reflective analysis of his or her own teaching, showing students what analytical reflection looks like in practice. Peer discussion is also valuable: when students discuss their reflective observations with classmates, they encounter alternative perspectives that challenge superficial interpretations and push thinking deeper. Muslimov (2014) noted that professional competence develops through the ability to see beneath the surface of pedagogical events and to identify the mechanisms that produce observable outcomes.

Situation 3: Emotional avoidance.

Emotional avoidance is a psychologically complex situation. Learning from mistakes requires acknowledging that mistakes were made, and this acknowledgement can be uncomfortable, especially in a context where academic performance is being evaluated. Some students present only the positive aspects of their practice in reflective work, omitting difficulties, failures, and uncertainties. Others write about mistakes in abstract, depersonalized terms that distance them from the emotional reality of the experience. The result is reflection that is safe but uninformative — it confirms what the student already believes rather than challenging assumptions and generating new understanding.

The solution to emotional avoidance requires the creation of a psychologically safe reflective environment. This means establishing clear norms: mistakes are learning opportunities, not failures; honest reflection is more valuable than positive self-presentation; and reflective work will be evaluated on the quality of analysis, not on the absence of problems. Confidential reflective journals that are read only by the instructor and not shared publicly can reduce the fear of exposure. To'rayeva (2006) argued that the formation of professional self-awareness requires an atmosphere of trust in which students can examine both their strengths and their weaknesses without fear of judgement. The instructor's own



willingness to share reflections on his or her teaching mistakes serves as a powerful model that normalizes honest self-examination.

Situation 4: Methodological confusion.

Methodological confusion arises when students are told to reflect but are not taught how to reflect. The instruction to write a reflective journal about your teaching practice is, for many students, as unclear as the instruction to be creative or to think critically. Without explicit guidance on what reflection involves, students default to familiar academic genres: summary, description, or uncritical self-evaluation. They may write lengthy accounts of what they did without ever examining why they did it or what they learned.

The solution involves explicit instruction on reflective methods and procedures. Students should be taught specific reflective frameworks: Korthagen's ALACT model, Gibbs' reflective cycle, or structured prompt protocols that guide analysis step by step. Examples of high-quality reflective writing should be provided and analysed in class, so that students have concrete models to follow. Reflective templates with specific sections — description, analysis of causes, identification of learning, and planning for future action — help students organize their thinking and avoid the common pitfall of writing pure description. Ishmuhamedov, Abduqodirov, and Pardayev (2008)

emphasized that innovative pedagogical methods require clear procedural guidelines that students can follow until the methods become internalized as professional habits.

Situation 5: Contextual isolation.

Contextual isolation occurs when reflective activities are disconnected from real pedagogical experience. If students are asked to reflect on teaching before they have any teaching experience, or if reflective tasks refer to hypothetical classroom situations rather than actual events, the reflection becomes an academic exercise rather than a professional learning activity. Students may produce thoughtful philosophical essays about the nature of teaching but without the concrete grounding that transforms general ideas into practical professional knowledge.

The solution is to connect reflective activities directly to teaching practice. Reflection should be built into every stage of the practicum: before teaching (anticipatory reflection on what is planned and why), immediately after teaching (reflection on what happened and why), and at the end of the practice period (summative reflection on what was learned overall). Even in early courses before the formal practicum begins, reflective activities can be connected to concrete experiences: observing experienced teachers, participating in microteaching exercises, or analysing video recordings of real lessons. Yo'ldoshev (2004) emphasized that the



development of methodological competence requires constant movement between theory and practice, and reflection is the mechanism that connects these two dimensions.

Situation 6: Evaluative distortion.

Evaluative distortion is a systemic problem that arises from the way reflective work is assessed. If reflective journals and self-analysis reports are graded using traditional criteria that reward correct answers and positive outcomes, students quickly learn to present their experience in the most favourable light. They write what they think the instructor wants to read rather than what they genuinely observed and thought. The result is a collection of reflective documents that are well-written but dishonest — they describe ideal teaching rather than real teaching, and they report learning that may not have actually occurred.

The solution requires a fundamental rethinking of how reflective work is evaluated. Assessment should focus on the quality and depth of analysis rather

than on the positivity of the content. A student who honestly analyses a lesson that went poorly and identifies specific reasons for the difficulties demonstrates higher reflective competence than a student who describes a successful lesson without examining the factors that contributed to the success. Rubrics for evaluating reflective work should include criteria such as depth of analysis, use of evidence from practice, consideration of alternative interpretations, and specificity of plans for improvement. The formative rather than summative assessment of reflective work — where the instructor provides feedback for development rather than a final grade — can also reduce evaluative distortion by removing the incentive to perform rather than learn.

3. Diagnostic-corrective framework

The third result is an integrated diagnostic-corrective framework that enables teacher educators to identify the type of reflective difficulty a student is experiencing and to select the appropriate intervention strategy.

Situation category	Diagnostic indicators	Recommended solutions
Motivational resistance	Formal compliance without engagement; formulaic entries; expressed scepticism about the value of reflection	Professional relevance demonstration; early success experiences; graduated introduction; practitioner testimonials
Cognitive superficiality	Pure description without analysis; absence of causal reasoning; generic conclusions	Structured analytical prompts; modelling by instructor; peer discussion; progressive complexity of tasks
Emotional	Only positive self-presentation;	Psychologically safe



Situation category	Diagnostic indicators	Recommended solutions
avoidance	depersonalized language about difficulties; absence of vulnerability in reflective writing	environment; confidential journals; instructor modelling of honest self-analysis; clear norms valuing honesty
Methodological confusion	Confusion of reflection with summary or self-praise; lack of analytical structure; requests for clarification about what reflection means	Explicit instruction on reflective frameworks (ALACT, Gibbs); exemplars of quality reflection; structured templates; guided practice
Contextual isolation	Reflective writing refers to hypothetical rather than real situations; philosophical rather than practical orientation; disconnection from practicum	Integration with teaching practice at every stage; observation-based reflection; microteaching with immediate reflection; video analysis
Evaluative distortion	Writing for the instructor rather than for self-development; strategic self-presentation; content that is too positive to be real	Assessment focused on analytical depth, not positivity; formative feedback replacing grades; rubrics valuing honest analysis; portfolio approach

This framework is designed to be used by university instructors, methodology teachers, and practicum supervisors. Its diagnostic function helps educators recognize the specific type of difficulty a student is facing rather than treating all reflective problems as a single undifferentiated category. Its corrective function provides targeted strategies that address the root cause of the difficulty rather than applying generic remedies. The framework is not prescriptive — it allows for adaptation to specific institutional contexts, cultural conditions, and individual student characteristics — but it provides a structured starting point for systematic intervention.

4. Conditions for sustainable reflective development

The fourth result is the identification of conditions necessary for the sustainable development of reflective abilities throughout the period of university preparation. The first condition is institutional commitment. Reflective development cannot be the responsibility of a single course or a single instructor. It must be recognized as a programme-wide priority that is supported by curriculum design, assessment policies, and faculty development. When reflection is confined to one pedagogy course while all other courses use traditional transmission methods, students receive a contradictory message about the value of reflection.



The second condition is faculty development. University instructors who teach future teachers must themselves be reflective practitioners. If instructors have never engaged in systematic reflection on their own teaching, they cannot credibly guide students in reflective development. Professional development programmes for faculty should include training in reflective mentoring, in the use of reflective frameworks, and in the assessment of reflective competence.

The third condition is progressive complexity. Reflective tasks should increase in complexity across the years of study. In the first year, students might engage in structured reflection using templates and guided prompts. In the second year, they might begin to use reflective frameworks more independently. In the third year, reflection should be connected to practicum experience. By the fourth year, students should be capable of autonomous reflective practice that they can sustain after graduation. This progression corresponds to the general principle that professional competencies develop through graduated challenge, not through uniform repetition.

The fourth condition is cultural sensitivity. In the Uzbek educational context, where respect for authority and avoidance of public self-criticism are important cultural values, reflective practices must be adapted to create conditions in which honest self-analysis is possible without violating cultural

norms. Confidential journaling, one-on-one mentoring conversations, and small-group discussions with trusted peers may be more effective than public reflective presentations in front of large groups. The goal is to honour cultural values while still developing the professional capacity for honest self-examination.

Discussion

The results of the theoretical analysis confirm that the development of reflective abilities in future teachers is a complex pedagogical process that encounters systematic difficulties. The six categories of problematic situations identified in this article are consistent with findings from international research on reflective practice in teacher education. Korthagen (2001) noted that student teachers often resist reflection because they prefer concrete solutions to abstract analysis. Moon (2004) documented the prevalence of descriptive rather than analytical reflection in student journals. Beauchamp (2015) identified emotional vulnerability as a significant barrier to honest reflective engagement in pre-service teachers.

The Uzbek scholarly tradition adds important dimensions to this analysis. The emphasis on professional self-awareness (To'rayeva, 2006), on the graduated development of pedagogical skills (Djurayev and Turgunov, 2006), and on the integration of innovative technologies with systematic methodological support (Ishmuhamedov et al., 2008) provides a foundation for



developing reflective practices that are appropriate to the Uzbek educational context. Muslimov (2014) correctly emphasized that professional competence, including reflective competence, is not acquired passively but is formed through purposeful pedagogical activity that addresses both cognitive and personal dimensions of professional development.

The diagnostic-corrective framework proposed in this article offers a practical tool for teacher educators. Its value lies in two features. First, it treats reflective difficulties as identifiable and classifiable rather than as random and unpredictable events. This classification enables educators to respond systematically rather than reactively. Second, it connects each type of difficulty with specific solutions grounded in theoretical understanding and practical evidence. This connection transforms the framework from a descriptive typology into an action-oriented guide.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the framework is based on theoretical analysis and literature review rather than original empirical data. While the six categories are supported by evidence from multiple sources, their validity and completeness should be tested through empirical research in specific institutional contexts. Second, the boundaries between categories are not always sharp: a student may exhibit motivational resistance and cognitive superficiality simultaneously, and the interaction between different

types of difficulty may create compound problems that require integrated solutions. Third, cultural factors influence the manifestation and resolution of reflective difficulties, and the solutions proposed in this article may need to be adapted for different cultural contexts within and beyond Uzbekistan.

For curriculum design in pedagogical universities, the discussion suggests several practical recommendations. First, reflective development should be integrated across the entire programme rather than confined to isolated courses. Second, explicit instruction on reflective methods should precede the expectation of reflective performance. Third, assessment of reflective work should focus on analytical quality and honest engagement rather than on positive self-presentation. Fourth, practicum experiences should include structured reflective activities at every stage. Fifth, university instructors should receive professional development in reflective mentoring. Sixth, the cultural context should be respected through the use of reflective formats that allow honest self-analysis without requiring public exposure of personal vulnerabilities.

Conclusion

The situations that arise in preparing future teachers through the development of reflective abilities can be classified into six categories: motivational resistance, cognitive superficiality, emotional avoidance, methodological confusion, contextual isolation, and



evaluative distortion. Each category has identifiable causes and can be addressed through specific pedagogical solutions. The diagnostic-corrective framework proposed in this article connects these categories with targeted intervention strategies, enabling teacher educators to approach reflective development not as an uncertain aspiration but as a systematic, manageable, and evidence-informed pedagogical process.

The main conclusion of the study is that reflective ability is not a natural by-product of teaching experience but a deliberately cultivated professional capacity. Students do not become reflective simply by being told to reflect or by being given reflective assignments. They become reflective when they understand the professional value of reflection, when they possess the analytical tools needed for systematic self-examination, when they work in a psychologically safe environment that supports honest self-analysis, when

reflective activities are connected to real pedagogical experience, and when assessment practices reward genuine learning rather than strategic self-presentation. Pedagogical universities that create these conditions produce graduates who are not only technically skilled but also professionally self-aware, adaptive, and capable of continuous growth throughout their teaching careers.

Further research should focus on empirical testing of the diagnostic-corrective framework in pedagogical university settings, development of reliable instruments for assessing reflective competence at different levels of sophistication, longitudinal studies tracking the development of reflective abilities from university preparation through the early years of professional teaching, and cross-cultural comparative studies examining how reflective development is influenced by educational traditions and cultural norms in different national contexts.

REFERENCES:

1. Beauchamp, C. (2015). Reflection in teacher education: Issues emerging from a review of current literature. *Reflective Practice*, 16(1), 123–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.982525>
2. Dewey, J. (1933). *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*. D. C. Heath and Company.
3. Djurayev, R., & Turgunov, S. (2006). *Pedagogik mahoratni shakllantirish texnologiyasi*. Fan nashriyoti.
4. Ishmuhamedov, R., Abduqodirov, A., & Pardayev, A. (2008). *Ta'limda innovatsion texnologiyalar*. Iste'dod nashriyoti.



5. Korthagen, F. A. J. (2001). Linking Practice and Theory: The Pedagogy of Realistic Teacher Education. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410600523>
6. Moon, J. A. (2004). A Handbook of Reflective and Experiential Learning: Theory and Practice. Routledge.
7. Muslimov, N. (2014). Kasb ta'limi o'qituvchilarining kasbiy kompetentligini shakllantirish. Fan va texnologiya nashriyoti.
8. Schön, D. A. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. Basic Books.
9. To'rayeva, O. (2006). Bo'lajak o'qituvchilarda kasbiy o'zlikni anglashni shakllantirish. Fan nashriyoti.
10. Yo'ldoshev, J. (2004). Ta'lim texnologiyalari va pedagogik mahorat. O'qituvchi nashriyoti.