

Structuring feedback and independent transfer in prospective primary school teachers learning to resolve dynamic conflicts

Dilkhumor Mirzabdullaeva

ORCID: 0000-0003-0505-8378

d.mirzabdullayeva@kiut.uz

Kimyo International University in Tashkent

Abstract: This article proposes an instructional sequence linking feedback, decision revision, and independent transfer in prospective primary school teachers' learning to resolve dynamic conflicts. It addresses a methodological difficulty: a student's successful revision immediately after a tutor's hint may reflect guided task completion rather than an independently available professional skill. A focused conceptual synthesis draws on feedback theory, simulation-based learning, transfer research, and pedagogical conflict analysis. The proposed sequence includes an unaided initial response, evidence-focused feedback, a reasoned revision, practice with reduced support, and a delayed unfamiliar case. Feedback is organized around the relationship between evidence, interpretation, and action. Transfer is defined through specified changes in contextual features and is assessed separately from supported performance. The article provides illustrative feedback exchanges, a practical teaching sequence, and a prospective evaluation design. No participant data or intervention effects are reported. The intended contribution is a clear separation of learning with support from evidence of independent application, with practical relevance to primary teacher education in Uzbekistan.

Keywords: formative feedback, transfer of learning, primary teacher education, pedagogical conflict, decision revision, reflective learning, independent performance

Introduction. Prospective teachers can often improve a case response when an instructor points out missing information. Such improvement is educationally useful, but it does not establish that the student can identify a comparable problem independently. When preparation for conflict resolution is evaluated only through answers produced after feedback, the instructional support and the learner's own performance become difficult to distinguish.

The issue is particularly relevant in dynamic cases, where new information can alter an initial interpretation. A tutor may ask whether the student considered the child's perspective or noticed a contradiction. The student may then produce a defensible response. The central question is whether the underlying way of reasoning

becomes available when the explicit cue is absent and the conflict appears in a different form.

This article develops a teaching sequence that separates supported revision from independent transfer. Its scope is methodological: it proposes how feedback and assessment can be organized in a teacher education program. It does not report a tested intervention or claim that transfer follows automatically from reflection. The sequence is intended for prospective primary school teachers and can be adapted to local educational conditions in Uzbekistan.

Discussion. The article uses a focused conceptual synthesis of four sources. They address the functions of feedback, instructional support in simulations, the interpretation of transfer, and the professional relevance of conflict competence. The sources were selected for their conceptual fit with the teaching problem. No systematic literature search or quantitative synthesis was performed. The resulting sequence and examples are author-proposed applications whose validity remains to be examined.

Hattie and Timperley distinguish feedback concerning the task, the process, self-regulation, and the person [1]. The present proposal prioritizes feedback that directs attention to evidence and reasoning. A comment such as asking which assumption is contradicted by new information is more closely connected to the intended learning process than a general judgment about personal flexibility. This is a design inference, not a separately demonstrated effect in the population addressed here.

Simulation-based learning research indicates that instructional support can facilitate the development of complex skills and that its usefulness varies with learners' prior knowledge [2]. This supports differentiating assistance rather than giving identical hints throughout instruction. A novice may need a worked comparison of two responses. A more experienced student may benefit from explaining an inconsistency without being told which alternative to choose. The appropriate balance needs to be established during piloting.

Barnett and Ceci conceptualize transfer through dimensions of content and context [3]. Their approach is useful because a change of character names alone offers limited evidence of independent application to meaningfully different conditions. For the proposed sequence, transfer tasks vary specified features such as the participant relationship, the source of new information, or the communication medium. The claim about transfer should remain limited to the dimensions actually tested.

Mirzabdullaeva emphasizes the importance of considering different participants' views, avoiding rushed conclusions, and reflecting on the teacher's contribution to conflict [4]. The present sequence uses these ideas as professional grounds for evidence-focused feedback. It extends the instructional question to whether students

can apply such reasoning without the instructor's immediate direction. It does not attribute a validated transfer mechanism to the earlier work.

Results and Analysis. The conceptual result is a five-stage instructional sequence. Stage one is an unaided provisional decision. Stage two is feedback directed at a specific gap in reasoning. Stage three is a justified revision or retention of the decision. Stage four provides another opportunity with reduced support. Stage five assesses an unfamiliar conflict without individualized prompts. The distinction between stages is essential because each produces a different kind of evidence about learning.

At the first stage, students receive a conflict description and write a brief response. They identify their proposed action, supporting evidence, and an uncertainty they would seek to resolve. The task should permit a defensible provisional response. The instructor retains the original answer so that subsequent reflection concerns an identifiable decision rather than a reconstructed account of what the student believes was intended.

The second stage follows a consequential information update. Feedback should identify a reasoning gap without supplying the entire solution. For example, a parent complains about a child's refusal to participate. The student's initial plan emphasizes explaining participation rules. An update reveals that the child did not understand the task instructions. Feedback can ask which part of the plan assumed understanding and what information now challenges that assumption.

This feedback gives the student a direction for analysis while preserving responsibility for the action proposed. By comparison, an instruction to replace the original response with a particular model answer would make it difficult to observe the student's own revision process. Direct examples may nevertheless be appropriate for initial teaching. If they are used, the resulting performance should be described as supported practice rather than independent mastery.

At the third stage, students explain the relationship between the old and new responses. A useful explanation identifies an assumption, states how the update affects it, and links the resulting interpretation to action. In the participation case, the student may retain a private conversation with the parent while adding a check of instructional clarity and an accessible participation option. This is a meaningful revision even though one element of the original plan remains unchanged.

Retention must also remain available as a defensible response. Suppose an update states that the parent has raised a similar concern before but supplies no new evidence about the present event. The student may reasonably retain a plan to investigate before assigning blame. Feedback should not reward change merely because a later detail was introduced. The object of learning is evidence-sensitive judgment rather than accommodation to each new demand.

Stage four reduces assistance in a planned way. A new case may first receive only a general instruction to review the evidence. Later practice can remove that instruction and ask for a justified decision directly. Reduction should depend on demonstrated performance, not a fixed assumption that all students progress at the same rate. If a student repeatedly misses consequential information, additional guided comparison may be needed before support is withdrawn again.

Peer discussion can be incorporated after individual responses are recorded. Students compare the evidence used and question each other's assumptions. The instructor should distinguish disagreement supported by case facts from pressure to adopt a majority answer. A brief individual continuation after discussion helps reveal whether the student can explain the adopted position. Group agreement alone is insufficient evidence of individual reasoning.

Stage five uses an unfamiliar task with no individualized hints. If instruction concerned teacher-parent disagreement about participation, an assessment might concern a dispute between pupils during group work, with new information delivered through a colleague's account. This varies participant relationships and the source of evidence. The task should still require the same underlying operations: identify relevant information, reconsider an explanation, compare feasible actions, and justify the response.

A delayed task can examine whether performance remains available after immediate practice. The interval should be selected and reported in advance, with consideration of intervening instruction and school placement. A delay alone does not create far transfer. Researchers must state what differs between training and assessment and avoid generalizing from written scenarios to all real classroom conflicts.

Supported and independent results should be reported separately. The former describes what students can achieve with instructional assistance; the latter addresses what they can demonstrate under specified unaided conditions. A large improvement after a hint combined with limited unfamiliar-case performance would indicate a need for further teaching, not necessarily failure of the entire method. Reporting only a combined score would conceal this distinction.

A prospective evaluation can compare evidence-focused feedback with a time-matched alternative using the same case material. One feasible alternative is feedback concentrated on the final recommendation. Both groups should receive comparable opportunities to respond and revise. The study can then examine whether the groups differ on an unfamiliar unaided task, while accounting for initial performance and class-level allocation. Such a design would investigate the added contribution of the feedback process rather than compare unequal amounts of teaching.

Scoring should use explicit anchors for evidence identification, coherence of interpretation, feasibility of action, and quality of justification. Independent raters can score anonymized responses without knowing group membership where feasible. Rater agreement, missing responses, and differences in writing demands should be reported. Participant numbers and statistical decisions require a prospective justification; no sample size or expected effect is asserted here.

Implementation should protect the learning relationship. Feedback should challenge reasoning without publicly labeling a student as incapable of managing conflict. Cases should use fictional or adequately anonymized situations. Locally developed materials should be reviewed for linguistic clarity and realistic school conditions. Paper forms are sufficient for initial implementation; digital tools are useful when they improve preservation of responses rather than merely add presentation complexity.

The main limitation is that the proposed sequence concerns designed learning conditions. It cannot reproduce every emotional, organizational, or time constraint of school practice. Strong written explanations can also coexist with difficulty acting in a live conversation. Later validation should therefore combine unfamiliar-case tasks with supervised observations or standardized role play, while acknowledging that each method captures different aspects of professional performance.

Conclusion. Feedback can support learning from changing conflict situations when it makes the relationship between evidence, assumptions, and professional action explicit. However, a revised answer produced with assistance should be distinguished from independent application. The proposed sequence preserves this distinction through recorded initial decisions, focused feedback, reasoned continuation, reduced support, and an unfamiliar unaided task.

Its methodological contribution is the separation of instructional success from evidence of transfer. Teacher educators can use this separation to identify where students still rely on prompts and to plan further practice. Empirical testing is needed before claims are made about effectiveness, durability, or application in real primary classrooms. In an Uzbek teacher education setting, local case review and a modest pilot provide a practical starting point for that work.

References

1. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
2. Chernikova, O., Heitzmann, N., Stadler, M., Holzberger, D., Seidel, T., & Fischer, F. (2020). Simulation-based learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(4), 499–541. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320933544>

3. Barnett, S. M., & Ceci, S. J. (2002). When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(4), 612–637. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.4.612>
4. Mirzabdullaeva, D. E. (2020). Ways and methods of resolving pedagogical conflicts between teachers and students in a modern school. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 8(12), 242–244. <https://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Full-Paper-WAYS-AND-METHODS-OF-RESOLVING-PEDAGOGICAL-CONFLICTS-BETWEEN-TEACHERS-AND-STUDENTS-IN-A-MODERN-SCHOOL.pdf>
5. Мирзабдуллаева, Д. Э. (2016). Конфликты в подростковом возрасте и пути их разрешения. *NovaInfo.Ru*, 2(45), 305–310.
6. Mirzabdullaeva, D. E. (2019). Socio-perceptual regulators and reflexive context are localized in adolescents. *Вестник магистратуры*, № 4-4, с. 91.
7. Мирзабдуллаева, Д., Лутфетдинова, Р. (2014). Способы эффективного взаимодействия учителя при конфликтных ситуациях. В *Институты и механизмы инновационного развития: мировой опыт и российская практика* (с. 269–271).
8. Мирзабдуллаева, Д. "Личностные факторы как детерминанты возникновения конфликтов и методы их диагностики." *Актуальные вопросы развития современного общества*. 2014.
9. Мирзабдуллаева, Дилхумор Эркиновна. "Здоровая психологическая среда в ученическом коллективе как фактор воспитания здорового поколения." *Состояние здоровья: медицинские, социальные и психолого-педагогические аспекты*. 2017.