



PEDAGOGICAL TECHNOLOGIES AIMED AT PREVENTING DESTRUCTIVE IDEAS AMONG STUDENTS OF GENERAL SECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Zaripov Fayziddin Muxitdinovich

Head of the Department for Youth Education and Organization of Professional Competitions,
Agency for Vocational Education under the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation
of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Pedagogical Sciences

ABSTRACT	KEY WORDS
The article addresses the prevention of destructive ideas among students of general secondary schools through pedagogical means. Drawing on international frameworks for preventing violent extremism through education and on national legislation of Uzbekistan, the study proposes a three-level (universal, selective and indicated) model of school-based prevention and a set of pedagogical technologies matched to each level: critical thinking and media literacy training, dilemma-based moral discussions, case studies, peer education, project-based civic learning, digital hygiene and mentoring. The roles of teachers, class tutors, school psychologists, parents and the mahalla in the prevention system are specified, and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of preventive work are suggested.	Destructive ideas, prevention, radicalization, pedagogical technology, critical thinking, media literacy, resilience, general secondary education, peer education.

INTRODUCTION

Annotatsiya

Maqolada umumiy oʻrta taʼlim muassasalari oʻquvchilari orasida destruktiv gʻoyalar profilaktikasining pedagogik vositalari tahlil qilinadi. Xalqaro tajriba va milliy qonunchilik asosida maktabda profilaktikaning uch bosqichli (universal, selektiv va individual) modeli hamda har bir bosqichga mos pedagogik texnologiyalar taklif etiladi.

Kalit soʻzlar: destruktiv gʻoyalar, profilaktika, radikallashuv, pedagogik texnologiya, tanqidiy fikrlash, media savodxonlik, barqarorlik.

Аннотация

В статье анализируются педагогические средства профилактики деструктивных идей среди учащихся общеобразовательных школ. На основе международного опыта и национального законодательства предложена трёхуровневая (универсальная, селективная и индивидуальная)

модель школьной профилактики и соответствующие каждому уровню педагогические технологии.

Ключевые слова: деструктивные идеи, профилактика, радикализация, педагогическая технология, критическое мышление, медиаграмотность.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of the digital environment has profoundly changed the way adolescents obtain information, form their worldviews and build social relationships. Alongside undeniable educational opportunities, social networks and messaging platforms have become channels through which destructive ideas - extremist and radical ideologies, calls for violence, cyberbullying, propaganda of suicide-related “challenges”, intolerance and hatred towards others - reach young people. School-age children are particularly vulnerable to such influences because their identity, value system and capacity for critical evaluation of information are still developing.

In the Republic of Uzbekistan, the legal framework for countering these threats is set out in the Law “On Countering Extremism”, which provides for a system of preventive measures - including educational ones - aimed at identifying and eliminating the causes and conditions that give rise to extremism [1]. The Law “On Education” names the upbringing of young people in the spirit of loyalty to the homeland, respect for national and universal values and tolerance among the fundamental principles of state policy in education [2]. Taken together, these documents imply that prevention cannot be limited to law enforcement: the school, as the institution in which almost every child spends a large part of the day, is a key actor in building young people’s resilience.

At the same time, school practice often reduces preventive work to lectures, awareness events and meetings with invited speakers, in which students remain passive listeners. International evidence suggests that such one-way formats have limited effect, whereas interactive approaches that develop critical thinking, empathy and a sense of belonging are more promising [3; 5]. The purpose of this article is therefore to substantiate a system of pedagogical technologies for preventing destructive ideas among students of general secondary schools and to specify the conditions for their effective use.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The international discourse on education and the prevention of violent extremism has been shaped largely by UNESCO. The UNESCO guide for policy-makers argues that education cannot prevent an individual from committing a violent act on its own, but that relevant, inclusive and high-quality education can help create the conditions that make it difficult for violent extremist ideologies to spread [3]. The companion teacher’s guide offers practical recommendations for managing classroom discussions on controversial and sensitive topics and stresses the importance of a safe, respectful learning environment [4].

L. Davies, in her study of education and extremism, contends that the most effective antidote to extremist thinking is not the transmission of “correct” values but the development of critical, questioning and open-minded dispositions, including the ability to live with ambiguity and to engage with opposing views [5]. R. Ghosh and colleagues, reviewing the role of education in countering violent religious extremism, conclude that schools can contribute to prevention by fostering critical

thinking, intercultural understanding and a sense of civic belonging, while cautioning against approaches that stigmatize particular groups of students [6]. S. Sieckelinck, F. Kaulingfreks and M. de Winter propose an educational rather than a security perspective on radicalization, viewing young people neither as villains nor as victims but as individuals whose search for ideals and meaning should be pedagogically supported [7].

The psychological mechanisms through which people come to accept harmful actions were described by A. Bandura in his theory of moral disengagement, including moral justification, euphemistic labelling, displacement of responsibility and dehumanization of victims [8]. Recognizing these mechanisms in propaganda messages is an important target of preventive education. R. Hobbs' plan of action for digital and media literacy identifies access, analysis and evaluation, creation, reflection and action as core competencies that enable young people to engage critically with media content [9]. The study employed theoretical analysis of normative documents and scientific literature, comparative analysis of international and national approaches, pedagogical modelling, and a systematization of pedagogical technologies according to the level of prevention and the age characteristics of students.

RESULTS

1. A three-level model of school-based prevention. Adapting the widely used public-health distinction between universal, selective and indicated prevention to the school context, a three-level model of preventive work was developed (Table 1).

Table 1

Level of prevention	Target group	Goal	Pedagogical technologies
Universal (primary)	All students of a class or school	Developing critical thinking, media literacy, civic identity, tolerance and emotional resilience	Critical thinking lessons, media literacy workshops, dilemma discussions, project-based civic learning, digital hygiene sessions
Selective (secondary)	Students in risk situations (social isolation, conflict in the family, low academic engagement, intensive unsupervised internet use)	Reducing risk factors, strengthening a sense of belonging and trusting relationships with adults	Mentoring, peer education, inclusion in clubs, sports and volunteering, joint work with parents and the mahalla
Indicated (tertiary)	Students already showing signs of exposure to destructive content	Timely individual support and prevention of further involvement	Individual psychological and pedagogical support, individual development plan, coordinated work with parents and specialists

2. A set of pedagogical technologies. For each level, pedagogical technologies were selected and adapted according to the principle of active student participation:

Critical thinking and media literacy technology. Students learn to identify the source, purpose and target audience of a message, distinguish facts from opinions, recognize manipulation techniques (emotional pressure, false dichotomies, “us versus them” framing) and verify information. Following R. Hobbs, the sequence “access - analyse and evaluate - create - reflect - act” is used [9]. In practice, students analyse examples of fake news, examine how a short video evokes emotions, and produce their own counter-messages.

Dilemma discussion and case study technology. Students discuss short cases based on realistic situations (for example, a classmate is invited to a closed online group promising “the only truth”). The discussion is structured around questions that reveal the mechanisms of moral disengagement described by A. Bandura: how violence is justified, how responsibility is shifted, how the “other” is dehumanized [8].

Peer education technology. Trained senior students conduct sessions with younger peers. Messages from peers are perceived as more credible by adolescents than lectures by adults, and peer educators themselves strengthen their civic position.

Project-based civic learning. Students design and implement social projects in their mahalla (supporting elderly people, environmental initiatives, school media). Such projects satisfy adolescents’ need for meaning, recognition and belonging - the very needs that recruiters of destructive movements try to exploit [7].

Digital hygiene technology. Students learn rules of safe online behaviour: privacy settings, responses to unknown contacts and invitations to closed groups, reporting harmful content, and seeking help from trusted adults.

Mentoring technology. A teacher, class tutor or senior student acts as a mentor for a student in a risk situation, providing regular personal contact, support in learning and inclusion in extracurricular activities.

3. Distribution of roles. The model specifies the functions of participants: subject teachers integrate elements of critical thinking and media literacy into lessons of history, literature, “Education” (Tarbiya) and informatics; class tutors conduct dilemma discussions and monitor the class climate; the school psychologist carries out diagnostics and individual support; the deputy director for youth affairs coordinates the system; parents are involved through thematic meetings on digital safety; the mahalla supports extracurricular employment of students.

4. Evaluation criteria. To assess the effectiveness of preventive work, the following criteria were proposed: the cognitive criterion (knowledge of manipulation techniques and legal consequences), the critical-analytical criterion (ability to evaluate information and arguments), the value-attitudinal criterion (tolerance, civic identity), the socio-emotional criterion (sense of belonging, trust in adults, willingness to seek help) and the behavioural criterion (participation in constructive social activity, safe online behaviour).

DISCUSSION

The proposed model shifts the emphasis of school prevention from a “warning” approach to a “development” approach. Rather than merely informing students about the dangers of extremist ideas, it seeks to equip them with the intellectual and emotional tools to resist manipulation. This is consistent with L. Davies’ argument that open, critical and questioning dispositions are a stronger safeguard than the transmission of fixed answers [5], and with UNESCO’s view that prevention through education should be embedded in the everyday learning process rather than confined to one-off events [3].

A key issue that requires careful attention is the risk of stigmatization. As R. Ghosh and colleagues warn, prevention programmes that single out specific groups of students can damage trust and even reinforce alienation [6]. For this reason, the model places the main weight on the universal level, which addresses all students equally, while selective and indicated measures are framed as support rather than surveillance. The educational perspective proposed by S. Sieckelinck and co-authors is particularly relevant here: the adolescent search for ideals is not a problem in itself but a resource that the school should direct towards constructive civic engagement [7].

The effectiveness of the model depends largely on teachers’ readiness to facilitate discussions on sensitive topics. UNESCO’s teacher guide notes that many teachers avoid such discussions for fear of losing control of the class [4]. Consequently, the implementation of these technologies requires targeted professional development of teachers and class tutors, as well as methodological materials adapted to the national context. Further research should include an experimental validation of the model in general secondary schools, with measurement of changes according to the proposed criteria.

CONCLUSION

1. The prevention of destructive ideas among school students should be understood as a pedagogical process aimed at developing critical thinking, media literacy, civic identity and emotional resilience, rather than as a set of isolated awareness-raising events.
2. The three-level model (universal, selective and indicated prevention) makes it possible to match pedagogical technologies to the needs of different groups of students while avoiding stigmatization.
3. The most promising technologies include critical thinking and media literacy training, dilemma discussions and case studies, peer education, project-based civic learning, digital hygiene and mentoring.
4. The effectiveness of preventive work depends on the coordinated action of teachers, class tutors, school psychologists, parents and the mahalla, and can be evaluated using cognitive, critical-analytical, value-attitudinal, socio-emotional and behavioural criteria.
5. Targeted professional development of teachers in facilitating discussions on sensitive topics is a necessary condition for implementing the proposed technologies.

REFERENCES

1. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Countering Extremism”. No. ZRU-523 of 30 July 2018 // National Database of Legislation. - URL: <https://lex.uz>
2. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Education”. No. ZRU-637 of 23 September 2020 // National Database of Legislation. - URL: <https://lex.uz>

3. UNESCO. Preventing Violent Extremism through Education: A Guide for Policy-makers. - Paris: UNESCO, 2017.
4. UNESCO. A Teacher's Guide on the Prevention of Violent Extremism. - Paris: UNESCO, 2016.
5. Davies L. Educating Against Extremism. - Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books, 2008.
6. Ghosh R., Chan W.Y.A., Manuel A., Dilimulati M. Can education counter violent religious extremism? // Canadian Foreign Policy Journal. - 2017. - Vol. 23, No. 2. - P. 117–133. - DOI: 10.1080/11926422.2016.1165713.
7. Sieckelinck S., Kaulingfreks F., De Winter M. Neither villains nor victims: towards an educational perspective on radicalisation // British Journal of Educational Studies. - 2015. - Vol. 63, No. 3. - P. 329–343.
8. Bandura A. Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities // Personality and Social Psychology Review. - 1999. - Vol. 3, No. 3. - P. 193–209.
9. Hobbs R. Digital and Media Literacy: A Plan of Action. - Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute, 2010.