International Journal of Pedagogics

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue03 2026
PAGE NO. 822-826
DOI 10.37547/ijp/Volume06Issue03-158

The Pedagogical Mechanism of Collaboration Among Schools, Families, And Prevention Inspectors in Developing Students' Resilience to Extremist Ideas

Safarov Erkin Nasilloyevich
Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Received: 18 February 2026; **Accepted:** 03 March 2026; **Published:** 31 March 2026

Abstract: This article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations of collaboration among schools, families, and prevention inspectors in developing students' resilience to extremist ideas. It explains the goal-oriented and methodological, organizational and stakeholder-related, content and process, diagnostic and corrective, and outcome-oriented components of the collaboration model. Indicators for assessing student performance are systematized according to information-analytical, value-motivational, practical-behavioral, and reflective criteria. Pedagogical approaches presented in the dissertation abstract are compared with international sources to identify the conditions, limitations, and practical implications of implementing the collaborative mechanism.

Keywords: Resilience to extremist ideas, school, family, prevention inspector, pedagogical collaboration, critical thinking, information literacy, safe decision-making, assessment.

Introduction: In an environment characterized by rapidly increasing information flows, enabling students to recognize manipulative messages, critically assess claims that justify violence and hostility, and make safe decisions in complex social situations has become an important educational responsibility. Legal warnings or isolated awareness-raising meetings alone cannot adequately address this task. Educational work should integrate knowledge, value-based attitudes, practical action, and reflection.

UNESCO guidance on preventing violent extremism through education prioritizes critical thinking, respectful dialogue, human rights, and inclusive learning environments [1; 2]. This approach provides a methodological rationale for linking classroom learning with family discussions and the legal and educational assistance that prevention inspectors may provide within their authority. Nevertheless, the involvement of multiple stakeholders does not, in itself, demonstrate that students have developed sustainable skills.

The aim of this study is to systematize, from a scientific and methodological perspective, the components, implementation stages, and assessment criteria of a tripartite pedagogical collaboration mechanism designed to develop students' resilience to extremist ideas. The object of the study is the educational development of general secondary school students; its subject comprises the pedagogical conditions, forms, and tools used to coordinate the activities of schools, families, and prevention inspectors.

METHODOLOGY

The article draws on the theoretical and methodological sections of the supplied dissertation abstract [5], UNESCO publications [1; 2], and research on school–family collaboration and educational responses to information manipulation. The methods employed include comparative literature review, content analysis, systems thinking, pedagogical modeling, component classification, and operationalization of assessment criteria. The dissertation abstract is treated as a source

rather than as evidence of a new independent empirical study.

In this article, 'resilience' does not refer to testing students' political or religious beliefs. Instead, it denotes a set of competencies involving verification of evidence, respect for human dignity and rights, reasoned rejection of claims justifying violence, safe choices under pressure, and help-seeking. Assessment is not intended to stigmatize students or classify them as legal risks.

RESULTS: STRUCTURE OF THE COLLABORATIVE MECHANISM

The theoretical analysis distinguishes five interrelated components. The goal-oriented and methodological component specifies the intended educational outcomes, principles, and approaches. The organizational and stakeholder component clarifies the responsibilities and feedback arrangements of schools, families, and prevention inspectors. The content and process component combines scenario-based exercises with reinforcement in everyday communication. The diagnostic and corrective component adapts support in response to observations. The outcome component focuses on students' ability to make justified and safe decisions in unfamiliar situations [5].

Table 1. Pedagogical responsibilities of the participants in tripartite collaboration

Participant	Main responsibility	Observable outcome
School	Identify educational needs; organize case studies, discussion, and reflection	Student distinguishes claims from evidence and justifies decisions
Family	Listen without blame; verify information together; agree on help-seeking options	Student asks questions and seeks assistance safely
Prevention inspector	Provide legal explanations and necessary referrals within statutory authority	Student knows lawful reporting channels and safe responses
Collaboration coordination	Agree on objectives, deadlines, responsible persons, and feedback procedures	Educational support is consistent and continuous

The school's coordinating role must not be confused with law-enforcement functions, and family involvement must not become surveillance or coercion. Prevention inspectors do not make pedagogical diagnoses; they provide explanations and referrals within their legal authority. Any exchange of students' personal information must comply with necessity, lawful grounds, and confidentiality requirements.

The mechanism follows five practical stages: identifying educational needs and agreeing on objectives; preparing participants and resources; organizing coordinated developmental activities; transferring learned skills to new situations; and analyzing outcomes to adjust support. These stages are not strictly linear: ongoing observation may require changes in task difficulty or family communication methods before a final assessment.

Students need not be exposed to authentic extremist propaganda in classroom activities. Teachers can construct safe fictional messages illustrating emotional pressure, unsupported generalizations, or an 'us versus them' framing. Students identify the source, claim, missing evidence, possible consequences, and safe responses. Families can then discuss how the same analytical procedure applies to ordinary information; questions requiring legal clarification may be referred to an authorized professional.

Table 2. Operational dimensions of the pedagogical conditions

Condition	Practical implementation
Alignment with educational needs	Set objectives based on an initial interview and scenario-based task

Agreed responsibilities and timing	Record the responsible person, deadline, and feedback point
Trust-based communication	Ensure non-discrimination, confidentiality, and opportunities to ask questions freely
Age-appropriate materials	Adapt texts, scenarios, and scaffolding to grades 5–9
Active family participation	Conduct brief home discussions and provide feedback to the school
Professional preparedness	Develop skills in educational dialogue, media literacy, and legal responsibilities
Lawful information exchange	Limit sharing to necessary information and protect confidentiality
Outcome-based adjustment	Assess student competencies separately from organizational implementation

The dissertation abstract presents these eight conditions as interdependent parts of a unified pedagogical system [5]. Applying them in isolation—for example, assigning a complex case without creating a setting in which students can ask questions freely—may reduce the validity of diagnostic conclusions.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND INDICATORS

Equating educational outcomes with the number of events, attendance, or lecture duration is a methodological error. Four complementary criteria should be used to assess students' demonstrated skills: information-analytical, value-motivational, practical-behavioral, and reflective. Knowledge tasks, safe educational cases, teacher observations, and interviews should be triangulated.

Table 3. Pedagogical criteria for assessing resilience to extremist ideas

Criterion	Indicator	Assessment method
Information-analytical	Verifies sources; distinguishes claims from evidence	Scenario-based information analysis
Value-motivational	Provides reasons for rejecting discrimination and justifications of violence	Problem-based questions and interview
Practical-behavioral	Chooses safe refusal and help-seeking responses under pressure	Role-play and case study
Reflective	Explains consequences and revisits decisions	Reflection sheet and observation

Performance levels may be described as 'completes with support,' 'completes partly independently,' and 'completes independently with justification.' These levels assess skills demonstrated in educational tasks, not political or religious convictions. A single weak performance must not be used to label a student as belonging to an at-risk group.

Table 4. Improved pedagogical mechanism of tripartite collaboration

Stage	School activities	Family activities	Prevention inspector	Outcome and feedback
1. Needs assessment	Identify difficulties in information	Listen without blaming and describe	Explain safe reporting channels within	Develop a map of educational needs without

	analysis and help-seeking through cases, interviews, and observation	communication needs	statutory authority	stigmatizing students
2. Agreeing on goals and responsibilities	Specify target skill, activity, deadline, and assessment indicator	Agree on home support and communication channel	Define scope and timing of legal-educational support	Record responsibilities and confidentiality requirements
3. Coordinated activities	Use safe fictional cases to practice claim–evidence analysis, manipulation recognition, and nonviolent choices	Discuss sources and potential consequences with the child	Explain threats, coercion, and lawful reporting in age-appropriate terms	Student verifies information and chooses a justified, safe response
4. Transfer to new situations	Assess independent decisions and supporting evidence in a novel scenario	Reinforce respectful discussion and help-seeking in everyday life	Refer to appropriate support when legally necessary	Observe application of skills in new contexts
5. Monitoring and adjustment	Compare rubrics, interviews, and observations across four criteria	Provide feedback on difficulties and support received	Advise only on legal matters within statutory authority	Assess student development and implementation separately; adapt support

The operational unit of the mechanism is not an isolated event but a cycle of need — agreed responsibility — educational action — observable skill — feedback. The school coordinates instruction, the family reinforces skills through everyday dialogue, and the prevention inspector provides legal and educational support only within the limits of their authority. At the end of each stage, participants determine whether subsequent activities should be adjusted.

Two types of results must remain distinct when assessing effectiveness: organizational implementation (completion of agreed tasks and regularity of communication) and pedagogical change (checking evidence, rejecting justifications of violence, making safe decisions, and seeking assistance). Neither set of indicators is intended to evaluate students' political or religious beliefs.

DISCUSSION

The methodological advantage of tripartite collaboration lies not in repeating identical messages across settings but in ensuring complementary contributions. Schools teach source verification and evidence-based reasoning; families discuss students' questions using everyday examples; and prevention inspectors explain lawful responses and channels for seeking assistance. Students thus practice a transferable decision-making procedure rather than memorizing a prescribed judgment.

Research by Roozenbeek and colleagues on psychological inoculation against information manipulation suggests that explaining manipulative techniques in advance may improve recognition of

misinformation [4]. However, these findings cannot be interpreted as direct evidence of improvement in every dimension of resilience to extremist ideas or as proof of reduced crime. Claims about educational outcomes must remain limited to the competencies actually measured.

Involving prevention inspectors in educational activities must be consistent with students' dignity, freedom of thought, and privacy. Automatically treating pedagogical difficulties as grounds for legal suspicion, construing a worldview as an indicator of danger, or singling out students publicly would contradict the educational purpose of the collaboration. Legal interventions require their own lawful grounds and procedures.

A key methodological limitation is the need to distinguish organizational indicators from student outcomes. The number of meetings attended by all three parties or the existence of an agreed plan may indicate collaboration activity, but does not directly measure critical thinking or safe decision-making. Each activity therefore requires predetermined indicators, scenario-based assessments, and, where feasible, delayed follow-up measurements.

Independent verification of its outcomes would require baseline and final raw data for experimental and control groups, sampling details, the assessment rubric, and the statistical procedures used. The present article therefore reports only the scope described in the source and does not add new claims concerning statistical significance or causal effects.

For practical implementation, each activity could be documented in a brief 'collaboration record' identifying the educational need, student age group, target skill, responsible party, safe learning material, implementation period, confidentiality safeguards, assessment indicator, and subsequent support. Such documentation can coordinate stakeholder responsibilities and link administrative reporting to observable educational outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Developing students' resilience to extremist ideas requires clearly coordinating the distinct responsibilities of schools, families, and prevention inspectors around a shared educational objective, rather than merging their functions. The proposed five-component model integrates the identification of educational needs, collaborative planning, scenario-based practice, transfer of skills to everyday communication, and adjustment of support in response to outcomes.

Information-analytical, value-motivational, practical-behavioral, and reflective criteria make it possible to observe students' ability to verify messages, respect human dignity, make safe decisions, and seek help. Organizational implementation must be assessed separately from changes in student competence. Definitive conclusions regarding the mechanism's effectiveness in different school settings require further empirical research based on verifiable primary data.

REFERENCES

1. UNESCO. A Teacher's Guide on the Prevention of Violent Extremism. Paris: UNESCO, 2016.
2. UNESCO. Preventing Violent Extremism through Education: A Guide for Policy-Makers. Paris: UNESCO, 2017.
3. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of the Child. New York, 1989. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child
4. Roozenbeek J., van der Linden S., Goldberg B., Rathje S., Lewandowsky S. Psychological inoculation improves resilience against misinformation on social media. Science Advances. 2022;8(34):eabo6254. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abo6254
5. Republic of Uzbekistan. Law 'On Combating Extremism,' No. ZRU-489, 30 July 2018 (in Uzbek).
6. Republic of Uzbekistan. Law 'On the Prevention of Offenses,' No. ZRU-371, 14 May 2014 (in Uzbek).. Geneva: WHO, 2016.