

TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING COHESION AMONG PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS THROUGH ACTIVE GAMES

Karimova Sadoqat Mamaraimovna

Lecturer, Department of Physical Culture, Termez State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract. This paper presents a pedagogical technology for developing cohesion among primary school pupils through active games. Cohesion is defined as a combination of shared-goal orientation, mutual assistance, coordinated communication, individual accountability, and reflective responsibility for group outcomes. The study is conceptual and uses policy analysis, a review of research on cooperative learning and physical education, and pedagogical modelling. The proposed technology includes diagnostic orientation, cooperative game design, role-based implementation, group reflection, and corrective assessment. It is argued that active games foster cohesion when physical tasks are combined with explicit social objectives, inclusive participation rules, rotating roles, and structured reflection.

Keywords: active games, primary school, cohesion, cooperative learning, mutual assistance, individual accountability, reflection.

INTRODUCTION

Primary school is a formative period in which children learn not only academic and motor skills but also how to participate in a group, accept common rules, coordinate actions, and respond to the needs of peers. Cohesion in this context does not mean uniformity or the absence of disagreement. It refers to a functional unity in which pupils recognize a shared goal, contribute their own effort, support others, and maintain cooperation when difficulties occur.

Active games offer a particularly relevant environment for this development because they combine physical action, emotion, rules, rapid communication, and visible group outcomes. However, participation alone does not guarantee social learning. Reviews of school physical education emphasize that social benefits depend on task design, interaction quality, inclusion, and teacher guidance [1]. Therefore, active games need to be organized as a pedagogical technology rather than used as isolated entertaining activities.

The purpose of this paper is to develop a structured technology for promoting cohesion through active games and to identify the mechanisms and pedagogical conditions that make this process intentional, repeatable, and assessable.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study used a conceptual research design. Materials included educational policy documents, international guidance on physical activity, research on cooperative learning,

social-emotional learning, and pedagogical models in physical education. Content analysis was conducted using the categories of positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, social skills, inclusive participation, and group reflection.

Comparative analysis was used to distinguish a conventional competitive game structure from a cooperation-oriented structure. Pedagogical modelling was then applied to connect goals, principles, lesson stages, teacher actions, pupil actions, and assessment criteria. The proposed technology does not report original experimental statistics; instead, it synthesizes mechanisms supported by systematic reviews and meta-analyses [2; 3; 4].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first component of the technology is diagnostic orientation. The teacher observes who initiates interaction, who remains peripheral, how pupils request help, how roles emerge, and how disagreements are resolved. The purpose is not to label children but to adapt group composition, task complexity, and communication support.

The second component is cooperative game design. Each activity includes a motor objective and a social objective. A motor objective may involve running, passing, balancing, throwing, or spatial orientation. A social objective may require every team member to complete a role, exchange information, protect a partner, share limited resources, or create a common strategy. The group outcome must depend on contributions from all members; otherwise, a fast or highly skilled pupil can complete the task while others remain passive.

The third component is role-based implementation. Roles such as coordinator, signal giver, equipment manager, safety observer, encourager, and result recorder are made visible and rotated. Rotation prevents stable dominance and helps pupils experience both leadership and supportive participation. Individual accountability is maintained because each role has a clear contribution to the common outcome.

The fourth component is inclusive participation. Elimination rules are minimized. A pupil who makes an error returns through another role, a corrective task, or a second attempt. Physical differences are addressed through differentiated distances, equipment, time, or role functions. Recent evidence indicates that cooperative learning can strengthen peer support and engagement among pupils with disabilities when the task is appropriately structured [5].

The fifth component is group reflection. After the game, pupils answer short questions: What helped us act together? Whose contribution was essential? Which signal was clear? How did we respond to an error? Reflection turns an event into transferable social knowledge and links the game experience to group work in other lessons.

Assessment is based on four criteria: shared-goal orientation, coordinated communication, mutual assistance and accountability, and reflective self-regulation.

Evidence is collected through observation and brief pupil self-assessment. The teacher uses results to adjust the next game rather than to rank children publicly.

This technology is consistent with research showing that cooperative goal structures improve peer relationships [2], that cooperative learning in physical education can produce social, cognitive, affective, and physical outcomes [3], and that structured social-emotional learning benefits pupils when skills are explicitly taught and practiced [6]. Its main limitation is that implementation quality depends heavily on teacher competence. Teachers need to distinguish genuine positive interdependence from simple group placement and to balance competitive excitement with inclusive cooperation.

CONCLUSION

Active games can develop cohesion among primary school pupils when physical action is intentionally connected with social learning. The proposed technology integrates diagnostic orientation, cooperative game design, rotating roles, inclusive participation, group reflection, and corrective assessment.

Its central principle is that the success of one pupil should contribute to, but not replace, the success of others. Future empirical studies should test the technology across different grades and school contexts using validated measures of peer support, coordinated action, belonging, and responsibility.

REFERENCES

1. Bailey R. Physical education and sport in schools: a review of benefits and outcomes // Journal of School Health. — 2006. — Vol. 76, No. 8. — P. 397–401. DOI: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2006.00132.x.
2. Roseth C.J., Johnson D.W., Johnson R.T. Promoting early adolescents' achievement and peer relationships: the effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures // Psychological Bulletin. — 2008. — Vol. 134, No. 2. — P. 223–246. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.223.
3. Casey A., Goodyear V.A. Can cooperative learning achieve the four learning outcomes of physical education? A review of literature // Quest. — 2015. — Vol. 67, No. 1. — P. 56–72. DOI: 10.1080/00336297.2014.984733.
4. Boke H., Aygun Y., Tufekci S., Yagin F.H., Canpolat B., Norman G., Prieto-González P., Ardigò L.P. Effects of cooperative learning on students' learning outcomes in physical education: a meta-analysis // Frontiers in Psychology. — 2025. — Vol. 16. — Article 1508808. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1508808.
5. Van Ryzin M.J., Murray C., Roseth C.J. The effects of cooperative learning on self-reported peer relations, peer support, and classroom engagement among students with

disabilities // Journal of Educational Research. — 2024. — Vol. 117, No. 6. — P. 355–364. DOI: 10.1080/00220671.2024.2410494.

6. Durlak J.A., Weissberg R.P., Dymnicki A.B., Taylor R.D., Schellinger K.B. The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: a meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions // Child Development. — 2011. — Vol. 82, No. 1. — P. 405–432. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x.

7. World Health Organization. WHO Guidelines on Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour. — Geneva: WHO, 2020. — 104 p. ISBN 978-92-4-001512-8.

8. OECD. OECD Learning Compass 2030: A Series of Concept Notes. — Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.

