



## **COMPETENCY-METHODICAL MODEL OF FORMING HISTORICAL THINKING IN HISTORY EDUCATION: WORKING WITH SOURCES, CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS AND ARGUMENTATION STRATEGIES**

Boymatov Farhodjon Ziyodkuzi o'g'li  
Lecturer of the Department of History

### **Abstract**

The article examines the formation of historical thinking in history teaching methodology through the categories of competency-based learning, source-based reasoning, contextual analysis, historical empathy, causality and historical interpretation. The author interprets a history lesson not as a linear transmission of facts, but as a didactic system that guides learners to select, verify, compare and interpret historical evidence and formulate reasoned conclusions. The study analyzes legal and curricular documents, international concepts of historical thinking and local pedagogical experience. As a result, a five-stage model is proposed: formulating a problem question, identifying sources, reconstructing context, corroborating evidence and writing an argumentative conclusion.

**Keywords:** History teaching methodology, historical thinking, competency-based approach, source work, contextual analysis, reasoning, historical interpretation, critical thinking, historical literacy.

### **Introduction**

#### **Annotatsiya**

Mazkur maqolada tarix o'qitish metodikasida tarixiy tafakkurni shakllantirish masalasi kompetensiyaviy yondashuv, manbaviy dalillash, kontekstual tahlil, tarixiy empatiya, sabab-oqibat bog'liqligi va tarixiy interpretatsiya kategoriyalari kesimida tadqiq etiladi. Muallif tarix darsini faktlarni ketma-ket bayon qilish jarayoni sifatida emas, balki o'quvchini tarixiy dalilni tanlash, tekshirish, solishtirish, sharhlash va asoslangan xulosa chiqarishga olib kiruvchi didaktik tizim sifatida talqin qiladi. Tadqiqotda normativ-huquqiy hujjatlar, tarix fanidan amaldagi o'quv dasturlari, tarixiy tafakkur haqidagi xalqaro metodik konsepsiyalar hamda mahalliy pedagogik tajriba qiyosiy tahlil qilindi. Natijada tarixiy tafakkurni shakllantirishning besh



bosqichli modeli — muammoli savol qo‘yish, manbani aniqlash, kontekstni tiklash, dalillarni korroboratsiya qilish va argumentativ xulosa yozish — taklif etildi. Maqolada mazkur modelni umumta’lim, akademik litsey va oliy ta’limning kirish kurslarida moslashtirish imkoniyatlari ilmiy-metodik jihatdan asoslanadi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** tarix o‘qitish metodikasi, tarixiy tafakkur, kompetensiyaviy yondashuv, manba bilan ishlash, kontekstual tahlil, dalillash, tarixiy interpretatsiya, tanqidiy fikrlash, tarixiy savodxonlik.

### **Аннотация**

В статье исследуется формирование исторического мышления в методике преподавания истории через компетентностный подход, работу с источниками, контекстуальный анализ, историческую эмпатию, причинно-следственные связи и историческую интерпретацию. Урок истории рассматривается не как линейная передача фактов, а как дидактическая система, направляющая обучающегося к отбору, проверке, сопоставлению и интерпретации исторических доказательств. В результате предложена пятиэтапная модель: постановка проблемного вопроса, выявление источников, восстановление контекста, корреляция доказательств и аргументированный вывод.

**Ключевые слова:** методика преподавания истории, историческое мышление, компетентностный подход, работа с источниками, контекстуальный анализ, аргументация, историческая интерпретация, критическое мышление.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The modern task of history education is not limited to memorizing a list of specific dates, dynasties, wars, reforms and personalities for a pupil or student; it must first of all form a culture of understanding historical reality as a system of complex relationships between evidence, reasons, circumstances, interests, values and interpretations. The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Education” establishes the principles of continuity, humanism, scientificity of education and development of the intellectual potential of the individual, which require the methodology of teaching history to go beyond the limits of factual reproduction and be oriented towards independent thinking and social responsibility [1]. The Development Strategy of New



Uzbekistan for 2022–2026 places special emphasis on improving the quality of education, connecting the knowledge and skills of young people with modern needs, and developing cultural heritage and national identity [2]; It is at this point that history becomes a strategic field that combines civic stance, historical memory, and analytical thinking. In history lessons, the student must find answers to the question “what happened?”, but a methodological approach at the DSc level shows that even more important questions are “how do we know this?”, “who is the author of the source?”, “in what circumstances did the event occur?”, “why did different groups interpret this event differently?” and “what evidence is there to support today’s conclusion?”. In the theory of international history education, this approach is explained by the concept of “historical thinking”; Wineburg considers historical thinking to be a specially trained intellectual practice, not a naturally occurring everyday thought [5], while the C3 Framework proposes organizing historical knowledge through a cycle of asking questions, applying disciplinary concepts, evaluating evidence, and communicating the result [4]. In Uzbekistan, history curricula gradually expand historical content from grades 5 to 10 [3], but the methodological problem is that this content is often given in the form of ready-made information and is not sufficiently systematized to allow the student to think like a historian, work carefully with sources, reconstruct the context, and defend historical conclusions with evidence. Therefore, the relevance of the article is determined by the need to transform the competency-based approach in history education into a practical mechanism, that is, to transform historical thinking operations into visible, measurable, and evaluable activities at each stage of the lesson. The scientific value of the methodology of historical thinking is that it shifts the relationship between the teacher and the student from the “informant - rememberer” scheme to the “problem-raiser - substantiator” scheme; this brings the history lesson closer to an intellectual laboratory. In a lesson based on working with historical sources, the student is confronted with a document, map, photograph, memoir, decree, statistical table, archaeological find, or oral history sample; he learns to read the source not as a simple repository of information, but as a complex communicative trace related to the author, period, purpose, audience, and hidden positions. In this process, historical literacy is manifested not only as a set of historical knowledge, but also as respect for evidence, critical distance from the source, caution in conclusions, and intellectual honesty towards different interpretations. The purpose of this article is to develop a competency-methodological model of the formation of



historical thinking in history lessons and to substantiate it through work with sources, contextual analysis, and argumentative reasoning strategies; the object of the study is the process of history education, and the subject is the structure of the lesson, the system of tasks, and assessment criteria that serve to form historical thinking. The article puts forward the following scientific hypothesis: if each topic in a history lesson ends with a problematic question, a set of primary and secondary sources, a contextual analysis algorithm, a comparison of evidence, and a written argumentation, students will develop a higher level of historical understanding, independent interpretation, and civic judgment than simply reproducing historical facts. This assumption is especially methodologically important, since the subject of history often includes emotional content associated with social memory; in such conditions, the teacher's task is not to turn the student into an indifferent observer, but to balance emotion with the discipline of evidence. Thus, the methodology of historical thinking is neither a catalog of cold facts nor a collection of slogans; it is an academic order between evidence, content, and value, the historian is like a knife in the kitchen: if used incorrectly, it cuts, but if used correctly, it chops the content and prepares it for digestion. Another important aspect of the topic is the direct connection of historical thinking with the information culture in society. Today's student does not receive historical information only from textbooks; he lives among social networks, short videos, blogs, mass culture products, and various informal interpretations. In such an environment, the history teacher is not only a provider of knowledge, but also a specialist in shaping the culture of critical filtering of historical information. If a student does not learn the concepts of source, author, context, and evidence in the classroom, he or she will quickly believe emotional, biased, or manipulative interpretations in the external information field. Therefore, the methodology of historical thinking, along with its educational function, also performs the function of social protection.

## **Methods**

The research methodology is complex, integrative, and practice-oriented in nature, and uses the methods of normative and legal analysis, content analysis, comparative and methodological analysis, didactic modeling, expert evaluation, and reflexive generalization. First of all, the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Education,” the New Uzbekistan Development Strategy, and the goals, competencies, content, and



expected results of the history curriculum as institutional foundations of history education were analyzed [1; 2; 3]; these documents made it possible to view the purpose of the lesson not only as “passing” the subject, but also as a criterion for organizing the student’s intellectual activity. In the next stage, sources related to the theory of historical thinking, in particular Wineburg's views on reading a source through authorship, context, and confirmation [5], the concepts of historical significance, evidence, continuity and change, cause and effect, historical perspective, and ethical dimension identified by Seixas and Morton [6], as well as the structure of the inquiry arc within the C3 Framework — asking questions, using disciplinary tools, evaluating evidence, and communicating conclusions — were used as methodological support [4]. The study used a deductive approach to adapt general theoretical concepts to the local learning process, and an inductive approach to systematize methodological situations that are common in history lessons — excessive attachment to the textbook text, using maps and documents only as decorations, turning question-and-answer into reproductive examination, and not distinguishing conclusive evidence as a separate criterion in evaluation. In the process of content analysis, historical topics were conditionally divided into three groups: the first is event-political topics, which are convenient for analyzing causes, consequences, interests, and decision-making mechanisms; the second is socio-economic topics, which require working with evidence such as statistical data, maps, professions, migration, trade, and management; the third is cultural-spiritual topics, in which the analysis of texts, architectural monuments, visual sources, oral memory, and values plays an important role. This classification showed that it is wrong to apply the same methodological template to each topic: for example, while a table of decisions and interests is useful in political history, contextual interpretation and analysis of symbolic meaning are more effective in cultural history. In the stage of didactic modeling, a five-stage methodological algorithm was developed: in the first stage, the lesson was "Was the state of Amir Temur an example of strong centralization or a system of military-political balance?", "Is modernism only an educational movement or also a modernization project?", "Is the Great Silk Road a trade route or an intercultural communication system?" opens with a problematic question like; in the second step, students are given two or three types of sources and they are examined for author, time, place, purpose, audience, reliability, and limitations; at the third stage, the context of the event is restored, where geographical conditions, political



environment, economic interest, cultural tradition and international factors are separated on separate cards; in the fourth stage, the evidence is corroborated, that is, an answer is sought to the question of whether the sources confirm, complement or deny each other; in the fifth stage, the student writes a short argumentative conclusion, which is required to contain at least one thesis, two arguments, one counterargument, and a careful final judgment. A rubric was developed to evaluate these methods: the criteria of knowing the source, interpreting the context, connecting the evidence, justifying the conclusion, using historical understanding and following the academic language standards were evaluated from 0 to 3 points. Also, in the article, the possibilities of practical application of the methodological model were checked based on imaginary lesson scenarios, typical options of student answers and teacher's reflection. This approach does not completely replace traditional experimental-statistical research, but it is important at the stage of creating a methodological model: because in the methodology of teaching history, everything does not end with numbers, sometimes one wrong question turns the whole lesson into a closed door in the museum. Therefore, research combines scientific rigor with practical flexibility; when evaluating the model, priority was given not only to the criterion of how many facts the student remembered, but also to the criterion of how he turned the fact into evidence, how he connected the evidence, and how careful he was in his conclusion. As another important part of the methodology, a system of diagnostic tasks was developed. Diagnostics, unlike a simple test, was focused on revealing the students' historical thinking processes: for example, given a single document, they were asked not to extract three facts from it, but to ask about the author's position, limitation, and how to check the document with another source. In this, historical thinking was observed according to four indicators: whether the reader understands the question, determines the origin of the source, connects the evidence with the context, and avoids overgeneralization in the conclusion. Also, the sources used in the lesson were divided into simplified, semi-authentic and authentic sources according to the level of difficulty; it was found appropriate to use simplified excerpts and images at the lower level, and a short excerpt from the original document, a statistical table, or two conflicting sources at the upper level. Methodical modeling also used the principle of "one topic - one thinking action": it was considered more effective to perform one basic action corresponding to the nature of the topic, rather than to cram all historical competencies into each lesson. For example, the analysis of cause and effect in the



topic of state administration, symbolic meaning and historical significance in the topic of culture, analysis of decisions, resources and consequences in the topic of wars, and indicators of continuity and change in the topic of reforms will be prioritized. This principle protects the teacher from methodological eclecticism: it is not necessary to mix ten different methods for the lesson to look modern, one correctly chosen method sometimes lifts the whole lesson.

## **Results**

The results of the study showed that the competency-based approach to the formation of historical thinking becomes declarative if the structure of the lesson, the type of task and the assessment criteria are not coordinated with each other. The proposed five-stage model removes the history lesson from the triad of topic statement, questions and answers and homework and turns it into a cycle of evidence development: a problematic question introduces the student to the content, source analysis reveals the origin of the information, the context connects the event with the conditions of the period, corroboration identifies confirmations and contradictions, and an argumentative conclusion transforms historical knowledge into a discursive product. As the first result of the model, the components of historical thinking were divided into specific operations: to determine historical significance, the student assesses the scale, continuing impact and impact on various groups of the event; to identify source evidence, the author, purpose and reliability are checked; to understand continuity and change, the line “first - process - result” is built; to explain cause and effect, differentiates between immediate cause, deep cause, conditions and consequences; to understand the historical point of view, learns not to confuse the worldview of contemporaries with today's assessment criteria [6]. The second result was reflected in the typology of lesson tasks: reproductive tasks serve to recall a fact, analytical tasks put a fact into context, interpretative tasks compare different interpretations, and argumentative tasks require the student to defend an independent position with evidence. For example, the question “When did Jadidism appear?” is reproductive, the question “Why were Jadid schools formed as an alternative to the traditional education system?” is analytical, the question “Is it enough to interpret Jadidism only as enlightenment?” is interpretive, and the task “Prove the thesis that Jadidism was a movement that put forward the idea of modernization in Turkestan society based on two sources” is argumentative. The third result revealed that the



assessment rubric has a strong impact on the quality of the lesson: if the teacher evaluates only the correct answer, the student tends to memorize the answer; if the teacher evaluates the selection of evidence, the interpretation of the evidence, the recognition of counter-evidence, and the careful judgment in the conclusion, the student is forced to demonstrate the thinking itself. The fourth result showed the effectiveness of the “see - name - interpret - evaluate” algorithm when working with sources: the student first describes what he sees in the source, then names the main elements, then interprets their historical content, and finally evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the source. This algorithm is especially useful when working with maps, photographs, architectural monuments, posters, decree texts, and statistics, as it turns visual or documentary material from a simple decoration into an object of analysis. The fifth result revealed the connection between contextual analysis and historical justice and historical prudence: the reader reconstructs the political, religious, economic, and cultural contexts of past people before hastily judging them by today's standards, but this historical understanding does not translate into moral indifference; rather, it leads to evidence-based, normatively balanced evaluations. The sixth result was manifested in the change in the role of the teacher: the teacher becomes not a provider of ready-made answers, but a question architect, source selector, and moderator of the analysis process. In such a lesson, the question “which evidence is stronger?” prevails over the question “who won?”; this is where the seriousness of history education begins. The lesson cycle developed on the basis of the model can be applied at three levels: at the basic level, students examine one source by author and purpose; at the intermediate level, they compare two sources and identify their similarities and differences; at the advanced level, they defend a problematic thesis based on three or more sources. This differential approach adapts the subject of history to audiences with different levels of preparation and mitigates the methodological problem of “everyone reads the same, but not everyone understands the same.” The scientific novelty of the results is that the competence of historical thinking was described not as an abstract idea, but as a set of specific didactic operations placed at the introductory, main, consolidation and assessment stages of the lesson. Its practical significance lies in providing the history teacher with a ready-made algorithm: a problematic question at the beginning of the lesson, a source and context in the main part, an argumentative conclusion at the end, and a rubric for assessment. As a result, the subject of history is elevated to the status of



“the past for remembering”, not “the past for thinking”. Based on the results, a new type of written work in the history lesson was recommended - “an evidence-based historical mini-essay”. In it, the student is required to give a thesis, evidence, explanation and a final verdict in the volume of 120–180 words. This volume does not seem large, but it is very convenient for assessing historical thinking, because in a short text the student avoids excessive description and is forced to link his opinion to evidence. The mini-essay rubric is based on four criteria: the clarity of the thesis, the reliance of the argument on the source, the logical bridge between the argument and the conclusion, and the appropriate use of historical concepts. In addition, the element of “response to counterargument” can be introduced separately in high school and higher education; this element takes the student out of one-sided thinking and introduces him to the culture of historical debate. The results of the study also showed that historical thinking is formed not only in the final examination, but also through micro-activities during the lesson: when short tasks such as a 3-minute source passport, a 5-minute causal chain, a 7-minute map explanation, and a 10-minute comparison of evidence are regularly repeated, the student becomes accustomed to the language of historical thinking. In this regard, the model is not limited to a large project or a complex seminar; it serves to change the internal mechanics of a simple 45- or 80-minute lesson. Practical observations show that in the formation of historical thinking, special attention should be paid to the language of questions. “Who?”, “when?” and “where?” questions are necessary, but they are at the initial level; questions such as “why?”, “on what basis?”, “for whom was it useful?”, “which group saw it differently?”, “what is the long-term consequence of this process?” take the student to a higher cognitive level. Therefore, in the methodological model, it was recommended that the teacher create a bank of questions: factual questions test basic knowledge, analytical questions test connections, interpretive questions test interpretations, and metacognitive questions test the student’s understanding of his or her own thinking process. This system of questions does not artificially complicate the lesson, but rather equips the student with a universal thinking algorithm that moves from topic to topic.

## **Discussion**

The results obtained require a reconsideration of one of the most delicate issues of history teaching methodology - the relationship between content and method. In



traditional history teaching, content is often understood as the main thing, and the method as a means of conveying it; the competency-based approach shows the method not as a secondary technique, but as the acquisition of historical content itself. If a student knows the fact that “the Kokand Khanate was abolished” but cannot analyze how the politics of the Russian Empire, local government conflicts, economic interests, military technology, and the international situation interacted in this process, such knowledge is not historical thinking, but a shelf in the memory storehouse. At this point, the inquiry arc in the C3 Framework emphasizes the need to base the lesson on questions and investigations [4], and Wineburg shows that historical understanding remains superficial without reading the source through the questions “who wrote it, when, for what purpose, under what conditions?” [5]. In the conditions of Uzbek education, the full adoption of this approach requires some methodological precautions. First, under the guise of historical thinking, it is impossible to weaken the substantive core of the lesson; the student cannot interpret the fact without knowing it, therefore, the factual basis is preserved, but the fact is not the ultimate goal, but is seen as raw material for analysis. Second, there is a risk of overcomplicating work with sources; it is inappropriate to burden a 5th-6th grade student with the apparatus of academic source studies, but it is possible to teach simple questions about the author, time, and reliability. Third, the concept of historical empathy should be used with caution: understanding the position of people from the past does not mean automatically justifying their actions; it is only a culture of substantiating the judgment with evidence and context. Fourth, if the assessment system does not change, the methodological model will remain a beautiful scheme on paper; because the student very quickly notices what points are given and knows well that the real “constitution” in the lesson is the assessment criterion. If the assessment is given only for the date and name, it relegates the construction of evidence to the second level; if the assessment is given for the evidence, explanation, connection and conclusion, the student approaches the historian's discourse. Fifth, national values and universal academic criteria should not be opposed in history education. UNESCO's recommendations on education for peace, human rights, international solidarity and sustainable development also see education not only as imparting knowledge, but also as a process of responsible citizenship and critical understanding [7]; in this process, history enriches national memory with scientific evidence and a culture of open dialogue. In this regard, historical thinking in history lessons does not weaken national



identity, but rather makes it evidence-based, resistant to manipulation and intellectually stable. The model proposed in the article also has some limitations: it does not cover all topics to the same extent, multi-source lessons are time-consuming, require the teacher to select sources in advance and develop questions precisely, and if they are not fully integrated with the textbook and testing system, they can be perceived as an additional burden. However, these limitations are not weaknesses of the model, but rather indicate the conditions for its implementation. The teacher does not have to turn a history lesson into a large archival expedition every time; sometimes one short document, one map, and one correct question are enough. The most important issue is for the student to learn to see information not as a ready-made result, but as a testable claim. At the same time, linking the methodology of historical thinking with digital tools is a promising direction: electronic archives, virtual museums, digital maps, and interactive timelines increase the number of sources, but if they are not methodological questions, they will remain only screen brightness. Digital tools make history lessons modern, but they do not guarantee that they will be scientific; scientificity is ensured by the culture of selecting sources, asking questions, and verifying evidence. Therefore, the model of forming historical thinking places more work on the teacher, but this burden is not a meaningless bureaucratic burden, but an intellectual preparation that increases the scientific quality of the lesson. When a history teacher enters a lesson with the question “What paragraph will I finish today?” instead of “What historical thinking action will the student perform today?”, the methodology changes in a real sense. The impact of the model on the teacher’s speech within the framework of the discussion also deserves special attention. If in a history lesson the teacher uses questions such as “What evidence is there to support this?”, “What are the limitations of this source?”, “Could another group have seen this event differently?” rather than the command “Give the correct answer,” the intellectual atmosphere in the classroom changes. The student learns to express historical thought as a testable claim, not as a personal impression or a memorized sentence. This approach can intensify the debate in some lessons, but this is not a danger, but an opportunity; only the debate must be guided by the discipline of evidence. In a history lesson, debate is not noise; if it returns to the source, it is a methodological achievement. At the same time, the teacher should not forget about the educational sensitivity of historical topics: on topics such as national heroes, colonialism, religious and cultural processes, wars, deportations or repressions,



historical thinking should be not only critical, but also morally responsible. Evidence-based thinking does not eliminate human empathy; on the contrary, it directly protects it from sloganeering. To implement this approach in history departments and methodological associations, it is necessary to establish a resource bank, a problem question bank, and an exchange of assessment rubrics between teachers. Not every teacher needs to create all the resources from scratch; if tested materials are compiled through scientific and methodological cooperation, both the quality of the lesson and the teacher's time are saved. At the same time, the use of ready-made materials should not turn into mechanical copying; each class, audience and topic requires its own adaptation. Methodological material is like dough: there is a recipe, but the result of the bread also depends on the temperature of the hand.

## **Conclusion**

The formation of historical thinking in history education is one of the central tasks of modern methodology, which raises historical knowledge from the level of memorization, repetition and acceptance of ready-made conclusions to the level of working with sources, restoring the context, comparing evidence, evaluating interpretations and drawing an argumentative conclusion. The competency-methodological model developed in the article bases the five stages of a history lesson - a problematic question, source analysis, contextual reconstruction, corroboration of evidence and argumentative conclusion - as a single interconnected didactic cycle. This model does not reduce the content of history, but rather turns it into a field of active thinking: the student perceives a historical event not only as an “event that happened”, but as a complex process in which evidence, interests, conditions and interpretations intersect. The scientific and practical significance of the study is that it shows historical thinking not as an abstract competency, but as a methodological practice organized in the form of a lesson assignment, question, source, rubric and written conclusion. The main conclusions recommended for the teacher are as follows: each topic should have at least one problematic question; at least one primary or visual source should be used in addition to the textbook text; the student should check the source in terms of author, time, purpose, and reliability; cause and effect should be analyzed as a graded system, not a simple list; the final assessment should take into account not only the correct answer, but also the explanation of the evidence and the justification of the conclusion. When implementing the model, age



characteristics, lesson time, subject complexity, and the level of preparation of students are taken into account; this makes it flexible, step-by-step, and close to real lesson practice. A lesson based on historical thinking simultaneously develops national memory, civic responsibility, and critical thinking in the student, because it teaches to perceive the past neither as a romantic myth nor as a catalog of dry facts, but as a social experience that is studied responsibly. In future research, it is advisable to experimentally test this model across specific grade levels, the history of Uzbekistan, and world history topics, develop options that integrate with digital sources, and empirically measure the reliability indicators of assessment rubrics. The final scientific conclusion is that the quality of history teaching methodology is determined not by the number of topics or the beauty of slides, but by the student's ability to think based on evidence; a good history lesson does not just remind the student of the past, but forces him to think. In general, a methodology based on historical thinking places the history lesson on three pillars: a substantive pillar - historical facts and processes; an intellectual pillar - questions, evidence, context and interpretation; an educational pillar - memory, responsibility and a civic position. If one of these three pillars is missing, the balance of the lesson is disrupted: without facts, the analysis remains empty, without analysis, the fact turns into memorization, without educational meaning, history moves away from the student's life. Therefore, in the future, history teaching methodology should combine the textbook text, digital resources, sources, maps, museums and written argumentation in a single competency system. The model proposed in this article serves as one of the theoretical and methodological foundations in this direction. Thus, the methodology for the formation of historical thinking makes the subject of history more effective in academic, educational and civic terms. It shows the student history not as a repository of ready-made judgments, but as a complex field of knowledge that is worked with evidence. This also increases the professional status of the history teacher: he becomes not a simple storyteller, but a designer of historical thinking. The most important thing is that such a lesson teaches the student not to hastily acquire historical truth, but to approach it through evidence. This caution is the beginning of scientific thinking. If this criterion is maintained, the subject of history educates the student not only as an educated person, but also as a responsible person who respects the source and makes independent judgments.



## REFERENCES

- [1] O‘zbekiston Respublikasining “Ta’lim to‘g‘risida”gi Qonuni. O‘RQ–637-son, 23.09.2020. Lex.uz.
- [2] O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining “2022–2026-yillarga mo‘ljallangan Yangi O‘zbekistonning taraqqiyot strategiyasi to‘g‘risida”gi Farmoni. PF–60-son, 28.01.2022. Lex.uz.
- [3] Tarix fanidan o‘quv dasturlari. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Bilim va malakalarni baholash agentligi rasmiy resursi.
- [4] National Council for the Social Studies. College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards. Silver Spring, MD: NCSS, 2013.
- [5] Wineburg, S. Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.
- [6] Seixas, P., Morton, T. The Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts. Toronto: Nelson Education, 2013.
- [7] UNESCO. Recommendation on Education for Peace and Human Rights, International Understanding, Cooperation, Fundamental Freedoms, Global Citizenship and Sustainable Development. Paris: UNESCO, 2023.
- [8] UNESCO. Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives. Paris: UNESCO, 2015.
- [9] Shamsutdinov, R., Karimov, Sh. O‘zbekiston tarixi. O‘quv qo‘llanma. Andijon, 2024.
- [10] Dewey, J. How We Think. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1910.