

PEDAGOGICAL MECHANISMS FOR DEVELOPING HISTORICAL THINKING AND AXIOLOGICAL ATTITUDES IN PRE-SERVICE HISTORY TEACHERS THROUGH MUSEUM PEDAGOGY

Javlonbek Jakhongir-ugli Niyozov

j.niyozov@kiut.uz

Namangan branch of Kimyo International University in Tashkent

Abstract: This study examines the theoretical and methodological foundations and pedagogical mechanisms for developing historical thinking and axiological attitudes in pre-service history teachers through museum pedagogy. Historical thinking is conceptualized as a complex competence involving the contextual, causal, chronological, and evidence-based interpretation of the past, whereas an axiological attitude is understood as the capacity to recognize, interpret, and critically reflect upon the values embedded in historical and cultural heritage. The study employed a theoretical-conceptual research design based on theoretical analysis, comparative analysis, conceptual synthesis, generalization, and pedagogical modeling. International and Uzbek scholarly literature related to museum pedagogy, historical thinking, historical empathy, cultural heritage education, and axiological education formed the theoretical basis of the analysis. The findings reveal three interconnected dimensions of historical-axiological development: cognitive-analytical, emotional-empathic, and axiological-reflective. The study further establishes the dual pedagogical function of museum objects as both historical evidence and carriers of cultural values. On this basis, a six-stage pedagogical mechanism is proposed: perception - contextualization - analysis - axiological interpretation - reflection - pedagogical transfer. Historical empathy is identified as a mediating mechanism between contextual historical understanding and axiological reflection, while pedagogical transfer represents the professional transformation of museum-based experience into history teaching practice. The proposed framework contributes to understanding museum pedagogy as an integrative educational environment capable of connecting historical reasoning, cultural heritage awareness, value-oriented reflection, and professional pedagogical competence.

Keywords: museum pedagogy, historical thinking, axiological approach, axiological attitude, pre-service history teachers, historical empathy, historical memory, cultural heritage, national values, universal human values, cultural identity, pedagogical transfer, history education

INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental objectives of contemporary history education is not merely to provide learners with a body of historical facts but to develop their capacity to analyze historical realities on the basis of evidence, compare different historical interpretations, identify causal relationships between events and processes, and understand the significance of past experiences for contemporary society. This objective is particularly important in the professional preparation of pre-service history teachers. A history teacher is not simply a specialist who communicates historical knowledge but also an educator who contributes to the formation of learners' historical consciousness, historical memory, cultural identity, worldview, and value orientations.

Historical thinking differs substantially from the reproductive acquisition and memorization of historical information. It requires learners to analyze historical evidence and sources, determine historical significance, explain causes and consequences, recognize change and continuity, consider historical perspectives, and substantiate interpretations of the past with relevant evidence. Accordingly, the effectiveness of history education should not be assessed solely by the amount of

historical information retained by students but also by their ability to engage critically, analytically, and reflectively with historical material.

However, an exclusive emphasis on the cognitive dimension of historical thinking is insufficient. History embodies the accumulated social and cultural experiences of humanity, including values, choices, conflicts, achievements, tragedies, cultural traditions, and collective memories. Consequently, history education requires not only knowledge about the past but also an understanding of the value-based meanings embedded in historical experience and cultural heritage.

This requirement introduces an axiological dimension into history education. Within an axiological framework, a historical object, document, monument, or museum artifact is understood not simply as a source of factual information but also as a cultural phenomenon embodying the values, experiences, collective memories, and identities of particular societies and historical communities.

Therefore, pre-service history teachers should move beyond questions such as “What is this object?”, “When was it created?”, and “Which historical event does it represent?” They should also learn to formulate questions such as: “What values does this object represent?”, “What form of historical memory does it preserve?”, “What significance does it have for present generations?”, and “How should this cultural heritage be interpreted from historical, cultural, and ethical perspectives?”

Museum pedagogy provides significant educational opportunities for achieving these objectives. Museums represent distinctive cultural and educational environments in which historical knowledge is embodied in tangible evidence and material culture. Falk and Dierking (2013) conceptualize museum learning as an interaction among personal, sociocultural, and physical contexts. From this perspective, museum learning cannot be reduced to the passive reception of information. Instead, it represents a contextual learning experience shaped by prior knowledge, individual experience, social interaction, and engagement with material environments.

Museum objects are particularly important for history education because they perform at least two interconnected pedagogical functions. First, as historical evidence, they contribute to the development of source analysis, contextual reasoning, comparison, interpretation, and evidence-based historical thinking. Second, as manifestations of cultural heritage, they communicate historical memory, cultural meanings, and value orientations and can therefore contribute to historical empathy, cultural identity, and axiological reflection.

Research on historical empathy further demonstrates that understanding the past involves both cognitive and affective dimensions. Savenije and de Bruijn (2017) emphasize the importance of connecting contextualization with emotional engagement in museum-based historical learning. Similarly, Uppin and Timoštšuk (2019) demonstrate the potential of museum activities for developing historical empathy. Karn (2024) approaches historical empathy as a pedagogically developable competence rather than a spontaneous emotional response.

Despite these developments, the relationship between historical thinking and axiological attitudes in the professional preparation of pre-service history teachers requires further conceptual clarification. Existing approaches frequently address historical reasoning, museum learning, heritage education, or historical empathy as related but relatively independent educational dimensions. Less attention has been devoted to how museum pedagogy can systematically integrate historical analysis with axiological interpretation and subsequently transform this integrated learning experience into professional teaching competence.

Accordingly, the research problem addressed in this study concerns the identification of pedagogical mechanisms through which museum-based learning can simultaneously develop historical thinking and axiological attitudes in pre-service history teachers.

The purpose of this study is therefore to theoretically substantiate an integrative pedagogical mechanism for developing historical thinking and axiological attitudes among pre-service history teachers through museum pedagogy.

The study addresses the following research questions:

What structural dimensions connect historical thinking and axiological attitudes in museum-based history education?

What pedagogical functions do museum objects perform in the development of historical-axiological understanding?

What role does historical empathy play in connecting historical contextualization with axiological reflection?

What sequential pedagogical mechanism can support the integrated development of historical thinking and axiological attitudes among pre-service history teachers?

How can museum-based historical learning be transformed into the professional pedagogical competence of future history teachers?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a theoretical-conceptual research design. Its primary purpose was not to measure the effectiveness of a specific experimental intervention but to identify, systematize, and conceptually integrate pedagogical mechanisms relevant to the development of historical thinking and axiological attitudes through museum pedagogy.

The research was based on the assumption that historical thinking and axiological attitudes should not be treated as isolated dimensions of teacher education. Instead, they were examined as interrelated components of professional competence that may be developed through structured interaction with museum objects, historical sources, and cultural heritage.

Since the study is conceptual rather than experimental, no participant sample, control group, or statistical hypothesis testing was employed. The results therefore represent theoretically derived findings and a pedagogical framework requiring subsequent empirical validation.

Theoretical Sources

The theoretical corpus of the study included scholarly literature addressing five principal areas: historical thinking and historical reasoning; museum pedagogy and museum learning; historical empathy; cultural heritage and value-oriented education; professional preparation of pre-service history teachers.

International and Uzbek scholarly sources were considered in constructing the theoretical framework. Particular attention was paid to research conceptualizing museum learning as contextual and experiential, historical thinking as evidence-based reasoning, and historical empathy as involving an interaction between cognitive understanding and emotional engagement.

The selection of literature was based primarily on conceptual relevance to the research questions. Consequently, the present study should be regarded as a theoretically structured conceptual synthesis rather than a systematic review or bibliometric study.

Research Methods

Several complementary methods were employed.

Theoretical analysis was used to examine the conceptual foundations of historical thinking, museum pedagogy, historical empathy, axiological education, and cultural heritage learning.

Comparative analysis was employed to identify similarities, differences, and potential points of integration between cognitive approaches to historical reasoning and value-oriented approaches to historical and cultural heritage.

Conceptual synthesis was used to integrate cognitive, contextual, emotional, axiological, reflective, and professional dimensions of museum-based history education into a coherent theoretical framework.

Generalization enabled the formulation of broader theoretical conclusions concerning the educational potential of museum environments in the professional preparation of history teachers.

Pedagogical modeling was employed to construct a sequential mechanism describing how engagement with museum objects may progress from initial perception to professional pedagogical application.

Analytical Framework

The theoretical materials were examined through five analytical dimensions.

The cognitive-historical dimension concerned historical evidence, causal relationships, chronological understanding, source analysis, and historical interpretation.

The contextual dimension concerned the interpretation of historical objects and events within their temporal, spatial, social, political, and cultural environments.

The emotional-empathic dimension concerned the understanding of historical actors, experiences, motivations, possibilities, and constraints within their own historical circumstances.

The axiological-reflective dimension concerned the identification and interpretation of cultural, ethical, national, and universal values embedded in historical experience and cultural heritage.

Finally, the professional-pedagogical dimension concerned the ability of pre-service history teachers to transform museum-based learning experiences into pedagogically meaningful strategies, tasks, and activities for school history education.

Procedure for Developing the Conceptual Mechanism

The conceptual model was constructed through a sequence of analytical procedures. First, the principal characteristics of historical thinking and axiological attitudes were identified. Second, their overlapping dimensions were compared and synthesized. Third, the pedagogical functions of museum objects were analyzed. Fourth, historical empathy was examined as a possible connecting mechanism between contextual historical understanding and value-oriented interpretation. Finally, pedagogical modeling was used to organize the identified processes into a sequential framework applicable to pre-service history teacher education.

This procedure resulted in the development of a six-stage mechanism:

Perception → Contextualization → Analysis → Axiological Interpretation → Reflection → Pedagogical Transfer.

RESULTS

The theoretical and conceptual analysis produced five principal findings concerning the development of historical thinking and axiological attitudes through museum pedagogy.

Three Interconnected Dimensions of Historical-Axiological Development

The first finding concerns the structural relationship between historical thinking and axiological attitudes. The analysis identified three interconnected components: cognitive-analytical, emotional-empathic, and axiological-reflective.

The cognitive-analytical component refers to the ability to identify the origin, function, historical period, causal relationships, and broader historical context of a historical fact, source, or museum object. It includes source analysis, comparison, interpretation, and evidence-based reasoning.

The emotional-empathic component refers to the capacity to understand the experiences, motivations, perspectives, possibilities, and limitations of historical individuals and communities within the conditions of their own historical period. This component does not imply emotional identification with historical actors; rather, it requires context-sensitive historical perspective-taking.

The axiological-reflective component refers to the ability to recognize the value-based meanings of historical experience, develop a conscious relationship with cultural heritage, compare historical and contemporary value frameworks, and construct a reasoned personal position based on historical evidence.

The analysis therefore indicates that historical-axiological development should not be conceptualized as a simple combination of historical knowledge and moral education. Instead, it involves an interaction among evidence-based historical reasoning, contextual understanding, historical empathy, and reflective value interpretation.

The Dual Pedagogical Function of Museum Objects

The second finding is the identification of the museum object as simultaneously historical evidence and a carrier of cultural values.

At the first level, museum objects function as sources of historical evidence. Archaeological artifacts, manuscripts, photographs, works of art, numismatic materials, memorial objects, and everyday objects may provide information concerning particular historical periods, social structures, technologies, cultural practices, economic relations, and ways of life.

At the second level, the same objects may embody historical memory, cultural identity, aesthetic traditions, social values, collective experiences, and symbolic meanings.

Accordingly, pedagogical engagement with museum objects can be represented through two interconnected forms of analysis:

Historical-cognitive analysis → Axiological interpretation.

Historical-cognitive analysis asks what the object is, when and where it originated, who produced or used it, what function it performed, and what evidence it provides about the past.

Axiological interpretation examines what values and meanings are associated with the object, what historical memory it preserves, why it remains significant for contemporary society, and what responsibilities may arise regarding its preservation and interpretation.

The integration of these levels transforms a museum object from a merely illustrative educational resource into an instrument for developing historical reasoning and reflective value consciousness.

Historical Empathy as a Mediating Mechanism

The third finding concerns the role of historical empathy. The theoretical analysis suggests that historical empathy functions as a mediating mechanism between contextual historical understanding and axiological reflection.

This relationship can be represented conceptually as follows:

Historical Contextualization → Historical Empathy → Axiological Reflection

Historical contextualization enables students to reconstruct the social, political, cultural, and intellectual conditions within which historical actors made decisions.

Historical empathy subsequently enables learners to consider the perspectives and experiences of those actors without automatically imposing contemporary assumptions upon them.

Axiological reflection then allows students to evaluate the meanings and values associated with historical experiences in an evidence-based and critically reflective manner.

Historical empathy should therefore not be equated with sympathy or moral approval. Understanding why historical actors behaved in particular ways does not require accepting or

legitimizing their actions. Instead, historical empathy enables students to distinguish between historical explanation and ethical evaluation.

For pre-service history teachers, this distinction is particularly significant because they must be capable of teaching controversial, sensitive, or value-laden historical topics without reducing them either to decontextualized moral judgments or to uncritical historical relativism.

Six-Stage Pedagogical Mechanism

The fourth and central finding of the study is the development of an integrative six-stage pedagogical mechanism:

PERCEPTION → CONTEXTUALIZATION → ANALYSIS → AXIOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION → REFLECTION → PEDAGOGICAL TRANSFER

Stage 1: Perception

The process begins with visual, sensory, and cognitive engagement with a museum object. Students examine its material, form, dimensions, condition, symbols, decorative features, and other observable characteristics.

At this stage, students may formulate preliminary hypotheses before receiving detailed contextual information. The primary pedagogical function of perception is to activate prior knowledge, stimulate curiosity, and generate intrinsic motivation for further investigation.

Stage 2: Contextualization

The museum object is subsequently situated within its relevant chronological, geographical, social, political, and cultural context.

Students investigate questions such as: Who created the object? Who used it? When and where was it produced? What purpose did it serve? What social or cultural practices were associated with it?

Contextualization transforms the artifact from an isolated physical object into historically meaningful evidence.

Stage 3: Analysis

Students critically examine the museum object in relation to other historical evidence. They compare material sources with written documents, photographs, archival materials, oral histories, visual sources, or digital reconstructions where appropriate.

This stage develops the ability to assess evidence, identify causal relationships, distinguish fact from interpretation, compare alternative explanations, and formulate historically grounded conclusions.

The museum artifact therefore ceases to function merely as an illustration of textbook knowledge and becomes a source for historical inquiry.

Stage 4: Axiological Interpretation

The fourth stage constitutes the distinctive value-oriented component of the proposed mechanism. Students move from determining what the object tells them about the past toward examining the values and meanings associated with it.

Guiding questions may include:

What values does this object represent?

What historical or collective memory does it preserve?

What significance does it have for contemporary generations?

Why should this form of heritage be preserved?

How does it reflect national and universal human values?

Have the meanings associated with this object changed over time?

What responsibilities does contemporary society have toward this heritage?

Axiological interpretation should not prescribe predetermined moral conclusions. Its purpose is to facilitate informed and evidence-based reflection on the cultural, ethical, and social meanings of historical experience.

Stage 5: Reflection

During the reflective stage, students reconsider their initial assumptions in light of contextualization, evidence analysis, and axiological interpretation.

Questions such as “What did I initially think about this object?”, “Which evidence changed my interpretation?”, “What historical meaning did I discover?”, and “Which values did I reconsider?” may be used to structure reflection.

Reflective essays, portfolios, group discussions, presentations, analytical diaries, and self-assessment activities may support this process.

The principal function of reflection is to make students conscious not only of what they have learned but also of how their historical interpretations and value positions have developed.

Stage 6: Pedagogical Transfer

The final stage transforms museum-based historical learning into professional pedagogical competence.

Pre-service history teachers use their museum experience to design lesson fragments, inquiry questions, source-analysis activities, historical empathy tasks, projects, virtual museum tours, discussions, or reflective assignments suitable for school history education.

Pedagogical transfer therefore distinguishes professional teacher education from general museum learning. The future teacher progresses from being a participant in museum-based learning to becoming a professional capable of designing such experiences for others.

An Integrated Model of Professional Development

The fifth finding is that the identified components and stages can be integrated into a broader model of professional development:

Museum Object → Historical Evidence → Contextual Understanding → Historical Empathy → Axiological Interpretation → Reflection → Pedagogical Application

This sequence demonstrates that museum pedagogy can connect historical cognition with professional teaching competence through a value-oriented educational process.

The model also suggests three broader outcomes.

First, the cognitive outcome consists of enhanced source analysis, contextual reasoning, causal explanation, and evidence-based historical interpretation.

Second, the axiological outcome consists of a more reflective understanding of historical memory, cultural identity, heritage, and national and universal human values.

Third, the professional outcome consists of the ability to transform historical and cultural resources into pedagogically meaningful learning experiences.

Consequently, the theoretical findings position museum pedagogy not as an auxiliary form of history instruction but as an integrative environment for historical, axiological, and professional development.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study provide a conceptual basis for reconsidering the role of museum pedagogy in the professional preparation of pre-service history teachers. The proposed framework extends beyond approaches that treat museum visits primarily as supplementary excursions or forms of visual instruction. Instead, museum environments are conceptualized as spaces in which historical evidence, contextual reasoning, emotional engagement, value interpretation, reflection, and professional pedagogical practice can interact.

The identification of the museum object as both historical evidence and a carrier of values is consistent with contextual approaches to museum learning. Falk and Dierking (2013) emphasize that museum learning emerges through interaction among personal, sociocultural, and physical contexts. The findings of the present conceptual study suggest that, in pre-service history teacher education, this contextual experience may be further developed through an explicitly historical-axiological dimension. Museum objects are not only physically encountered and socially interpreted; they may also become subjects of historical inquiry and critical value reflection.

The results concerning historical empathy are broadly consistent with Savenije and de Bruijn (2017), who emphasize the interaction between contextualization and emotional engagement in museum environments. Similarly, Uppin and Timoštšuk (2019) demonstrate that museum-based activities can provide meaningful conditions for the development of historical empathy.

The present framework develops this relationship further by positioning historical empathy between contextualization and axiological reflection. In other words, historical empathy is conceptualized not as the final objective of museum learning but as a mediating process that helps students progress from understanding historical circumstances to critically considering the meanings and values associated with historical experiences.

This interpretation is also compatible with Karn's (2024) understanding of historical empathy as a pedagogically structured learning process. For teacher education, this has particular significance because future teachers must understand how historical empathy can be intentionally facilitated through questions, sources, museum objects, discussions, and reflective activities.

Another significant result is the inclusion of axiological interpretation as an independent stage within the proposed mechanism. Historical thinking research traditionally emphasizes evidence, causation, chronology, historical significance, change and continuity, and perspective-taking. These competencies are indispensable; however, engagement with cultural heritage also raises questions concerning historical memory, identity, responsibility, preservation, and value.

The present study therefore proposes that evidence-based historical thinking and axiological reflection should be interconnected rather than treated as competing educational objectives.

At the same time, axiological education should not be reduced to the transmission of predetermined value judgments. A museum object may carry different meanings for different communities and at different historical moments. Therefore, an academically grounded axiological approach should encourage students to examine how values are historically constructed, communicated, contested, transformed, and remembered.

The findings can be summarized through the following conceptual triad:

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE → HISTORICAL UNDERSTANDING → AXIOLOGICAL ATTITUDE

Historical evidence provides the empirical foundation for inquiry. Historical understanding organizes evidence into contextualized and reasoned interpretations. Axiological attitude enables learners to critically reflect upon the cultural, ethical, social, and personal significance of historical experience.

The inclusion of pedagogical transfer represents another important theoretical contribution. Museum-based learning for pre-service teachers cannot be considered complete when students themselves understand an artifact. Professional preparation requires an additional transformation: future teachers must learn how to convert their historical understanding into educational experiences for school learners.

This distinguishes the proposed model from general museum education. Pedagogical transfer connects museum experience directly with professional teacher competence and may include lesson

planning, inquiry design, source selection, questioning strategies, historical empathy activities, digital museum resources, assessment, and reflection.

Thus, the principal theoretical contribution of the study lies in conceptualizing museum pedagogy as an integrative environment in which four areas are interconnected:

historical cognition + historical empathy + axiological reflection + professional pedagogical competence.

Nevertheless, the findings must be interpreted within the methodological boundaries of the study. The proposed mechanism was derived through theoretical analysis and conceptual synthesis rather than experimental testing. Consequently, the study does not claim that the six-stage sequence has already produced statistically measurable improvements in pre-service history teachers' historical thinking or axiological attitudes.

This limitation also defines the next stage of research. The conceptual model should be operationalized through measurable criteria and indicators and subsequently tested in empirical educational settings.

CONCLUSION

The present study theoretically examined the pedagogical mechanisms through which museum pedagogy may contribute to the integrated development of historical thinking and axiological attitudes among pre-service history teachers.

The analysis identified three interconnected structural dimensions: cognitive-analytical, emotional-empathic, and axiological-reflective. These dimensions demonstrate that historical learning in museum environments should not be limited to the acquisition of factual information. Instead, students should be encouraged to analyze evidence, understand historical perspectives, interpret cultural meanings, and critically reflect upon the values embedded in historical experience.

A second major conclusion concerns the dual function of museum objects. Museum artifacts may simultaneously serve as historical evidence and carriers of cultural values. This dual function creates conditions for integrating historical-cognitive analysis with axiological interpretation.

The study further identified historical empathy as a mediating mechanism connecting contextual historical understanding with axiological reflection. Historical empathy enables students to understand historical actors within the conditions and limitations of their own periods before moving toward critical and value-oriented evaluation.

The central theoretical result of the research is the proposed six-stage pedagogical mechanism:

Perception → Contextualization → Analysis → Axiological Interpretation → Reflection → Pedagogical Transfer.

The mechanism describes a progression from initial engagement with a museum object to contextual understanding, evidence-based analysis, value-oriented interpretation, reflective meaning-making, and professional pedagogical application.

Of particular importance is the final stage, pedagogical transfer. For pre-service history teachers, museum learning acquires professional significance when they are able to transform their own historical and axiological understanding into pedagogically structured experiences for school learners.

The theoretical contribution of the study therefore lies in integrating historical thinking and axiological attitudes within a museum-based pedagogical framework and conceptualizing the museum object simultaneously as historical evidence and a carrier of values.

The proposed framework also demonstrates that historical thinking and axiological education should not be treated as independent or mutually exclusive educational objectives. Historical reasoning without reflective engagement with values may overlook the cultural and human

significance of the past, whereas value education detached from historical evidence may result in decontextualized or present-centered judgments. Their integration provides a basis for historically grounded, critically reasoned, culturally sensitive, and reflective history education.

Because the present study is theoretical-conceptual, further empirical research is required. Future studies should operationalize the proposed framework by developing measurable criteria and indicators for cognitive-analytical, emotional-empathic, and axiological-reflective development. Experimental or quasi-experimental research involving pre-service history teachers could then assess the effectiveness of the six-stage mechanism using pre-test and post-test procedures, qualitative observation, reflective writing, interviews, and appropriate quantitative analyses.

Further research may also investigate how virtual museums, three-dimensional reconstructions, digital collections, augmented or virtual heritage environments, and interactive museum platforms can support the proposed historical-axiological mechanism in blended and digitally enhanced teacher education.

References

1. Yuldashev, J. (n.d.). Bo‘lajak tarix o‘qituvchilarining aksiologik pozitsiyasini rivojlantirish metodikasi. Dene Tárbiası Hám Sport, 251.
2. Yuldashev, J. (2024a). Bo‘lajak tarix o‘qituvchilarida aksiologik pozitsiyani rivojlantirishning pedagogik asoslari. Педагогическая акмеология: Международный научно-методический журнал, 1(9).
3. Yuldashev, J. (2024b). Bo‘lajak tarix o‘qituvchilarini tayyorlash jarayoniga aksiologik yondashuvni joriy etishning metodik xususiyatlari. Farg‘ona davlat universiteti, (5), 6–6.
4. Yuldashev, J. (2024c). Developing the axiological position of future history teachers as an important direction of history education. Академические исследования в современной науке, 3(50), 33–36.
5. Yuldashev, J. A. (2024d). The content of the introduction of the development of the axiological approach in future history teachers. JournalNX, 10(10), 34–38.
6. Yuldashev, J. A. (2024e, December). The main criteria for developing a system of values in the training of future history teachers. In International Conference on Economics, Finance, Banking and Management (pp. 201–205).
7. Yuldashev, J., & Xayrullayeva, N. J. (2026). O‘qituvchi shaxsiyati ta’lim va tarbiya samaradorligining asosiy omili. Science and Education, 7(4), 580–585.
8. Мавлонов, А. А. (2024). ТИЛ МАСАЛАСИ-МАЪНАВИЙ МУСТАҚИЛЛИКНИНГ АСОСИЙ ШАРТИ СИФАТИДА. Вестник магистратуры, (6-1 (153)), 42-46.
9. Мавлонов, А. А., & Раҳимжонов, И. (2023). ЎРТА ОСИЁГА ФОТОГРАФИЯНИНГ КИРИБ КЕЛИШИ ТАРИХИ. Вестник магистратуры, (5-3 (140)), 44-45.
10. Мавлонов, А. А., & Абдулхафизов, М. (2023). ФИҚҲ ЁКИ ИСЛОМ ҚОНУНШУНОСЛИГИНИНГ ВУЖУДГА КЕЛИШ ТАРИХИ. Вестник магистратуры, 46.
11. Kudratkhodja, S., Alptekin, M. Y., Altinboyev, N., Pulatova, D., Mavlonov, A., & Aripov, M. (2026). DISAPPEARING WEDDING RITES OF PASSAGE IN UZBEKISTAN: MODERNIZATION AND FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVES.
12. Anvarxanovich, M. A., & Safoxon, M. (2023). QADIMGI DUNYO TARIXIDA O‘RTA OSIYO XALQLARINING MILLIY ISTIQLOL OZODLIK HARAKATLARI. Вестник магистратуры, (5-3 (140)), 42-43.
13. Mavlanov, A., & Mirzohidov, S. (2024). THE CULT OF WATER IN THE ANCIENT BELIEFS OF THE UZBEKS OF THE FERGANA VALLEY. Science and innovation, 3(C1), 5-7.

14. Mavlonov, A., & Mirzohidov, S. (2024). USE OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN HISTORY TEACHING METHODOLOGY. *Science and innovation*, 3(B8), 26-28.
15. Mavlonov, A., & Mirzohidov, S. Uzbek Cultural Heritage: Preserving Traditional Songs Importance AND Methods. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(8), 20-26.
16. Mavlonov, A. (2021, June). WATER CULT IN ANCIENT RELIGIOUS BELIEFS (Based on materials from the Fergana Valley). In Конференции.
17. Mavlonov, A. A. U., Ortqiova, K. I., & Ortiqov, O. I. (2026). HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LIFE AND ACTIVITY OF INOMJON XIDIRALIYEV. *Mahalliy va xalqaro konferensiyalar platformasi*, (5), 45-50.
18. Mavlonov, A., & Mirzohidov, S. (2024). O'ZBEK AYOLLARINING JAMIYATDA O'Z O'RINLARINI TOPISHI–KELAJAK AVLODNING POYDEVORIDIR. *Вестник магистратуры*, (6-1 (153)), 3-6.
19. Niyozov, J. (2026, January). DEVELOPING HISTORICAL THINKING OF PRE-SERVICE HISTORY TEACHERS THROUGH MUSEUM PEDAGOGY. In *International Conference on Science, Education & Law (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 4-7)*.
20. Niyozov, J. (2026, February). DEVELOPING THE AXIOLOGICAL COMPONENT OF HISTORICAL THINKING IN PRE-SERVICE HISTORY TEACHERS BASED ON MUSEUM PEDAGOGY. In *International Conference on Culture & History (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 8-12)*.
21. Niyozov, J. (2026, February). MUSEUM PEDAGOGY AS A TOOL FOR DEVELOPING SOURCE-CRITICAL AND INTERPRETATIVE SKILLS IN PRE-SERVICE HISTORY TEACHERS. In *International Conference on Social Sciences & Humanities (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 11-15)*.
22. Niyozov, J. (2026, January). DEVELOPING HISTORICAL THINKING THROUGH THE INTEGRATION OF MUSEUM PEDAGOGY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES. In *International Conference on Arts, Society & Humanities (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 24-27)*.
23. Niyozov, J. Educational Potential OF Museum Pedagogy AND Criteria for Its Application in Developing Historical Thinking OF Pre-Service History Teachers. *Maktabgacha va Maktab Ta'limi Jurnali*, 676773.
24. Niyozov, J. Bo 'lajak Tarix O 'qituvchilarini Muzey Pedagogikasi Vositasi Orqali Tarixiy Tafakkurini Rivojlantirishning Modeli. *Maktabgacha va Maktab Ta'limi Jurnali*, 675308.
25. Niyozov, J. J. U. (2026). THE ROLE OF MUSEUM PEDAGOGY IN ENHANCING HISTORICAL THINKING AMONG FUTURE HISTORY TEACHERS. *Mahalliy va xalqaro konferensiyalar platformasi*, (5), 161-169.
26. Саримсоков, А. А. (2010). Календарные обряды узбеков (на основе материалов Ферганской долины).
27. Арифханова, З. Х., Абашин, С. Н., & Алимова, Д. А. (2011). Узбеки.
28. Саримсоков, А. А. (2011). Узбекларнинг таквими маросимлари (Фаргона водийси материаллари асосида). Тошкент: Yangi Nashr.
29. Саримсоков, А. А. (2020). Традиционные календарные взгляды узбеков. *Ученый XXI века*, (1 (60)), 24-29.
30. Sarimsokov, A. A. (2020). Uzbek views on the calendar of the year.
31. Sarimsokov, A. A. (2022). IMAGINATIONS OF UZBEK PEOPLE RELATED TO" GOOD" AND" BAD" TIME. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, 11(8), 66-69.
32. Саримсоков, А. А. (2024). The ritual of “qo'sh chiqarish” among Uzbeks and its territorial features (on the example of the Fergana Valley). *Историческая этнология*, 9(2), 214-223.

33. Sarimsokov, A. A. (2024). Navruz: Customs and Ceremonies. *Central Asian Journal of Social Sciences and History*, 5(2), 14-20.
34. Abdiraximovich, S. A. (2024). O 'RTA ASRLAR TARIXINI DAVRLASHTIRISH: MUAMMO VA YECHIMLAR (Osiyo va Afrika mamlakatlari misolida). *UBS Scientific Bulletin*, (4), 3-11.
35. Abdiraximovich, S. A. (2024). JAHON TARIXI (Osiyo va Afrika mamlakatlarining o'rta asrlar tarixi). [Darslik]. ISBN: 978-9910-662-80-5
36. Abdiraximovich, S. A. (2025, August). NAMANGAN VILOYATI QORAQALPOQLARIDA HUNARMANDCHILIK AN'ANALARI. In Partner conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 135-139).
37. Abdiraximovich, S. A. (2025, August). O 'ZBEKLARNING TAQVIMIY MAROSIMLARI: BAHORIY SAYILLAR. In Partner conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 152-156).
38. Abdiraximovich, S. A., & Tursunpulotovich, M. M. (2025, September). O 'ZBEKISTON BA KOREYA RESPUBLIKASI MUNOSABATLARI YANGI BOSQICHDA (NAMANGAN VILOYATI MISOLIDA). In Partner conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus (Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 369
39. Sarimsokov, A. (2025). O 'ZBEKLAR TAQVIMIY MAROSIMLARINING ARXEOLGIK MANBALARDA AKS ETISHI. *Muarrix*, 1(3).
40. Abdiraximovich, S. A. (2026) REFLECTIONS OF UZBEK PEOPLE'S CALENDAR RITUALS IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOURCES. "PEDAGOGS" international research journal ISSN: 2181-3027_SJIF: 5.449
41. Egamberdiyev, B. (2026). O 'ZBEKISTONDA MAHALLIY ODATLAR VA MAROSIMLARINING SHAKLLANISHI VA ULARNING FALSAFIY-TARIXIY MOHIYATI. Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг долзарб муаммолари Актуальные проблемы социально-гуманитарных наук Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences., 6(1), 75-82.
42. Baxodir o'g'li, E. B. (2025, December). O'ZBEK XALQINING AN'ANAVIY MAROSIM VA URF-ODATLARINING TARIXIY ASOSLARI VA RIVOJLANISH FALSAFIY TAHLILI (QADIMGI DAVR, ISLOM DAVRI MISOLIDA). In Partner conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 20-24).
43. Egamberdiyev, B. B. O. (2026). THE PHILOSOPHICAL ROLE OF CUSTOMS AND RITUALS IN SOCIAL LIFE AND THE MAHALLA SYSTEM IN UZBEKISTAN. *Mahalliy va xalqaro konferensiyalar platformasi*, (5), 29-36.
44. Rahimberdiyev, S. (2026). KOREYA RESPUBLIKASIDA O 'ZBEK MIGRANTLARINING MADANIY IDENTIFIKATSIYASI: TRANSMILLIY JARAYON VA KUNDALIK HAYOT DINAMIKASI. *Universal xalqaro ilmiy jurnal*, 3(3.1), 434-440.
45. Bekmurod o'g'li, R. S. (2025, December). KOREYADAGI O 'ZBEKISTONLIK MEHNAT MIGRANTLARINING IJTIMOIIY HOLATI VA MADANIY IDENTIFIKATSIYA JARAYONLARI. In Partner conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 108-111).
46. Rahimberdiyev, S. (2025). Socio-Cultural Adaptation of Uzbek Students in Korea. *Muarrix*, 1(3).
47. Rahimberdiyev, S. B. U. (2026). THE FORMATION AND TRANSFORMATION OF CULTURAL SELF-IDENTIFICATION AMONG LABOUR MIGRANTS. *Mahalliy va xalqaro konferensiyalar platformasi*, (5), 122-128.

48. Yusupov, D. S. O. (2021). The stages of creation smart clothing and electronic garments. *Science and Education*, 2(4), 163-165.
49. Yusupov, D., & Usanova, G. (2026). POSSIBILITIES OF USING CARBON FIBER AND HEAT-RETAINING MATERIALS IN SMART CLOTHING. *Mahalliy va xalqaro konferensiyalar platformasi*, (5), 175-184.
50. Bobojonova, D. B. Q., Usanova, G. I. Q., Yusupov, D. S. U., & Tashpulatov, S. S. (2026). THE RELEVANCE OF CHILDREN'S CLOTHING DESIGN: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND TRANSFORMABLE SOLUTIONS. *Mahalliy va xalqaro konferensiyalar platformasi*, (5), 37-42.
51. Yusupov, D. (2026). SMART CLOTHING IS THE FUTURE. *European Review of Contemporary Arts and Humanities*, 2(6), 119-124.
52. Gulbaxor, M., & Bahodir, S. (2025). TIL O 'RGANISHDA CHATGPT, TARJIMA TIZIMLARI VA ULARNING SAMARADORLIGI. *TADQIQOTLAR*, 76(3), 17-21.
53. Muzaffar, G., & Bahodir, S. (2025). INSON ORGANIZMIDA UCHRAYDIGAN ICHKI KASALIKLAR. *TADQIQOTLAR*, 76(2), 71-74.
54. Bakhodir, S., & Dilshoda, R. (2025). EASTERN THINKERS OF THE ERA OF THE FIRST RENAISSANCE. *Global Science Review*, 8(1), 682-687.
55. Zebo, N., & Bahodir, S. (2025). O 'RTA ASRLARDA ANGLIYA (V-XV ASRLAR). *Global Science Review*, 11(1), 85-90.
56. Шамсиддинов, Б., & Гуламов, М. (2023). ЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ СООТНОШЕНИЯ ФИЛОСОФИИ С ЛИТЕРАТУРОЙ. *Oriental Art and Culture*, 4(3), 332-335.
57. Shamsiddinov, B. J., & Jakbaraliyeva, Z. (2022). Scientific and Empirical Relations of Philosophy and Literature. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, 7, 70-73.
58. Abdullaev, U. B., & Shamshiddinov, B. (2024). O 'RTA ASRLAR YOZMA MANBALARIDAGI ETNIK NOMLAR. *Ijtimoiy-gumanitar sohada ilmiy-innovatsion tadqiqotlar*, 1(1).
59. Шамсиддинов, Б. Ж., & Жакбаралиева, З. О. (2022). АБУ АЛИ ИБН СИНО ТИББИЙ ТАРБИЯ ХУСУСИДА. *Oriental Art and Culture*, 3(2), 670-674.
60. Shamsiddinov, B. (2022). The importance of supporting innovative activities of entrepreneurs in uzbekistan. *ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MARKETING & MANAGEMENT REVIEW* ISSN: 2319-2836 Impact Factor: 8.071, 11(11), 165-170.
61. Шамсиддинов, Б. Ж. (2023). МАМЛАКАТИМИЗ МИЛЛИЙ ЮКСАЛИШНИНГ ИЖТИМОИЙФАЛСАФИЙ АСОСЛАРИ. *Oriental Art and Culture*, 4(5), 345-350.
62. Шамсиддинов, Б. (2020). Тарбия жараёнида шар мутафаккирларининг қ педагогик ва психологик қарашлари. In *Актуальные вопросы развития современного общества, экономики и профессионального образования* (pp. 268-271). Российский государственный профессионально-педагогический университет.
63. Shamsiddinov, B. B. DINSHUNOSLIKNING BOSHQA FANLAR BILAN ALOQASI.
64. Shamsiddinov, B. B. Ta'lim innovatsiyasi va integratsiyasi.
65. YANGI, V. T. V. M., & YONDASHUVLARI, T. H. OZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY TALIM, FAN VA INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI NAMANGAN DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI “ZAMONAVIY JAHON TARIXSHUNOSLIGIDA FARG'ONA.
66. Kozimjon o'g, N. M. K. (2026). BUXORO AMIRI AMIR NASRULLONING SIYOSIY FAOLIYATI MAHALLIY VA HORIIY MANBALAR ASOSIDA. *TADQIQOTLAR*, 79(2), 2850291-2850291.

67. Kozimjon o'g, N. M. K. (2025). RUSLAR TOMONIDAN XIVA XONLIGINING BOSIB OLINISHI TARIXIY MANBALAR TAHLILI ASOSIDA II-QISIM. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTEGRATED SCIENCES, 1(1).
68. Kozimjon o'g, N. M. K. (2025). TOSHKENTNING ROSSIYA IMPERIYASI TOMONIDAN BOSIB OLINISHI. FARS International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities., 13(7), 47-53.
69. Kozimjon o'g, N. M. K., & Baxtiyor o'g'li, A. M. (2025). O 'RTA OSIYODA MA'RIFAT VA MILLIY UYG 'ONISH G 'OYALARI: MAHMUD XO 'JA BEHBUDIY FAOLIYATI MISOLIDA. Modern education and development, 36(2), 104-110.
70. Kozimjon o'g, N. M. K. (2025). THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KHOREZM PEOPLE'S SOVIET REPUBLIC. Universal Science Perspectives International Scientific Practical Journal, 1(1).
71. Kozimjon o'g, N. M. K. (2025). THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BUKHARA PEOPLE'S SOVIET REPUBLIC. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTEGRATED SCIENCES, 1(1).
72. Murodjon o'g'li, I. S., & Kozimjon o'g, N. M. K. (2025). XIX-ASR BIRINCHI YARIMIDAN XX-ASR IKKINCHI YARIMIGACHA O'RTA OSIYODA YUZBERGAN INGLIZ-RUS RAQOBATIDA XONLIKLARNING AHAMIYATI. IMRAS, 8(5), 138-147.
73. Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2013). The museum experience revisited. Left Coast Press.
74. Karn, S. (2024). Designing historical empathy learning experiences: A pedagogical tool for history teachers. History Education Research Journal, 21(1), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.14324/HERJ.21.1.06>
75. Niyozov, J. (2026). Educational potential of museum pedagogy and criteria for its application in developing historical thinking of pre-service history teachers. Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi jurnali. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18503335>
76. Savenije, G. M., & de Bruijn, P. (2017). Historical empathy in a museum: Uniting contextualisation and emotional engagement. International Journal of Heritage Studies.
77. Uppin, H., & Timoštšuk, I. (2019). “We'll be back by Christmas”: Developing historical empathy during a museum activity. Journal of Museum Education, 44(3), 310–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2019.1612660>