



CONFERENCE ARTICLE

PEDAGOGICAL CONDITIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' CREATIVE THINKING IN HISTORY LESSONS AT GENERAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS

Tursunova Sevarxon Umarovna

Independent Researcher, Namangan State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the issues of forming and developing students' creative thinking in the process of teaching history at general education schools. The research examines the definitions of creative thinking, its importance in history lessons, and the pedagogical conditions necessary for its practical implementation. The article reveals the possibilities of developing students' skills in analyzing, comparing, and drawing independent conclusions about historical events by moving away from traditional memorization methods and applying interactive and problem-based learning technologies.

Keywords: Creative thinking, history lessons, pedagogical conditions, interactive methods, problem-based learning, historical sources, case study, critical thinking.

INTRODUCTION

The processes of globalization and informatization occurring in the global education system are bringing to the forefront the task of equipping students not just with ready-made knowledge, but with the competencies of independent thinking, finding non-standard solutions, and engaging in creative activity. The concept for the development of the education system of the Republic of Uzbekistan also prioritizes the principle of "moving from memorization to thinking." In realizing this task, the subject of history holds particular significance. History is not merely a collection of past events, dates, and figures, but a fundamental science that allows for the analysis of human experience, the understanding of cause-and-effect relationships, and the drawing of conclusions for the present day.

However, in current teaching practice, history lessons often remain within the framework of traditional methods based on transmitting ready-made knowledge, which leaves the student in the position of a passive listener. Such an approach hinders the expression of the student's personal opinion, analytical reasoning, and creative potential. In this regard, the ideas put forward in the works of the American philosopher and educator John Dewey are of great importance. He emphasized that education is not just the transmission of knowledge, but a process of learning through experience [1]. Therefore, it is extremely urgent to reconsider the content and methodology of history lessons in a way that stimulates students' creative thinking and to scientifically substantiate the necessary pedagogical conditions for this.

LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODS

This research is based on constructivist learning theory, a person-centered approach, and achievements in cognitive psychology. The problem of developing creative thinking in the educational process has been studied by many scholars internationally. In particular, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, in his famous "Flow" theory, substantiates that a person achieves the highest creativity when fully immersed in an activity, demonstrating their skills to the maximum extent [2]. This theory shows the importance of creating a creative environment in the educational process through tasks that can interest the

student and are appropriate for their abilities. This idea is also supported by Ken Robinson; in his works, he criticizes the standardized approach of modern education systems for often stifling creativity and calls for stimulating students' natural curiosity and individualizing education [3]. According to K. Robinson's analysis, schools often prioritize subjects where there is a "single right answer," considering art, humanities, and other creative fields as secondary. This hinders the development of a culture of risk-taking, trying out original ideas, and learning from mistakes in students. Consequently, his views emphasize the need to create a free environment in history lessons for discussing different interpretations and hypotheses rather than memorizing strictly defined facts.

In linking creative thinking to specific stages of the learning process, the taxonomy of cognitive domains developed by Benjamin Bloom is of fundamental importance. According to its revised model, the cognitive process begins with simple remembering and understanding and ends with analysis, evaluation, and the highest level, creating [4]. This taxonomy serves as a methodological basis for teachers to design tasks that elevate history lessons above the level of mere fact memorization and direct students towards analytical and creative thinking.

When analyzing the topic directly from the perspective of teaching history, the research of Stanford University professor Sam Wineburg deserves special attention. In his works, Wineburg studied the working methods of professional historians with sources and found that they do not just accept information but "interrogate" it [5]. This approach urges the need to free students from seeing the textbook text as absolute truth and to turn them into critical thinkers who can evaluate the reliability of sources and draw independent conclusions by comparing them. The works of Uzbek scholars such as N.A. Muslimov and others have also examined the issues of designing the educational process based on modern pedagogical technologies and increasing student activity through interactive methods, which creates a foundation for developing creative thinking in the national educational context [6]. The research of these scholars reflects the aspiration in Uzbekistan's education

system to move away from traditional approaches and to orient the educational process towards the student's personality. Their works create the didactic basis for implementing modern methods and technologies in practice. However, it should be noted that while these studies focused more on the methods themselves, this article places central importance on the deeper philosophical change required for these methods to work—the necessity of re-conceptualizing the subject of history itself as a "science of interpretations." In this sense, the foundation laid by national scholars serves as a basis for the paradigmatic shift proposed in this study.

The analysis of the literature above shows that developing creative thinking is one of the central problems of modern education. However, the issue of integrating it directly into the content of history lessons and scientifically substantiating the pedagogical conditions that lead to effective results as a whole system requires further research. Theoretical methods such as analysis, synthesis, comparative-logical analysis, generalization, induction, and deduction were used in the research.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS. An analysis of scientific literature on developing creative thinking in history lessons shows that the solution to the problem lies not in simply "adding" separate methods to the lesson, but in fundamentally changing the entire teaching paradigm. In the traditional approach, history is presented as a collection of unchangeable, final knowledge about the past. In this paradigm, the teacher's task is to transmit this knowledge accurately and without error, and the student's task is to remember and repeat it. There is no room for creative thinking in such a system because it encourages "dangerous" activities like questioning the existing "truth" and searching for alternative interpretations.

The scientific position we propose is based on re-conceptualizing history as a science of interpretations. In this approach, history is not the past itself, but a continuous endeavor to reconstruct the past based on limited and sometimes contradictory sources. In this paradigm, the student is no longer a passive recipient but plays the role of an apprentice-historian. Their task is not just to know "what happened," but to understand "how our knowledge about the past was formed."

Based on this position, developing creative thinking requires the following interconnected transformations:

1. At the center of the traditional lesson is the textbook, which is considered the absolute source of knowledge. In the new approach, the historical problem and primary sources are placed at the center. The textbook becomes only an auxiliary tool that provides context. For example, when teaching the topic "The Jadidist Movement," students are given excerpts from an article by Behbudi, a secret report of the tsarist administration, and a fatwa from the ulema. By analyzing these conflicting sources, students create their own substantiated answer to the question, "Who were the Jadids?" This process, as S. Wineburg notes, teaches students to "interrogate sources" [5] and encourages them to ask questions rather than seek ready-made answers. Here, creativity is manifested in the ability to fill the "gaps" in the sources, expose the author's hidden purpose, and create a new, alternative interpretation of the event.

2. Traditional pedagogy values answers. The new approach, however, values questions, especially hypothetical ones like "What if...?" Such questions divert the student from simply repeating what happened and force them to think about historical possibilities and alternatives. For example, the question, "What would have been the future fate of the Golden Horde if the alliance between Amir Timur and Tokhtamysh had not been broken?" prompts the student to deeply analyze cause-and-effect relationships, evaluate the weight of various factors in the historical process, and create their own original scenario. This process directly corresponds to the highest level of B. Bloom's taxonomy—creating [4]. This process demonstrates and develops not just the student's knowledge, but their intellectual

potential. Creativity is often not about creating something new, but about finding unexpected, new connections between existing elements. A hypothetical question prompts the student to do just that: they reconsider the chain of causes and effects, combine historical factors in a different combination, and as a result, gain the opportunity to look at history with new eyes. This, in turn, deepens the student's historical thinking and teaches them to avoid standard solutions and search for alternative options when faced with any complex problem in the future.

3. The traditional classroom is based on individual competition: each student is responsible for themselves. Studying history as a science of interpretations, however, requires creating a community of interpretation. When students work in small groups, they test their initial hypotheses against the evidence and criticism of others. They are forced to defend their positions, understand others' points of view, and sometimes change their own opinions. This process is not just about assimilating knowledge, but about co-constructing knowledge. This, as K. Robinson noted, creates a creative environment that is "not afraid of mistakes," values diversity, and is based on collaboration [3]. These skills are the basis of critical thinking, which is necessary not only in history class but throughout life. Being able to change one's opinion based on evidence, rather than blindly clinging to it, is a sign of intellectual maturity. The "community of interpretation" provides a practical training ground for achieving this maturity.

Thus, as a result, we propose changing not just a set of individual methods, but the entire philosophy of the history lesson. This transformation changes the student's attitude towards history: it is no longer a collection of boring facts, but a living, debatable intellectual adventure in which they can also participate. The main outcome of this process is not the knowledge of historical facts, but the formation of a creative individual who possesses historical thinking skills, can critically approach any information, and can create their own well-founded conclusions.

CONCLUSION

The problem of developing students' creative thinking in history lessons in general education schools is one of the urgent tasks of today's education system. The theoretical and methodological analysis conducted in this article shows that an effective solution to this task should not be limited to the mechanical application of separate interactive methods to the lesson process. To achieve a real result, it is necessary to change the entire teaching paradigm, i.e., to approach history not as a collection of unchangeable facts, but as a science of interpretations. The main scientific idea put forward in the article is to elevate the student from a passive recipient of ready-made knowledge to the status of an "apprentice-historian," which, at an epistemological level, means abandoning the dominance of the textbook in favor of primary sources; at a pedagogical level, moving from seeking the "right answer" to being able to ask the "right question"; and at a social level, shifting from individual competition to forming a "community of interpretation" where students co-construct knowledge.

This approach fundamentally changes the student's attitude towards the subject of history. For them, history becomes not a collection of boring dates and events, but a lively intellectual process in which they can participate by analyzing sources, comparing evidence, and defending their own substantiated conclusions. The practical significance of the research is that the proposed paradigm serves as a new methodological compass for teachers in designing history lessons. For future research, promising directions include creating concrete mechanisms for implementing this theoretical approach in practice, including a set of source-based case studies for different grades, and developing valid criteria for assessing the products of students' creative activity. The final result is the education of a competent individual who not only knows history well but can think critically and creatively in any field and can independently analyze information.

REFERENCES

1. Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. The Macmillan Company. [Electronic source: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/852/852-h/852-h.htm>]
2. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention. Harper Perennial.
3. Robinson, K. (2011). Out of Our Minds: Learning to be Creative. Capstone Publishing Ltd. [Author's famous TED talk: https://www.ted.com/talks/sir_ken_robinson_do_schools_kill_creativity]
4. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.
5. Wineburg, S. (2001). Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past. Temple University Press.
6. Muslimov, N.A., et al. (2016). Principles of designing innovative pedagogical technologies in vocational education. Scientific-methodical journal "Education, Science and Innovation", (4). [Electronic source (similar topic): <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/innovatsion-talim-tehnologiyalari-va-ularni-talim-jarayoniga-tatbi-etish-usullari>]
7. Hattie, J. (2008). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. Routledge.
8. Brookhart, S. M. (2010). How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom. ASCD.